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CHAPTER ONE

The study of conflict behavior within the field of communication has been a substantial addition to this field for quite a number of years. It is extremely justifiable to study conflict within this realm, as it is communication that gives conflict its form and meaning. Indeed, Swenson (1973) opens his survey of research on interpersonal relations with the observation that, "People have been social beings from the beginning, and they have had problems in their social relationships from the beginning." Such a statement implies the union of communication and conflict.

As research findings have accumulated and expanded, we have come to accept that conflict is inevitable and that it may often be a very productive element of human existence. With this working premise, that conflict is indigenous to human life, it has been argued that good communication is not the elimination of conflict, but the consequence of the character of the approach to the stress. The issue then becomes that of discovering whether the interaction in conflict maintains (and even enhances) the situation, or does it injure (and even destroy) the relationship. Thus we now seek to construct and revise a theory of the management of conflict in an attempt to use conflict advantageously, minimizing the potential for the destructive consequences which are also a known result of conflict.
It has been demonstrated that many variables interact within a conflict episode, including the situational context, the perceptions and personalities of the parties involved, and their behavioral manifestations. In order to begin to construct a theory of conflict management that encompasses all of these dimensions, it has been customary to study each dimension separately until we have accumulated enough systematically replicatable data to feel comfortable in our accuracy of predicting the nature of the particular variable studied. Within the field of conflict it has been claimed that the scales have been tipped too much in favor of the study of the behavioral and situational variables, while research in the area of personality and perceptual differences is sorely needed. As Brown, Yelsma, and Keller (1981) point out, "If communication is the matrix of interpersonal relations, then it is the meaning or interpretation that people attach to a communication that is central," (p. 1102). Thus it is suggested that an interactional view of perception processes, behavior, and situational context is in order.

One area of perception that has proven to coincide with the manifestation of conflict is the perception of inequity. When a person's sense of justice or fairness in outcomes is seemingly being violated, he or she is generally motivated to correct this injustice in some way, quite often bringing rise to a conflict situation. In this field, too, it has been established that individuals have an internal standard of fairness, thus an understanding of individual differences and personality on the perception of fairness and the allocation of rewards is essential for adding insight to conflict management.
Within the realm of personality, it has been demonstrated that certain personality differences do make a rather substantial difference in perception and behavior. Psychoanalytic theory postulates that within each individual's psyche is the predisposition to perceive and behave in a certain manner. Thus, although the situational context is necessary to stimulate a perception and desire to behave, the actual perception and behavior is largely determined by this psychical predisposition. Many studies have looked for and verified these predispositions and their behavioral manifestations in such areas as work situations, career choice, counselor-patient relationships, and a myriad of other contexts. Isolations such as complexes (inferiority, Oedipal), needs and motivations (security, achievement, dependency), anxieties (sexual, social, neurotic), habit hierarchies and so on have all been shown to contribute to the perception of reality and take on behavioral expressions.

Thus, if one is guided by the premise that people must understand conflicts before they can successfully manage them, it would seem that a study attempting to ascertain the effect of personality upon perception in the areas of inequity and conflict would be warranted. This study endeavors to do just that by attempting to identify some of the constructs of personality that may bear upon an individual's predisposition to conflict situations. This should, hopefully, contribute to a "filling of the void" of heuristic knowledge surrounding the role perception plays within conflict management.

The purpose of the present study will be to look at the relationship among the perceptions of inequity, conflict behavior, and personality
type within the small work group setting. Specifically, the aim will be to investigate the interrelationship of the impact of personality type on the perception of inequity, the amount and type of conflict experienced, and the resolution strategy used. Is there a significant difference between the amount of conflict experienced between individuals of differing personality types? Are people of certain personality types more likely to perceive inequity? The relationship between the amount of conflict and the perception of inequity has already been established to have a positive correlation. This study will again attempt to verify that, as well as the possible effect personality differences may have on these perceptions.

From the standpoint of interactional psychology (Endler and Magnusson, 1976), it is argued that casting person (personality) and situational (organizational structure) attributes as joint moderators should yield a more accurate understanding of outcome relationships than using either of these attributes as simple moderators. Thus it is the contention of this author that knowledge of the tendencies of behavior that coincide with a particular personality type should be used in conjunction with the situational model. Included within the situationally contingent prescriptives offered by Thomas (1976), can be added prescriptive contingencies based upon personality. Thus an interactive conflict model could be constructed which includes both situational and perceptual contingencies, allowing for a more precise model in an attempt to contribute to the theoretical development within the field of conflict management.
In summary, the main objective of this study is to examine the interactive effects of personality type, perception of inequity, and the perception of conflict on behavior as manifested in the individual's choice of conflict resolution strategy. A secondary objective is to conceptually extend the work of Wall and Nolan (1984) by determining the influence of personality as it relates to perception of the conflict situation.
CHAPTER TWO

This chapter will cover a review of the relevant literature in the areas of conflict, equity, and personality research. An introduction to psychoanalytic theory, with specific reference to Jungian psychoanalytic theory, is included to enhance understanding of a theoretical paradigm for the study of personality as well as a selected instrument designed to assess personality type.

CONFLICT

Usually when beginning any type of scholarly endeavor, it is important to provide a definition of the concept being studied. Unfortunately, however, there is no one simple definition of the term "conflict." For example, several popular definitions in the literature today indicate that conflict is:

...the interaction of interdependent people who perceive incompatible goals and interference from each other in achieving these goals (Frost and Wilmot, 1978, p. 4).

...mutually incompatible goals or methods (Deutsch, 1969, p. 7).
... (1) behavioral preferences, the satisfaction of which are incompatible with another person's implementation of his preferences, (2) wants some mutually desirable resource which is in short supply such that the wants of everyone may not be satisfied fully, or (3) possesses values or attitudes which are salient in directing behavior but which are perceived to be exclusive of the values or attitudes held by the other (Rahim and Bonoma, 1979, p. 1323).

Hawes and Smith (1973) attempt to classify the conceptual definitional problem of conflict along three dimensions. First, the goals dimension includes those definitions of conflict that assume individuals have goals or intentions that direct and explain their behavior. Thus, when the goals of two or more individuals are incompatible, they are said to be in a state of conflict. The second dimension, the strategy dimension, encompasses those definitions that describe conflict as either something to be "resolved" and eliminated or those who define and describe conflict as something to be "managed" and maintained. The third definitional dimension is the time dimension. Within this dimension are those descriptions of conflict that are defined as "episodic", meaning that each conflict episode has a start and a finish or those definitions of conflict that describe it to be an ongoing or continuous process.

Although there may not be a consensus as to one predominant definition of conflict, there are two elements concerning conflict that social scientists do tend to agree upon. One is that conflict is a form of interaction which develops and is managed through communication (Folger and Poole, 1984; Poole, 1980; Putnam and Jones, 1982), and two is that
conflict is an inevitable part of human existence (Perrow, 1979; Pondy, 1967; Katz and Kahn, 1978).

Since it has come to be accepted that conflict is inevitable, growing concern has surfaced regarding how to handle or "manage" conflict as it arises in an effort to ensure that the conflict is as productive and functional as possible instead of allowing it to become destructive or eliminated altogether (Deutsch, 1969; Lippitt, 1982; Hawes and Smith, 1973). Many researchers have focused on the differing conflict-handling styles or behaviors exhibited by individuals in an effort to better learn how to manage conflict.

The concept of style originated with Blake and Mouton (1964); Hall, (1969); and Kilman and Thomas, (1977). These researchers identified five distinct types of conflict behavior based on two independent components of conflict behavior: 1) assertiveness, defined as behaviors intended to satisfy one's own concerns, and 2) cooperativeness, defined as behaviors intended to satisfy the other individual's concerns (Ruble and Thomas, 1976). These components combine to specify the five styles: competitive (forcing or dominant), accommodative (appeasement or smoothing), avoiding (withdrawal or flight), collaborative (problem-solving or integrative), and compromising (sharing). Brown, Yelsma and Keller (1981) argue that collaboration and withdrawal are diametrically opposing behaviors, as are accommodation and competition. Thus, they suggest that accommodating and collaborating are socially oriented behaviors, while withdrawing and competing are ego-oriented or self-assertive behaviors. These five styles have been extensively used by many major writers on interpersonal or organizational conflict (Filley,
Rahim (1983) conducted a study to construct factorially independent scales to measure the five styles of handling conflict and to provide evidence of their reliability and validity. Test-retest and internal consistency reliability coefficients for the five scales were satisfactory and compared favorably with other existing instruments; discriminant analyses provided evidence of empirical validity of the scales. He also found that four of the scales are free from social desirability or response distortion bias. His conclusion is that these scales can be used in basic research as well as the diagnosis of styles of handling interpersonal conflicts among members of a work group or organization.

Sillars (1982) proposed a three-category scheme (derived from the original five styles) which is said to reflect the two dimensions of communication that dominate discussions of communication in conflict. The first dimension is the directness, or disclosiveness of communication. Distributive and integrative acts are both relatively direct and disclosive about perceptions and feelings, while avoidance acts are not. The second dimension is the competitiveness of the communication, which distinguishes distributive versus integrative acts (Sillars, 1980). There are three main categories and twenty-seven subcategories of verbal strategies that are meant to apply to a variety of interpersonal contexts and are applicable to the needs of different researchers, including this author. The three main categories are: 1) avoidance (minimize explicit discussion of conflicts), 2) distributive (verbally competitive or individualistic behaviors), and 3) integrative (verbally cooperative
behaviors).

One of the main criticisms concerning conflict management styles is the assumption that individuals have a characteristic mode of conflict management behavior. Oftentimes an individual's behavior may vary across a variety of situations and/or in relation to the other party in the interaction (Rahim and Bonoma, 1979; Putnam and Wilson, 1982). For example, in superior-subordinate communication, Rahim (1983) notes that an individual may use a more obliging style with superiors than with a subordinate or peer. A study by Phillips and Cheston (1979) found that the forcing approach was the more common strategy in handling conflicts with subordinates than with peers, and much less common with superiors, while a compromising approach is expected when both parties have equal power.

In an attempt to describe the various dynamics of the concept of conflict, Thomas (1976) undertook an extensive review of the literature and proposed the Process and Structural models of conflict. The Process Model focuses upon the sequence of events within a conflict episode and is intended to be of use when intervening directly into the stream of events of an ongoing episode, while the structural model focuses upon the conditions in the environment which shape conflict behavior and is intended to help in structuring a situation to facilitate various behavior patterns.

The first element of Thomas's Process Model is that of the perception of frustration, defining conflict as, "the process which begins when one party perceives that the other has frustrated, or is about to
frustrate, some concern of his," (1976, p. 891). This notion of perception is extremely important in the study of conflict because, regardless of whether goals are actually incompatible, if the parties believe them to be incompatible then conditions are ripe for conflict. The second element of the process model is that of conceptualization. It is within this stage that the individual's unique conception of the situation, that personal picture that he or she has of the situation is said to be crucial. Thomas refers to this as "subjective reality" quoting Allport, "The way a man defines his situation constitutes for him its reality." (p. 896). Again it is made clear by Thomas that there may be no relationship at all between an individual's interpretation of an event and the actual reality of the event itself. Thus, the parties' interpretations and beliefs play a key role in conflicts, and communication is the key to shaping and maintaining the perceptions that guide conflict behavior (Folger and Poole, 1984).

Indeed, many researchers, including this author, claim that to understand conflict it is first necessary to understand how individuals perceive it. Kilman and Thomas (1978) refer to this orientation as the internal source of influence; the assumptions, perceptions, motives, insights, and decision-making styles are phenomena which occur within the individual and are, therefore, internal constructs for explaining behavior. Putnam and Jones (1982) term those researchers who focus on perceptions or the psychology of conflict as motive-centered, typified by Thomas and Pondy's (1977) advancement that, "the key to conflict management by principal parties is to understand the role of higher mental processes during a conflict episode," (p. 1091).
Jones and Melcher (1982) argue from a motive-centered perspective that Thomas's (1976) model is behaviorist oriented and is largely prescriptive in its contention that the appropriate conflict-handling mode is contingent upon the context or type of situation encountered. They cite the example from Thomas,

Confrontation may be most appropriate when the issues are critical, when there is a desire that the conflict remain resolved rather than re-emerge and where time is not particularly critical. The forcing mode may be most appropriate when time is of the essence, understanding of decisions is not strongly related to the motivation of behavioral compliance, and negative behavioral consequences are predicted to be minimum. The compromising mode should be used when the conflict has reached a high emotional state and needs to be somewhat diffused or where the issue is not sufficiently consequential (p. 657).

This contingency approach, however, has been criticized as ignoring the findings of motive-centered researchers (Jones and Melcher, 1982; Watkins, 1974; Klesler, 1978; Bell and Blakeney, 1977), findings that strongly suggest that all individuals are not equally disposed with regard to the choice of the style of conflict resolution. Jones and Melcher (1982) argue that, to date, the topic of conflict resolution has been approached by outlining under which set of circumstances each management style would be most appropriate and has failed to recognize that no conflict gets resolved unless both parties enter into the same resolution mode. Brown, Yelsma and Keller (1981) offer research findings that suggest that there are individual differences in susceptibility to
conflict, based on the method in which the individual manages conflict. They found that the better an individual manages conflict (i.e., the tendency to use collaborative methods), the less susceptibility the individual has to the distress of conflict situations. The implications of these findings then, is that while managers must analyze the situation to determine the appropriate conflict-handling style, they must also be aware that the preference for entering into a particular conflict-resolving mode is dependent upon the personality of each of the conflicting parties.

The study of conflict in relation to personality often falls into the realm of psychoanalytic theory. Several ideas from psychoanalytic theory (also called psychodynamic theory) are absolutely fundamental to an understanding of conflict (Coser, 1956). Of great value to the study of conflict is this theory's explanation of the role of what Coser terms "impulses", particularly the role of aggression and anxiety in conflicts. Psychodynamic theory recognizes the importance of substitute activities, displacement, scapegoating, and inflexibility, which allow for an explanation of many subtle processes that affect an individual's behavior in conflict. It is also true that few theories of conflict could function without ideas derived from psychodynamic concepts such as "rechanneling" or "subconscious motivation" (Folger and Poole, 1984).
of a conflict episode.

**EQUITY**

Within the context of conflict management and psychodynamic theory is the assumption that the manner in which a person perceives his or her potential outcomes in the conflict situation may have some relation to the behavior manifested by the individual during the conflict. One extremely powerful entity that has been found to have influence upon an individual's perception of his or her outcomes is the concept of "fairness", the meaning of which varies not only among individuals, but among cultures, civilizations, and historical eras. The origins and development of an individual's conception of justice have much play in the reasons and motives underlying his or her present conceptions of justice and just behavior (Boehm, 1962).

Within the realm of psychoanalytic theory, the superego, the internalized moral arbiter of conduct, is one of the three major systems of personality. Through this mechanism a child incorporates parental rules and prohibitions as well as the capacity for self-punishment - to experience guilt feelings - whenever he or she violates a rule or prohibition. The ego, another major system of personality, functions to bring rationality and prudence into the individual's behavior (Berg and Mussen, 1975). According to some analysts (Bieber, 1972; Esman, 1972), the irrational superego gradually becomes dominated by the rational,
adapted ego and, as this occurs, the individual's morality changes from one based on sanctions and rewards imposed from without to one based on reason and internalized principles of morality. At this point, equity plays a greater role in an individual's thinking about justice or fairness, hence extenuating circumstances, motivations, and intentions are heavily weighted in making moral judgments (Berg and Mussen, 1975).

Equity theory posits that individuals assess their outcomes by comparing them to a relative other's. More specifically, a state of equity exists when a person perceives his or her ratio of inputs (effort expended or costs) to outcomes (rewards) in proportion to the the input/output ratio of a comparison person. Inequity results when the ratios are not perceived as proportional (Adams, 1963). Perception is a key word within this theory, also, as the motivation by the individual to react in some way to an inequity is based on the individual's perception of the situation (or subjective reality) and not on what may be the actual set of circumstances (Steers and Porter, 1979). Within the same line of reasoning of most consistency theories, equity theory assumes that when faced with an inequitable situation, an individual will experience psychological tension and thus behave in some manner to reduce the tension by restoring equity.

Walster (1973) advanced the notion that the greater the inequity perceived, the greater the distress the individual will experience and thus be motivated to reduce or eliminate this distress by restoring "actual equity" or "psychological equity" to the relationship. Actual equity is restored in a straightforward way by altering inputs (i.e., the amount of effort expended on a job) or altering outcomes (i.e., taking more time off). Psychological equity may be restored by distorting "reality" in various
ways such as derogating the offender, minimizing the amount of suffering, or denying any responsibility for the situation.

It has been established that the identification of inequitable situations takes place through two types of social comparison. The first is a "local comparison" in which the person compares him or herself with one or more particular individual(s) on the same level such as another group member or work associate in the same department. The second is a "referential comparison" in which the individual compares to a generalized category of people, such as students or clerical workers. The assumption is that the individual must make both local and referential comparisons in order to conclude that a situation of equity or inequity exists (Tornblom, 1982; Berger et. al., 1972). In addition, other evidence shows that a person not only compares his or her own and the other person's inputs directly (comparison equity), but he or she also compares them to some internal standard (own and other equity) as well (Land and Messe, 1970; Weick and Nesset, 1968).

Goodman (1974) further examined the criteria for the selection of a comparison other and determined that people select referents that are seen as instrumental in satisfying individual needs. There is some indication that referents are selected which may enhance feelings of self-esteem, and avoidance of those which threaten feelings of self-esteem. Other evidence has shown that individuals with high self-esteem make a greater effort to restore equity, either actual or psychological, than a low self-esteem individual (Glass, 1964).

Rewards and the allocation of rewards is a major focus of study within equity theory. Deutsch (1975) and Leventhal (1976) have proposed
three rules that might be used in allocating rewards. The first is the equity rule: outcomes should be divided in direct proportion to inputs. The second is the equality rule: outcomes should be divided equally regardless of inputs. The third rule is the need rule: outcomes should be divided in direct proportion to needs. There is research evidence that people who contribute more than another lean toward equity and that those who contribute less than another lean toward equality (Sampson, 1969; Leventhal, 1976).

Ancock and Chertkoff (1982) looked at the allocation of rewards among members of a group to discover any biases in the direction of a tendency to distribute more rewards to one’s own group. Ingroup bias was most apparent when the ingroup member was a low performer given the same reward as an outgroup member who was a high performer. The results indicated the existence of some ingroup bias and that self-presentation is probably a crucial factor in allocating payoffs.

Bond, Leuing, and Choi (1982) examined the dimension of collectivism-individualism and its influence on the way rewards are allocated in a group situation. Prior research established that collectivism entails the need to preserve group harmony and will result in a more egalitarian assignment of rewards (Austin, 1980; Leventhal, et. al., 1972). These findings were again supported as well as establishing that contributions to group maintenance in the form of Bales’ (1950) socioemotional inputs as well as task-related inputs are accorded a role in determining payoffs.

Messe (1970) found support for his argument that the norm of distributive justice, or equity, can serve as a possible mediator of
conflict in bargaining situations. His contention was that if the persons in a bargaining situation subscribe to the norm of equity, they should all agree on that outcome which gives a reward to each person that is proportional to his or her inputs. Past research has established that when subjects were given no reason to believe that their inputs were not equal, they agreed on the equal-payoffs outcome; however, when they were led to believe that one person did qualitatively better on a prior task, agreement tended to be on an outcome that gave that person more reward than it did the other bargainer, congruent with the norm of equity (White, 1964).

Messe argues that the norm of equity appears to mediate conflict by allowing the parties involved to focus upon and give prominence to a particular alternative out of all the outcome alternatives available and this, in turn, tends to lessen the time it takes to reach agreement.

Behavioral reactions to a perceived inequitable situation have been found to be very similar to those reactions found in conflict situations. Just as withdrawal and avoidance operate as a conflict handling strategy, Dittrich and Carrell (1979) have established that employee perceptions of inequity demonstrate a significant relationship to absence. Absenteeism is seen as a form of withdrawal as well as a form of reduction of effort (outputs). Confrontation and attempts at forcing restitution are also some of the more popular techniques used to reestablish equity (Leventhal and Bergman, 1969; Marwell, Schmitt, and Shotoia, 1970).

A study by Wall and Nolan (1985a) was undertaken to assess the relationships among the amount of perceived inequity, amount of conflict, and resolution strategies within the small group setting. Prior research had established that the amount of inequity perceived by group members
was positively related to the amount of conflict experienced by the group (Nolan, 1982). The Wall and Nolan study again found this to be true, as well as finding that the greater amount of inequity was associated with conflicts centered around people than with those centered around the task and tended to be handled by avoidance management styles. These results were reanalyzed at the individual level, offering more support for the above mentioned claims. Thus it is safe to assume that, "a perceived inequity gives rise to some form of conflict which requires that it be managed in some form in order to restore equity," (Wall and Nolan, 1985b, p. 13). Therefore, the claim is again advanced that further study of the inequity variable and its causal potential should be undertaken in an effort to understand the unfolding of a conflict episode and its outcome.

It was earlier stated that many authors contend that the internal standard of the individual is an important component of justice behavior (Lane and Messe, 1971; Reis and Burns, 1982; Messe and Watts, 1983). Indeed, Morgan and Sawyer (1967) believe that what is acceptable depends upon the expectations each person has, and Walster (1973) maintains that personality variables will affect how participants view their situation. Berg and Mussen (1975) argue, with agreement from this author, that,

moral behavior as well as concepts of justice and morality must be explored within a very broad context of social and personality variables (p. 200).
Such investigations will help us not only to understand moral
development, but personality and social development as well.

PERSONALITY

If one is to attempt a look at the personality of individuals involved
in a conflict situation, it is necessary again to define what is meant by
"personality." Similar to the problem encountered when looking for an
agreed upon definition of conflict, many differing definitions of
personality have been offered by theorists. Consider the following
definitions by just a few of the major theorists in the field of
personality:

... the dynamic organization within the individual of
those psychophysical systems that determine his
characteristic behavior and thought (Allport, 1971, p.
28).

... the most adequate concentration of a person's
behavior in all its detail (McClelland, 1951, p. 69).

... those habits and habit systems of social
importance that are stable and resistant to change
(Guthrie, 1944, p. 5).

... the general orientation the psyche will take (Jung,
1926, p. 11).
Although one specifically agreed upon definition is not available, most, if not all, personality theorists would agree that a person's personality can be described in terms of consistent behavior patterns. Levy (1970) argues that what have been offered as definitions of personality might better be understood as,

declarations of theoretical commitments concerning the form and content of personality theories and as policy statements concerning circumstances under which personality theories may be invoked to explain behavior, (p. 9).

The important concept, however, is that of identity. It is the tendency to respond consistently in various situations that gives an individual identity. The components of identity, according to Levy (1970) seem to satisfy three conditions. First, they are behavioral in nature. A person's name, hair color, etc. are not considered as having much to do with their personality. Personality is clearly associated with behavior. Second, identity components help define some important aspect of a person's identity. The attributes and behaviors that comprise a person's identity are useful in either understanding or predicting a person's behavior, to make sense out of how he or she behaves, and to anticipate their behavior. The third condition of the components of identity is that they have an internal locus of causation. This eliminates behaviors that are immediately explainable by the external situation (e.g., the startle reflex or the response of running from an uncaged lion).
Two other contributors to personal identity proposed by Levy (1970) are organization and structure. Organization refers to the notion that an individual's behavior appears to fit into a meaningful pattern that is understandable from the standpoint of achieving some goal or accomplishing some task. Structure refers to the interrelationships among the different attributes that contribute to personal identity. For example, people who are described as friendly also tend to be described as talkative, while there is little relationship between friendly and tense. This definable structure in the relationships between the various components of identity allows comprehensibility and predictability and is an essential aspect of the concept of personality. Thus, identity, internal locus of causation, organization, and structure are the conditions found present wherever the term "personality" is used.

In general, personality and behavior often are used interchangeably, causing great confusion. According to Mischel (1968), personality is,

an abstraction or hypothetical construction from or about behavior, whereas behavior itself consists of observable events. Statements that deal with 'personality' describe inferred, hypothesized, mediating internal states, structure and organization of individuals (p. 4).

Traditionally, personality psychology deals with inferences about the individual's personality, focusing on behavioral observations as signs of the underlying processes within the person that serve as clues to his or her personality. Thus, the phenomena that constitute the main focus
of interest for the majority of personality psychologists concern the development of organization and structure, differences in their form over time and in different situations, within the same individual and within different individuals, and the instances of their stability or resistance to change (Levy, 1970).

There are, of course, many differing explanations for a person's observable behavior. The "causal standpoint" is concerned with the extent to which, and how, individual behavior is affected by situational or environmental events (e.g., the effect of child-rearing practices on adult personalities). A second viewpoint is the interactional or assessment orientation in which external variables are controlled or manipulated in order to assess how much of the variation in overt behavior may be attributed to them, to personality variables, and to the interaction between them (Fiske, 1978). This is the orientation of research concerned with the prediction of individual behavior such as Eysenck's (1965) finding that introverts condition more rapidly than extraverts. Quite often researchers look at the variation of both a personality variable and an external variable. For example, Leventhal and Perloe (1962) compared the extent to which subjects who were diagnosed as either high or low in self-esteem were persuaded by either optimistic or threatening communications (the external variable). They found subjects who were high in self-esteem were more influenced by optimistic than by threatening communications, the reverse holding true for those low in self-esteem. This orientation attempts to explain how variations in personality variables will be manifested in overt behavior.
under different external circumstances.

At present there are a number of paradigms that guide the research in the area of personality. Five of the most common are: 1) the psychoanalytic paradigm which focuses on the analysis of the psyche (Sigmund Freud, Carl Jung); 2) the sociocultural paradigm which focuses on the study of the societal-cultural factors influencing personality (Alfred Adler, Erik Erikson); 3) the existential-humanistic paradigm based on the problems of human existence (George Kelly, Carl Rogers, Abraham Maslow); 4) the learning paradigm which focuses on the study of the learning process as it relates to personality development (B. F. Skinner, John Dollard); and 5) the trait paradigm which is based on the assumption that the personality is made up of certain definite attributes or traits (Gordon Allport, Raymond Cattell). None of these paradigms are considered "most correct", but rather all are seen as providing useful information about personality.

Many studies in the current literature seem to be looking at interrelationships between personality variables or traits. At the simplest level, a "trait" refers to the differences between the directly observable behavior of two or more individuals on a defined dimension (Fiske, 1978). It is assumed that particular traits are common to many people, vary in amount, and can be inferred by measuring their behavioral indicators. Most importantly it is assumed these traits are relatively stable and enduring predispositions that exert fairly generalized effects upon behavior (Sanford, 1965; Allport, 1966). Much of the research on traits has been guided by a cumulative quantitative measurement model.
Generally, trait indicators are related additively to the inferred underlying disposition (Loevinger, 1957). An example is, the more submissive behavior an individual displays by selecting more submissive content on an inventory, the stronger the underlying trait of submissiveness is assumed to be.

The following is a review of some of the more recent literature in which personality theories and variables were applied to show their effects upon the differences in individual perception and interpersonal orientation.

Bakan (1966), introduced the concepts of "agency" and "communion" to denote the primary psychological orientations of human beings which are reflected in a person's thoughts and actions. In Bakan's model, agency summarizes concerns with achievement, prominence, success, and so forth; communion represents concerns with interpersonal relationships, intimacy, attachments, etc. Findings of past research have suggested that females are more communal and males more agentic in their orientations (Bakan, 1966; Carlson, 1971 and 1972).

Maslow suggests a number of ways in which the perception of self-actualizing persons will differ from that of need-dominated persons (1968 and 1973). He claims that one of the ways self-actualizing persons are to be distinguished from need-dominated persons is in a greater clarity of interpersonal perception:

Because the self-actualizing people ordinarily do not have to abstract need-gratification qualities nor see the person as a tool, it is much more possible for them to take a non-valuing, non-interfering, non-condemning attitude, a
desirelessness, a choiceless awareness. This permits much clearer and more insightful perception of what is there (Maslow, 1968, p. 40).

Neville's 1983 study argues that "high functioning" persons (persons who are rated at high levels of the core interpersonal dimensions: empathy, respect, confrontation) will perceive more accurately the quality of interpersonal functioning in others. It was already demonstrated in prior evidence (Neville, 1978) that high functioning individuals were perceived by other group members as making a greater contribution to learning in the group than low functioning individuals. Furthermore, high functioning individuals have more "positive" perceptions of other group members and of the learning climate of the group. In his 1983 research, Neville goes on to refine the concept of highly functioning individuals such that they are able to respond to personal effectiveness as to a core element of personality, and see beyond simple behavioral manifestations to a unitary personality. In contrast, the perceptions of less highly functioning individuals seem to stop at perception of the behavioral manifestations themselves, their perception of which is governed by their immediate need-state. For example, high functioning individuals are better able to cope with perceived confrontation (less likely to react defensively) and yet still maintain the ability to perceive empathy on the part of the confronting individual.

Spector (1982) argues that little attention has been given to the individual personality in explaining human behavior in organizations.
Thus he examined the personality construct, locus of control, as it relates to behavior in organizational settings. The concept of locus of control is that people attribute the cause or control of events either to themselves or to the external environment. Those who ascribe control of events to themselves are said to have an internal locus of control and are referred to as internals. People who attribute control to outside forces are said to have an external locus and are termed externals (Rotter, 1966). Several studies linking locus of control to learning and problem-solving have demonstrated superior performance by internals. It is assumed that internals made better use of information in a complex problem-solving situation (DuCette and Wolk, 1973; Ude and Vogler, 1969). Spector summarizes by noting that when tasks or organizational demands require initiative and independence of action, the internal would be more suitable; when the requirement is for compliance, however, the external would be more appropriate.

Spector's (1982) review concerning the locus of control also turned up some interesting findings for the area of conflict management. It was found that externals are more conforming and compliant than internals. Internals look to themselves for direction; externals look to others. Thus, externals make more compliant followers or subordinates than do internals, who are likely to be independent and resist control by superiors and other individuals. This led to the hypothesis that the compliance of externals seemed reminiscent of the submissiveness of authoritarians, and, indeed, data are provided which found that externals tend to use a coercive leadership style in dealing with subordinates.
Deluty (1981) examined differences among aggressive, assertive, and submissive elementary-school children in terms of their ability to generate alternative solutions to interpersonal conflict situations. It was hypothesized that, for highly aggressive and highly submissive youngsters, behaving assertively might not occur as a possibility, while highly assertive children would be capable of conceiving of a wide variety of response alternatives. The results, however, found that while individuals of differing habitual styles of behaving did not differ significantly in terms of the total number of alternatives they generated, there were significant differences in the types of alternatives they offered. All types of children generated more assertive alternatives than submissive ones, but the desirability of the few submissive responses for submissive children was quite high, while aggressive alternatives were found to dominate the strategies offered by highly aggressive children. These findings further support Mischel's (1973) demonstration that an individual's actions in a given situation are intimately related to his or her capacity to select behaviors from a potential range of response alternatives.

Schweiger and Jago (1982) looked at personality correlates in relation to problem-solving style. They conceptualized problem-solving style based on Jung's (1923) theory of psychological types. Other research has suggested that Jung's psychological types are associated to the types of information that decision-makers use when arriving at a choice (Kerin and Slocum, 1981). In addition, Steers (1977) found significant relationships suggestive of personality determinants dictating level of
participativeness in the decision-making process. Schweiger and Jago hypothesized that "sensing types" and "feeling types" are more participative than "intuitive" and "thinking" types. Their investigation offers support that individual differences (i.e. personality) do contribute to a decision-maker's choice of autocratic versus participative decision-making methods. Predispositions toward accuracy, precision, and detail (sensing), led to a greater reliance on the resources of others as expressed in greater participativeness. Of additional interest, female respondents exhibited a larger feeling orientation than did male respondents.

In a review of experimental studies done by Walton and McKersie (1965), it was determined that certain personality attributes, such as high authoritarianism, high dogmatism, and low self-esteem increased conflict behavior. Further demonstration of personality variables in conflict behavior was demonstrated by Abdel-Halim's (1980) findings that persons with a low need for achievement and an external locus of control react more negatively to role conflict.

Mossholder, Bedelian and Armenakis (1981) quote research that found that high self-esteem individuals (as compared to those with low self-esteem) tend to rely less on their job environments and more on their own perceptions to guide their work behavior. They define self-esteem as, "self-esteem expresses an attitude of approval or disapproval, and indicates the extent to which the individual believes self to be capable, significant, successful, and worthy." (p. 226). They argue that since role conflict is generated largely by environmental events external to the individual, high self-esteem individuals are less vulnerable to the
negative effects and stress brought on by such role pressures. Their results supported this argument, as well as the converse argument that low self-esteem individuals are more susceptible to the adverse effects of role conflict.

An attempt was made by Shockley-Zalabak (1981) to differentiate the effects of sex differences on the preference of conflict management style. This study argued that a review of the literature had turned up no investigation of the preferences for utilization of conflict styles by male and female managers in personal, interpersonal, small group, and overall contexts in the work setting. Using the Conflict Management Survey (Hall, 1969), the results yielded no significant differences in the preference for conflict styles by males and females. Although much of the literature in gender research supports the view that females are more relationship oriented than males and that males opt for goal maximization more than females, the findings of this study did not indicate the existence of this dichotomy.

Bell and Blakeney (1977) investigated the extent to which individuals act out their personalities in resolving intergroup conflict. Specifically, they hypothesized that the extent to which an individual uses the confronting mode of conflict resolution is positively correlated with the strength of his or her need for achievement. The forcing mode is positively correlated with dominance and/or aggression, while the smoothing mode is related to need for affiliation. The strongest support was found for the higher the need for achievement, the higher the preference for the confronting mode of conflict resolution. They found these same results to be true for both the student population and a field
population of interorganizational boundary personnel.

Jones and Melcher (1982) replicated Bell and Blakeney’s study and found no support for the hypothesized positive achievement-confronting relationship. Their results were more consistent with those of Terhune (1970) who found that high achievers initiate more cooperation in Prisoner’s Dilemma games than those scoring high on dominance or affiliation. The Jones and Melcher results found that the need for dominance correlated positively with the preference for the confronting mode. The greater the need for aggression, the greater the aversion to the smoothing mode. Support was found in this study as well as the Bell and Blakeney study for a positive correlation between need for affiliation and smoothing. Also, the higher an individual’s need for affiliation, the more the individual perceives both the forcing and confronting modes as threatening to friendly associations. The strongest support was found for the need for succorance or nurturance (both require the maintenance of friendly relationships) having a strong positive preference for the smoothing mode. The strengths of the need for deference was positively correlated with desirability for the forcing mode. Lastly, support was found for Machiavellian individuals to prefer a confronting mode and be averse to smoothing. These results clearly indicate that the preference for entering into a particular conflict-resolving mode is strongly associated with the personality of each of the conflicting parties.

Personality characteristics have been found to have strong implications for understanding an individual’s equity orientation. For example, Deutsch (1975) has hypothesized that the norm of equity is most compatible with concerns about individual achievement, while the norm of
equality is more congruent with interpersonal concerns. Thus it would follow that individuals with a high need for achievement would be more likely to expect a greater share of the reward for themselves when their work inputs are superior to those of their co-workers. This has been demonstrated in a number of studies concerned with sex differences (Kahn, et. al., 1980; Mednick and Tangri, 1972).

Watts, Messe and Vallacher (1982) provided support for the claim that sex-linked personality variables contribute to differences in the manner that females and males distribute rewards. Many past studies (Carles and Carver, 1979; Kahn, 1972; Lane and Messe, 1971) have shown that relative to males, females tend to treat themselves inequitably. The study by Watts, Messe and Vallacher suggests that one reason for this sex difference is that women typically are less agentic (achievement oriented) than men, and high agentic people appear to be more concerned about being fairly compensated for their work.

Research on distributive justice consistently has found differences in the ways that men and women allocate rewards between themselves and others (Major and Deaux, 1982). Regardless of the sex of the partner, studies have all found that women take less reward for themselves than men do. Another prevailing view in the literature by way of explanation is that women and men differ in their interpersonal orientations, styles, or goals and that these differences lead to different patterns of allocations (Major and Adams, 1983).

Kahn (1980) proposed that due to different socialization histories women are more oriented toward the interpersonal aspects of their relationships, and they seek to establish or maintain friendly relations
with their partners, whereas men are more concerned with the task, with maximizing their own gain, or with asserting status over their partners. Such differences in interpersonal orientation are assumed to be linked to different preferences for the distribution of rewards.

Major and Adams (1983) examined the joint impact of personality and situational factors on distributive-justice behavior. They found that even when men and women were preselected to be identical in their level of interpersonal orientation, the typically obtained pattern of women allocating significantly fewer rewards to themselves and more to their coworker than do men was still obtained. This failure to find a relationship between interpersonal orientation and men's/women's patterns of reward allocations was partly thought to be explained by the situation. This situation may have minimized the impact of individual differences in interpersonal orientation on allocations because subjects never saw their co-worker prior to making their allocations.

Stolte (1983) looked at the personality variable, suspiciousness, and its effect on perceptions of fairness in social exchange. Past research in this area suggests that individuals who score high in suspiciousness tend to exhibit projection, hostility, egocentrism, and tenseness, while those who score low tend to evince social concern, calmness, optimism, and trust (Shure and Meeker, 1967). Stolte's study found that individuals with a high degree of trust felt their final outcome was fair, while those with a high degree of suspicion tended to perceive the same outcome for themselves as unfair.

Ellis and Penner (1983) examined the relationship between sociopathic tendencies and reactions to an inequitable exchange. A
sociopath is a person who is egocentric, hedonistic, selfish, and tends to rationalize and/or deny responsibility for their actions. Traditionally, sociopathy was viewed as a clinical personality type, but is now conceptualized as an interpersonal style which influences behavior in nonclinical populations. Other research had established that sociopaths see their antisocial behavior as less harmful to a victim and accepted less personal responsibility for their own behavior than did nonsociopaths. Furthermore, they experienced less emotional arousal in response to another's distress (House and Milligan, 1976). Ellis and Penner found that high sociopaths showed a greater preference for self-benefiting resolutions and were willing to rationalize the inequities they did to another person, but were not willing to do this when the same inequity was committed against them. It is the contention of these authors that the egocentrism identified in the clinical literature can manifest itself in normal exchanges and that a full understanding of equity-related behaviors requires a consideration of both situational and personality variables.

It is the hope of this author that the above review of the literature has created an understanding of the continued need for research in the aforementioned areas.

According to Mischel (1968), personality psychology seeks reliable statements either about the personality or about the directly observed behavior of one or more persons. Such statements always have to be based on observable events and behavioral manifestations, although the unobservable psychological processes underlying these manifestations may be inferred when their link to behavior is justifiable. Of course, "reliable" statements are those that must be arrived at by reproducible
steps that lead to the same descriptions when followed by different observers.

One of the most critical and controversial issues within personality research is the consistency of particular predispositions within any individual and the utility of searching for these generalized predispositional states in the person as the determining sources of his or her response in different situations (Mischel, 1968). According to Cattell (1965), a chief purpose of personality psychology traditionally has been to identify the individual's position on one or more dimensions (e.g., anxiety, introversion) by comparing him or her with norms based on other persons tested under comparable standardized conditions. If one believes that an individual's position on these continua would be relatively stable across testing situations and over lengthy time periods, then the main assessment emphasis becomes the development of reliable instruments, administered under standard conditions to tap the presumably stable, enduring, underlying traits possessed by the person (Guilford, 1959; Levitt, 1967).

Earlier in this chapter it was mentioned that psychoanalytic theory is of great value in the study of behavior in conflict. It is the contention of this author that psychoanalytic theory should be more extensively used as a means for investigating the link perception has to the behavior manifested during conflict. Thus I have chosen an instrument for this study that is derived from psychoanalytic theory and has been developed, revised and extensively tested and used over the past 40 years, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). The MBTI is based on Jung's theory of psychological type. A brief description of Jung's personality
theory is in order.

Jung felt that there are two general orientations the psyche can take in relating to the world. These he terms attitudes, one is inward toward the subjective world of the individual which is labeled Introversion. The other is outward toward the external environment, labeled extraversion. In addition to the attitudes or general orientations, there are four functions of thought. The functions pertain to how a person perceives the world and deals with information and experience. There are four functions:

1) Sensing... detects the presence of things. It indicates that something is there but does not indicate what it is.

2) Thinking... tells what a thing is. It gives names to things that are sensed.

3) Feeling... tells whether a thing is acceptable or unacceptable. It determines what a thing is worth to the individual. Pertains to liking and disliking.

4) Intuiting... hunches about the past or future events when factual information is not available. Jung says, “Whenever you have to deal with strange conditions where you have no established values or established concepts, you will depend upon the faculty of intuition,” (1968, p. 14).

Thinking and feeling are called rational functions, because they make judgments and evaluations about experiences. In addition, thinking and feeling are considered polar opposites because, according to Jung, “when you think, you must exclude feeling, just as when you feel you must exclude thinking,” (1968, p. 14).
Jung's ideal is that the attitudes and functions would be equally developed, and all would work in harmony. However, this is seldom the case. Instead, one attitude and one function become dominant, and the other attitude and the other three functions remain undeveloped and unconscious. For example, in a person whose thinking function is highly developed, the other three functions, especially feeling (the opposite of thinking) will be relatively undeveloped on the unconscious level and may be expressed in dreams, fantasies, or in odd disturbing ways.

By combining the two attitudes and the four functions, Jung described eight different types of people. He notes that these eight types probably never exist in pure form, because each person possesses both attitudes and all four functions, and which is conscious and which is unconscious is a matter of personal development. The eight pure types are given below, with a brief description of what the person would tend to be like:

**Thinking Introvert.** Lives according to fixed rules. Objective and cold. Positive and dogmatic in one's thinking. Feeling is repressed.

**Feeling Introvert.** Very emotional and respectful of authority and tradition. Sociable person who seeks harmony with the world. Thinking is repressed.

**Sensing Introvert.** Pleasure-seeking, jolly, and socially adaptive. Constantly seeking new sensory experiences. Probably interested in such things as good food and art. Very realistic. Intuition is repressed.
Intuiting Extrovert. Decisions guided by hunches rather than by facts. Very changeable and creative. Has trouble staying with one idea very long, rather moves from one idea to another very rapidly. Knows much about one's own unconscious. Sensation is repressed.


Feeling Introvert. Quiet, thoughtful, and hypersensitive. Childish, enigmatic, and indifferent to the feelings and opinions of others. Very little expression of emotion. Thinking is repressed.

Sensing Introvert. Life guided by just what happens. Artistic, passive and calm. Detached from human affairs since one's main concern is over what happens. Intuition is repressed.

Intuiting Introvert. The odd, eccentric daydreamer who creates new but "strange" ideas. Seldom understood by other people, but this is not a source of concern. Life is guided by inner experiences rather than outer ones. Jung would be an example.

(Hergenhahn, 1980, p. 59).

Jung's theory is that the goal of life is the harmony of the psyche but before this is possible, the different parts of the psyche must be
known to a person. The differentiation of the various parts of personality is called, "individuation." The process of individuation is becoming aware of such things as the "anima" or "animus", the "shadow", the "persona", the functions of thought, and all other components of the psyche. A person is constantly striving for unity, for wholeness and the integration of the personality. All of this moves toward the realization of the self, or "self-actualization".

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator is based on Jung's theory and the notion that much apparently random variation in human behavior is actually quite orderly and consistent (therefore, predictable), due to certain basic differences in the way people approach life. The underlying assumption is that every person has a natural preference for one or the other pole on each of the four types, similar to a natural preference for right or left-handedness (Carlyn, 1977). The MBTI is a forced-choice, self-report inventory which, according to Coan (1978), represents a major effort to capture Jungian personality typology in a psychometric instrument. Once again I would like to emphasize my choice of this instrument is based on the importance I feel psychoanalytic theory has for the study of conflict behavior as well as the extensive testing and application this instrument has received over the years that remove any doubts about the validity and reliability of the instrument. (This will be elaborated in Chapter 3.)

Jungian theory assumes that the two components of each polarity tend toward incompatibility, so that as one of them is differentiated for use in conscious mental operations, its opposite tends to be relegated to
relatively uncontrolled unconscious operation, thus explaining why individuals of differing types and orientations may find it a bit more difficult to understand one another, and experience more friction (Myers, 1980).

**SUMMARY**

What may be inferred from this review of the literature may be summarized as follows. Conflict is given its form and meaning through communication and may be viewed as an inevitable part of human existence. Differing styles or approaches to handling conflict have been established, and have been classified into three main categories: 1) avoidance, 2) distributive, and 3) integrative.

The concept of fairness appears to play a role in an individual's perception of his or her outcomes, which may have some relation to the behavior manifested by the individual during conflict. Equity theory offers an explanation of an individual's thinking about justice or fairness through comparison of one's own input/output ratio to that of a relevant other. This comparison is based on a set of internal standards which seem to reflect individual differences in such areas as need-states, interpersonal orientation, gender, and personality. Often the behavioral reactions to a perceived inequity are similar to the reactions exhibited in a conflict situation such as withdrawal or forcing. In addition, the
perception of inequity is positively related to conflict, more often associated with conflicts centered around people than the task. Both conflict and inequity lead to behavior that is manifested as a result of an individual's perception of the situation, which may or may not reflect the actual set of circumstances.

Personality variables are reflected in an individual's behavior in situations of perceived inequity and conflict in various ways, some of which are:

1. Individuals with an external locus of control tend to use a coercive leadership style in dealing with subordinates.

2. Tendencies toward dominance and aggression and need for personal achievement are related to the forcing or distributive dimension of conflict management, while concerns with affiliation and interpersonal relationships are related to the avoidance or integrative dimensions.

3. Concerns with achievement are related to a desire for an equitable division of rewards, while concerns with interpersonal relationships are related to a desire for an equal division of rewards.

Personality is a concept that is described in terms of consistent behavior patterns which allow comprehensibility and predictability. One of the paradigms that guide research in the area of personality as well as conflict behavior is psychoanalytic theory. Jung's theory within this paradigm maintains that within the psyche is the natural preference for one or the other pole of four functions of thought (i.e., four ways to make sense of the world) and these preferences dictate behavior.
It is the contention of this author that knowledge of the tendencies of behavior that coincide with a particular personality type should be useful for the productive management of conflict. Included within the situationally contingent prescriptive offers by Thomas (1976), may be added prescriptive contingencies based upon personality. Thus a new model could be constructed which includes both situational and perceptual contingencies, allowing for a more precise model in an attempt to contribute to the theoretical development of the field. Based on the above literature review as well as the discussion of a well-accepted instrument for measuring personality, the following hypotheses are offered for testing:

H1: The greater the amount of perceived inequity, the greater the amount of perceived conflict.
H2: People-related conflicts will be associated with (a) a greater amount of perceived inequity and (b) a greater amount of perceived conflict than task-related conflicts.
H3: Integrative styles of conflict management will be associated with (a) less perceived inequity and (b) less conflict than either avoidance or distributive styles.
H4: Task-related conflicts will more likely be managed with integrative styles and people-related conflicts with either avoidance or distributive styles.
These first four hypotheses are included in an attempt to replicate and extend the earlier findings of Nolan (1982) and Wall and Nolan (1985a and b).

Since perceptual bias is argued to be of major import in this study, the particular Myers-Briggs dimension chosen (from the available four) for examination will be the dichotomy of thinking-feeling which is said to describe the way an individual makes decisions (the behavioral reaction) based on his or her perceptual predisposition more than the other dimensions. Myers (1975) proposed how representatives of this dimension of psychological type might respond in work situations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>THINKING TYPES</strong></th>
<th><strong>FEELING TYPES</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not show emotion readily and are often uncomfortable with people's feelings.</td>
<td>Tend to be very aware of other people and their feelings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May hurt people's feelings without knowing it.</td>
<td>Enjoy pleasing people, even in unimportant things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like analysis and putting things into logical order. Can get along without harmony.</td>
<td>Like harmony. Efficiency may be badly disturbed by office feuds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to decide impersonally sometimes paying insufficient attention to other people's likes and wishes.</td>
<td>Often let decisions be influenced by their own or other people's wishes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to be treated fairly.</td>
<td>Need occasional praise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are able to reprimand people or fire them when necessary.</td>
<td>Dislike telling people unpleasant things.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are more analytically-oriented, respond more easily to people’s thoughts. Are more people-oriented, respond more easily to people’s values.

Tend to be firm-minded. Tend to be sympathetic.

With this further understanding of the T/F dimension, the following hypotheses will be tested:

**H5:** There will be a significant difference in style of conflict management between opposite types. Specifically, the expectation is that thinking types will be more likely to use distributive methods which are thought to be more direct and disclosive about feelings with less regard for the other, and feeling types will be more likely to use integrative or avoidance methods which show regard for other’s feelings and a need to preserve group harmony.

**H6:** There will be a significant difference in the amount of perceived inequity between opposite types. The expectation is that thinking types will be more likely to perceive inequity than feeling types.

This is congruent with the research done by Deutsch (1975) mentioned earlier that found the norm of equity most compatible with
concerns about individual achievement (thinking types), while the norm of equality is more compatible with interpersonal concerns (feeling types).
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

The subjects used in this study consisted of 198 college students divided into 49 groups in an Introductory level Small Group Communication course. A major bonus for using this population was that the groups met Bales' (1950) requirement for full-fledged groups: that the group experiences initial uncertainty about the task, is required to reach a group decision, and there is the expectation of continued joint action over a period time until the task is completed. Another plus for this population is that all individuals in the group had to share the grade or "reward" earned for their group project. This was important because most research done on equity has been based in a controlled laboratory situation in which a monetary reward was manipulated. One of the major criticisms of this type of study is that the subjects are in a controlled atmosphere where the reward may or may not really make any difference to the subject. If the outcome is not perceived as substantially important - of value to the individual involved, then perceived inequity would not be particularly salient. However, in this study, it is assumed that the individual's grade was of importance, and, therefore, the
perceptions of inequity and conflict experienced were more likely to reflect a realistic situation as they had to share the grade (outcome) as a group instead of earning individual ones.

At the start of the quarter the subjects were randomly divided into groups of approximately five or six as part of the course design. The groups then had to complete a "Task Force Project" and give a group presentation by the end of the course. It was up to each individual group of students to decide upon their own group leader, division of labor, meeting places, procedures and deadlines. The structure of this course made it possible to ascertain the amount and type of conflict as well as any perception of inequity encountered by the subjects while working in the task-force group situation.

Procedure

Three different Instruments were used in this study and are described in greater detail below under their variable heading. At the beginning of the quarter I went to each class section and administered the MBTI Form F (see Appendix A) to each individual. This was done to ensure that each subject received the same instructions and rationale for completing it. The subjects were told that they would receive their results by the end of the quarter and that these results would benefit them by giving them greater insight into their interactions with other people. An experience with the MBTI reported by Sundberg (1970) warranted the necessity of carefully establishing a positive involvement with the test. The MBTI answer sheets were handscored, using the
special scoring key provided with the MBTI kit.

The third week of the quarter the subjects were provided with three sets of the conflict questionnaire appearing in Appendix B. In some sections, I gave out these questionnaires personally, in other sections the class instructor gave out the questionnaires to avoid the inconvenience of my interrupting class time. In either case, the subjects were verbally given the same instructions that also appeared at the top of the questionnaire. They were told to fill out one of these questionnaires (at home) after each group meeting (up to three) during which they felt the group experienced conflict. If they did not perceive any conflict, they were to say so on the questionnaire. These questionnaires were then collected during the fifth, eighth, and final week of classes. This was done to ensure a heightened level of anonymity, as subject identification was required on each questionnaire. The importance of asking the subjects to fill out three of these questionnaires was that having structured data after three different group meetings allowed for a better assessment of the actual conflict being experienced throughout the quarter rather than only what the subjects selectively remembered at the end of the quarter.

The last week of classes the final Equity/Conflict questionnaire was administered to each class section and appears in Appendix C. The rationale for giving this questionnaire the last week was that it takes an extended period of time working with the other group members and comparing situations with other members of the class for the perception of inequity to begin to develop. Thus any perception of inequity was
thought to be at its peak when all work for the project had been completed and the subjects had construed feelings about who contributed what to the final product.

It was required that all three instruments be completed. The subject's name was requested on each instrument and a careful record kept of who turned in what. It was clearly emphasized several times to the subjects that their responses on these questionnaires would in no way effect their grade, but were only being used for research and improvement of the Small Group Communication course.

**Instruments**

**Personality:**

In order to assess the personality variable, I administered the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Form F) as described in the previous section. The MBTI consists of 166 forced-choice Items that were easily answered within 45 minutes. (See Appendix A.) As mentioned in Chapter Two, this instrument was chosen because it is camped within psychoanalytic theory, its rigorous evaluation and revision history, its ease of administration, and its proven reliability and validity in measuring what it is intended to measure, Jungarian personality types. To reiterate, the four dimensions of the test purport to measure the preference for: Judging/Perceiving (JP), coming to a conclusion about something versus becoming aware of something; Thinking/Feeling (TF), arriving at judgments by impersonal and logical processes versus subjective and affective processes; Sensing/Intuiting (SN), perceiving
directly through the five senses versus indirectly by way of the unconscious; Extraversion/introversion (EI), orienting toward the outer world of people and things versus the inner world of concepts and ideas. Jungarian theory and the exposition in the Myers/Briggs manual prefer to treat these indices as alternative choices showing the person's dominant preference type rather than as scores on a trait continuum.

After the components of each pair are scored, they are combined into a single preference score (EI, SN, TF, or JP) which shows the direction of the subject's preference and the strength of the preference. The Indicator yields two types of scores for each person. It classifies respondents on four dichotomous type categories, and it also produces eight numerical scores which can be transformed into four continuous scores. MBTI scores may, therefore, be regarded as either dichotomous (as preferred by the Myers-Briggs manual) or continuous data.

It has been reported that the TF, SN, and EI scales are independent (intercorrelations between scales are low), but JP is consistently correlated with SN (ranges from .26 to .47) and less consistently with TF (Mendelsohn, 1970; Sundberg, 1970; Coan, 1978). This indicates that sensors tend to be judging types and intuitors tend to be perceptive types.

An unusually large body of reliability and validity data is available for this instrument. Internal consistency reliabilities for the scales range in general from .75 to .85 (Hoffman, 1974; Sundberg, 1970). Myers' recommendation (1962, pp. 20a-20b) is to estimate split-half reliabilities by calculating tetrachoric correlation coefficients and
applying the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula. Test-retest data have shown the proportion of agreement between the original and the retest to be significantly higher than would be expected by chance: reports on internal consistency have ranged from .66 to .90 for the TF dimension (Carlyn, 1977).

Reports on validity rest mainly on concurrent studies or expected relationships to other tests and to ratings and differences between groups. The relationships are in the expected direction. For example, the Strong Vocational Interest Blank interest in sales correlates significantly with extraversion; interest in psychology with intuition. The Edwards Personal Preference Scale scores for need for nurturance correlates with a feeling preference. Several researchers have used factor analysis to investigate the relationship between the constructs measured by the Indicator and constructs measured by other tests. In studies by Madison et. al. (1963) and by Ross (1966), factor analyses were used to relate a variety of tests to the MBTI. In all of these studies, the four MBTI scales tended to have substantial loadings on different factors, lending support to Myers and Briggs' premise of a four-dimensional interlocking structure of personality.

Scoring of the special answer sheets was done by hand. Each scored item has one answer weighted in favor of one of the eight preferences and the other answer weighted in favor of the opposing preference. Different weights have been assigned to certain answers in an attempt to offset social desirability bias. To determine the person's type, the points for each preference are totaled, yielding eight numerical scores.
These eight scores are interpreted as four pairs of scores, with the larger of each pair indicating the preferred pole. With regard to this particular study, the only pair of scores analyzed were those representative of the TF dimension, as was indicated earlier. (Although scores for all four dimensions were computed.)

Mendelsohn (1970) feels that few instruments appear to provide as much information as can be derived efficiently from the MBTI and is useful for personality research. Sundberg (1970) contends that whether or not one accepts the structural implications of Jungian theory, or even the theory itself, the empirical relations of the Inventory's scales can be studied and should be used with work groups, married couples or families.

Conflict:
Amount:

Amount of perceived conflict was measured using items 17 through 25 of the questionnaire in Appendix B. This questionnaire was originally developed by this author and has been modified and used in other studies. It consists of Likert-type questions about the amount of conflict the subjects may have encountered, as well as questions regarding the perception of inequity and satisfaction with their group. The range of possible responses is 4 to 20, with a lower score indicating a greater amount of conflict. Cronbach's Alpha has yielded a reliability coefficient of .85 for these items.
Type:

The type of conflict was determined based on responses to item 1 of the conflict questionnaire developed by Sills (1981) which asked the subject what the problem was about (see Appendix B). The responses were content analyzed using the category system developed in this author's previous research (see Appendix D) and will be discussed below.

Inequity:

Inequity was measured using the questionnaire originally developed by this author (see Appendix B). As previously mentioned, this questionnaire has been revised and used in more research (Wall and Nolan, 1985a and b) since that time and has been effective in tapping the inequity variable. There are six Likert-type items (see items 1-6 in Appendix B) with five response categories ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The range of scores may vary from 6 to 30, with a lower score indicating a higher perception of inequity.

Coding Procedures:

The coding scheme used for the open-ended conflict questionnaire (Appendix B) defined the type of conflict and the style of conflict resolution.

The type of conflict coding categories were originally drawn from Tosi's (1980) research done on conflict in organizations. These categories were modified for use in prior research (Nolan, 1982) and again used in research by Wall and Nolan (1985a,b). The categories may
be found in Appendix D. Categories 10, 20, 30 and 60 (leadership, unequal workloads, personality differences and affective matters) were considered people-related conflicts, while categories 40 and 50 (procedural matters and ideational matters) were considered task-related conflicts.

The categories used for management style were derived from Sillars' (1981) study of roommate conflicts. In his original category scheme there are 17 categories, containing the six major categories used for this study as shown in Appendix E. Since the concerns of this study lie primarily with the dimension of management styles, categories 10 and 20 (submission, avoidance, nonstrategies and indirect strategies) were operationally defined as Avoidance styles; categories 30 and 40; (non-coercive and coercive compliance gaining) are defined as Distributive styles; categories 50 and 60 (disclosure and problem solving) are defined as Integrative.

These two coding schema, Type of Conflict (Appendix D) and Conflict Management Styles (Appendix E) were included in the codebook used to code the entire Open-ended conflict questionnaire. The entire codebook may be found in Appendix F. These categories emerged from the data and had been previously developed by Professor Wall (O.S.U., 1985) for use with this questionnaire.

The codebook was used to code the data from this study by three coders. We trained together until a mutual understanding of the coding system was reached. We then randomly selected 20% of the
questionnaires (a total of 40) and coded them independently. A comparison of the codes given by each coder to the selected 40 questionnaires and our percentage of agreement determined the reliability of the coding system. An item was considered properly coded when two out of three coders agreed. Since this study is primarily interested in Items 1, 5, and 6 from this questionnaire, I computed the percentage of agreement on all items separately which are as follows:

Items 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 were 97% to 98% agreement for two out of three coders.

Item 1 (type of conflict) was 95% agreement for two out of three coders.

Items 5 and 6 (resolution strategies) were 93% agreement for two out of three coders.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Table I presents a summary of the data:

**TABLE I**

*Data Summary of Variables Across All Subjects*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Inequity</td>
<td>27.68</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Conflict</td>
<td>48.36</td>
<td>14.42</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking/Feeling Personality Type</td>
<td>-4.12</td>
<td>22.73</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Total Episodes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict Types:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-related</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People-related</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resolution Strategies:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H1: The greater the amount of perceived inequity, the greater the amount of perceived conflict.

This prediction was tested by using all 198 subjects and correlating the amount of perceived inequity with the amount of perceived conflict. The amount of inequity was computed from the sum of the scores received on items 1-6 of the conflict/inequity questionnaire, while amount of conflict was computed from items 17-25 (see Appendix B). Inequity was significantly correlated with conflict \((r=.35, \, df=197, \, p<.001)\) in the expected direction.

H2: People-related conflicts will be associated with (a) a greater amount of perceived inequity and (b) a greater amount of perceived
conflict than task-related conflicts.

Those items that were content analyzed were divided according to the source of the conflict (task or people) and comparisons made to the amount of conflict and perceived inequity using a MANOVA and then one-way ANOVAS with the Scheffe method for multiple comparisons. As the individual was used as the basic unit of analysis, it was necessary to categorize each individual according to their predominate type of conflict episode described. This was done on the basis of the majority of episodes mentioned (each subject could have up to three). Thus, if a subject reported two task-related conflicts and one people-related, his or her predominate type was considered task-related. If an individual reported one task-related, one people-related, and had no third conflict episode, the predominate type was considered mixed. If a subject reported only one conflict episode, then that one type reported was considered the dominate type and so forth for all possible combinations.

A MANOVA was conducted looking at the two dependent variables, conflict and inequity by type of conflict. Both inequity and conflict taken together as a multi-dimensional measurement showed a significant difference among the four conflict types (Wilks-Lambda=.934 df=3190, p=.044). In order to determine what these variables were individually, two ANOVAS were run.

The first ANOVA with perceived inequity as the dependent variable produced non-significant results. Table 2 displays the data:
### TABLE 2

**Amount of Perceived Inequity by Type of Conflict**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Conflict</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People-related</td>
<td>26.75</td>
<td>15.07</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-related</td>
<td>27.16</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>31.54</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F $1.18_{3/190}, p = .32$

The second ANOVA with the amount of conflict as the dependent variable did produce significant results. Table 3 displays the data:
TABLE 3

Amount of Perceived Conflict by Type of Conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Conflict</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People-related</td>
<td>45.81</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-related</td>
<td>47.34</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>46.69</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>56.96</td>
<td>26.90</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F_{4.263/190}.p=.006

The highest amount of perceived conflict was associated with people-related types, and all three groups, people-related, task-related and mixed did perceive significantly more conflict than the no conflict group. Although there was not a significant relationship indicated between inequity and type of conflict mentioned, the means fell in the expected direction, and both groups perceived more inequity than the no conflict group.
H3: Integrative styles of conflict management will be associated with (a) less perceived inequity and (b) less conflict than either avoidance or distributive styles.

Using the amount of perceived inequity and amount of conflict as the dependent variables and the resolution strategy (from the content analysis) as the independent variable, a MANOVA and two one-way ANOVAS were done.

The same procedure for categorizing the individual according to their predominate type of conflict was also used for categorizing the individual according to their predominate resolution strategy used. Again this was done on the basis of the majority of episodes mentioned (each subject could have up to three) from the open-ended conflict questionnaires. Thus, if a subject reported two avoidance and one integrative strategy, his or her predominate strategy was considered avoidance. If an individual reported one avoidance, one distributive, and had no third episode, the predominate strategy was considered mixed. If a subject reported only one conflict episode, then the strategy used during that one episode was considered the dominate strategy, and so forth for all possible combinations.

A MANOVA of both inequity and conflict taken together as a multi-dimensional measurement with strategy was significant (Wilks Lambda = .911 df=1156, p=.024). In order to determine the strength of each dependent variable, two ANOVAS were run and the results are as follows:
The first ANOVA with perceived inequity as the dependent variable failed to reach significance. Table 4 displays the data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>25.33</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>27.80</td>
<td>17.94</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative</td>
<td>29.11</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>24.15</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F(3, 156) = 1.86, p = .13

Again, the means fell in the expected direction. Those using the integrative strategy perceived less inequity than those using mixed strategies. Both the avoidance and distributive groups perceived more inequity than the integrative group, but not significantly.
The second ANOVA with conflict as the dependent variable was significant as shown in Table 5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>46.83</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>43.31</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative</td>
<td>50.31</td>
<td>12.58</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>45.79</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F3.63 3/156, p=.02

The means fell in the expected direction, revealing a significant (p<.05) difference between the integrative group and the distributive group. The integrative group perceived less conflict than the distributive and avoidance (and mixed) groups.

Thus it appears from the above mentioned results, that the two variables inequity and conflict do reach significance when considered together, however it's clear that the amount of conflict is most important.
H4: Task-related conflicts will more likely be managed with integrative styles and people-related conflicts with avoidance or distributive styles.

As this study uses frequency data, a chi-square analysis of type of conflict and resolution strategies was used. In order to compare cell proportions, z-score transformations were used.

The data analyzed were the paired responses summed across all the subjects' descriptions of conflict and how it was managed. The data displayed in Table 6 were derived by using all paired responses mentioned (e.g., episode 1 was paired with strategy 1, episode 2 with strategy 2, and episode 3 with strategy 3). This eliminated the mixed category. The final number of paired responses was 131. Table 6 presents the data:
### TABLE 6

**Type of Conflict by Resolution Strategy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution Strategy</th>
<th>Avoidance</th>
<th>Distributive</th>
<th>Integrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People-related</td>
<td>n = 52</td>
<td>n = 56</td>
<td>n = 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.69%</td>
<td>42.75%</td>
<td>17.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-related</td>
<td>n = 57</td>
<td>n = 57</td>
<td>n = 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.03%</td>
<td>26.03%</td>
<td>47.95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 32.712, df = 2, p = .0000008

This very significant chi-square indicates that type of conflict and conflict resolution strategy are not independent of one another. To pinpoint the differences, z-score transformations were used to compare cell proportions of people-related versus task-related conflicts for each of the resolution strategies:

- z-score for avoidance = 2.67, significant beyond .01
- z-score for distributive = 3.237, significant beyond .01
- z-score for integrative = 5.712, significant beyond .01

Thus, the results of the data do support the hypothesis, task-related conflicts are significantly associated with integrative styles of conflict.
management, and people-related conflicts are significantly associated with avoidance and distributive strategies.

H5: There will be a significant difference in strategy of conflict management between opposite types: thinking types will be more likely to use distributive methods, feeling types will be more likely to use integrative or avoidance methods.

A chi-square analysis of thinking types and feeling types with style of conflict management was done.

The data analyzed were the subjects' scores on the TF dimension of the Myers-Briggs Instrument and the predominate resolution strategy used. The results are shown in Table 7. The total number of subjects with both a Myers-Briggs score and a resolution strategy (as some did not have conflict) was 160.
Table 7

Personality Type by Resolution Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution Strategy</th>
<th>Personality Type</th>
<th>Avoidance</th>
<th>Distributive</th>
<th>Integrative</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feeling</td>
<td>n = 29</td>
<td>n = 20</td>
<td>n = 34</td>
<td>n = 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>n = 11</td>
<td>n = 15</td>
<td>n = 17</td>
<td>n = 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 2.157, df = 3, p = 0.54

The results were non-significant. I then analyzed the subjects at the extreme ends of the Myers-Briggs TF dimension by using only those in the top quartile of the Thinking dimension and the top quartile of the Feeling dimension and their predominate resolution strategy used. The total number of extreme subjects was 61. The results were nonsignificant, (Chi-Square = 6.438, df = 3, p = 0.09). Thus this data appears to indicate that personality type and conflict resolution strategy are independent of one another.
H6: There will be a significant difference in the amount of perceived inequity between opposite types: thinking types will be more likely to perceive inequity than feeling types.

This prediction was tested by using all 198 subjects and running a t-test comparison of mean differences in the amount of perceived inequity as the dependent variable, and the personality type as the independent variable.

As before, the amount of inequity was computed from the sum of the scores on items 1-6 of the conflict/inequity questionnaire (Appendix B), personality type was the score received on the TF dimension of the MBTI. The results showed that personality type was not related significantly to perceived inequity (t = .99, df = 196, p = .324).

Another t-test was run using the extreme ends of the TF dimension (the top quartile as before), but the results were still not significant (t = .71 df = 75, p = .48).

Two post hoc analyses were run using the extreme personality types. The first analysis was designed to answer the question: Is there a significant difference in the amount of conflict perceived between opposite types? This was tested by using the extreme types and running a t-test comparison of mean differences in the amount of conflict as the dependent variable and the personality type as the independent variable. The results were not significant (t = 1.47, df = 75, p = .14).

The second analysis attempted to answer the question: Do certain personality types tend to experience a certain type of conflict? A chi-square analysis of type of conflict and personality type was run
using the extreme (upper quartile) personalities. Again the results were not significant (Chi-square=2.36, df=3, p=.50).

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

A summary of these results show hypothesis one to be confirmed, the greater the level of perceived inequity, the greater the amount of conflict. Hypothesis two has been confirmed when considering inequity and conflict together. However, conflict seems to play the most important part, a higher amount of conflict is perceived in people-related conflicts than task-related. Although it was not significantly confirmed that more inequity is associated with people-related conflicts than task-related, the means did fall in the expected direction.

Hypothesis three also was confirmed when considering inequity and conflict together. Again, conflict appears to play the most important part. Less inequity and less conflict were associated with the integrative strategy of conflict management. While the highest perception of inequity was associated with mixed strategies, high conflict was associated with the distributive strategy.
The results from hypothesis four confirm that task-related conflicts are more likely to be resolved by integrative strategies, while people-related conflicts are more likely to be associated with avoidance or distributive strategies.

Hypotheses five and six were not confirmed, there appears to be little relationship between the personality type of Thinking versus Feeling and the likelihood of using a particular strategy of conflict management or a tendency to perceive more or less inequity.

A more thorough discussion of these results will be presented in Chapter Five.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

The overall results of this study with regard to inequity do seem to lend support to the contention that there is good reason to study the perception of inequity as an element of conflict management. It was significant that the higher the level of perceived inequity, the greater the amount of perceived conflict. This provides additional support for the past findings of Nolan (1982) and Wall and Nolan (1985a and b). This meets one objective of this study. Another objective was to expand upon the prescriptives for conflict management offered by Thomas (1976).

When considering the application of these findings to the organizational setting, it should be helpful to be aware of the relationship between inequity and conflict. For example, conflict is known to produce both constructive and destructive consequences. It is the management of the conflict that seems to determine whether these consequences will be productive or destructive. Therefore, one should be able to apply this same logic to the perception of inequity. There may be occasions when the perception of inequity could lead to the stimulation of productive behavior in an attempt to restore equity. Following this
same reasoning, the perception of inequity could have positive potential for the construction or reconstruction of an organization's structure. Merit increases, promotions, cost of living increases, job descriptions etc. could all be evaluated with an extended understanding of why and how conflicts over the seeming "unfairness" of these organizational elements erupt and culminate in consequences that may be destructive to the organization. An attempt to restore equity could be channeled into positive consequences such as constructive criticism and the stimulation of new ideas for changing an organizational element that had been causing problems due to its "appearance" of being inequitable. Indeed, often Quality of Work Life circles, Job Enrichment programs and other Organizational Development programs are put into effect for just such a purpose.

These results also lend further support to the notion of understanding the importance of "subjective reality" and its relation to the perception of inequity and the resulting conflict behavior. In an attempt to utilize an understanding of "subjective reality," an organization could make extra efforts to have "objective reality" clearly elucidated. This is congruent with the already existing organizational prescriptive such as clearly defining job descriptions. Besides reducing the conflict caused by role ambiguity, this would also reduce the tendency to feel "overworked and underpaid", as one would know what "outputs" were expected for what "inputs."

In an attempt to locate what types of conflict seemed to be most closely related to the perception of inequity, the hypothesis was
generated that it would be those conflicts centered around interpersonal concerns more so than conflict regarding the task. Although this prediction failed to yield significant univariate results, the results were still encouraging as they were in the expected direction. When the amount of conflict and the perception of inequity were taken together in relation to the type of conflict, the results were significant. Although conflict played the most important part, this certainly seems to lend evidence to the notion that inequity and conflict are not independent entities. Based on the direction of the means when looking at just inequity with type of conflict, the highest amount of inequity was associated with people-related conflict and mixed conflict (which also includes people-related). It was also seen that those with no conflict perceived the least amount of inequity.

An attempt was also made to isolate what type of conflict seemed to generate the highest level of conflict. In this case the results significantly indicated that those conflicts centered around people generated the most perceived conflict, the mixed (both people and task) were next, and the least amount was centered around the task. Since inequity and conflict are significant when taken together, it seems safe to say that the hypothesis is confirmed that people-related conflicts are associated with a greater amount of inequity and conflict than task-related conflicts.

One possible reason for this may again relate to the notion of "subjective reality." The conflicts considered people-related consisted of such things as personality clashes, leadership assumption, a seeming
lack of appropriate involvement on the part of one of the members of the group, and affective matters - misunderstandings that caused hurt feelings. All of these things are open to many varying and discrepant perceptions that are very difficult to ground in reality. Contrast this with the more objective reality of the task itself. Conflicts surrounding the task include very objective problems such as when to have a group meeting, what to include in the presentation, what order to present the material, etc. Thus, although there will be conflict over how these things should be done, it is more clearly and objectively seen that the job entails that these things must be done – an objective reality everybody shares.

When attempting to identify behaviors or conflict management strategies that were enacted in an attempt to restore equity, it was predicted that either avoidance or distributive methods would be used, while integrative methods would be used by those perceiving the least inequity. The results approached significance in the expected direction. The highest amount of inequity was handled by a mixture of strategies, followed by avoidance; while the least amount was handled by an integrative strategy as expected. These results, while not significant, may still be seen as valuable because they are consistent with the prior research done in this area.

In conjunction with identifying the conflict management strategies associated with perceived inequity, it was also hypothesized that those experiencing the most conflict would tend to use avoidance or distributive strategies, while the lowest amount of conflict would be
handled by integrative strategies. The hypothesis was confirmed. The highest amount of conflict was associated with the distributive dimension, followed by mixed strategies and finally avoidance. The least amount of conflict was associated with the integrative style. These results are also consistent with the prior research in this area.

Once again, when the amount of conflict and the amount of perceived inequity were taken together in relation to strategies of management, the results were significant, again seeming to confirm the non-independence of these two variables. Based on the fact that the direction of the means in relation to the integrative style were the same for both inequity and conflict when taken as univariate measures, and significance is achieved when looking at the two variables together, it is concluded that integrative strategies are used by those perceiving the least amount of inequity and conflict.

The results thus far have culminated into an argument that more perceived inequity and conflict is associated with people-related conflict than task-related. A higher perception of inequity and conflict tends to be handled using distributive and avoidance strategies, while those perceiving a lower amount tend to use integrative strategies. This leads to the next prediction analyzed, that task-related conflicts would more likely be managed with integrative strategies, while people-related conflicts would be managed with distributive or avoidance styles. This prediction was confirmed. This is viewed as very encouraging because it lends support to the other results already discussed in this study as well as prior research that has also
determined the same relationships.

It would appear, then, that an open discussion of the problem and alternative solutions are more easily generated when the problem is an objective one such as the task. On the other hand, it seems that the subjective problems such as those involving people's perceptions of each other and their underlying motives are much less likely to be brought into the open in a problem-solving manner, but tend to be either forced or avoided altogether. When applying these tendencies to the organizational setting, it would seem that it might be possible to trace the root of a conflict back from the behaviors being exhibited by the individuals involved. For example, if forcing is the strategy being exhibited, then the conflict causing this behavior may more likely be one of an interpersonal nature brought on by the individual's subjective perception and less likely to be caused by the job (though the individual may like to make it seem like the problem is caused by the job). Indeed, until these perceptions can be clearly understood and articulated by the individual(s) involved, they cannot become the objective reality apparently required for integrative problem solving.

Finally, the attempt was made to isolate certain personality variables in an effort to determine their effect on an individual's likelihood of choosing a particular strategy for managing conflict. It was predicted that "Thinking Types" would be more likely to use distributive strategies based on their general orientation toward achieving a goal with little regard for others' feelings. "Feeling Types" were expected to use integrative or avoidance strategies based on their
general orientation toward affiliation and the need to preserve group harmony. It was also predicted that Thinking types would be more likely to perceive inequity due to the norm of equity being compatible with individual achievement, while Feeling types would be less likely to be concerned with inequity due to their interpersonal needs which lean more toward equality. These results failed to materialize. However, when looking at the extreme opposite ends of the TF dimension, the results do approach significance in the expected direction, but still are not what was hoped for.

One reason for this could be the nature of the task. According to the theory behind the MBTI, thinking and feeling are opposite ways of deciding. One way to decide is through thinking. Thinking predicts the logical result of any particular action. Then it decides impersonally, on the basis of cause and effect. The other way to decide is through feeling. Feeling takes into account anything that matters or is important (without requiring that it be logical), and decides on the basis of personal values. An individual possesses the capacity to use both, but usually not at the same time. It is possible that the nature of the task of this particular study triggered goals that were congruent with the person's personality type, but the behavior manifested to accomplish these goals was not very different. For example, it is congruent with the thinkers to want to get an A in the course to satisfy their achievement needs. However, they realize that this is a group course, so they behave in a more friendly manner in an effort to accomplish their goal. On the other hand, it is congruent with the feeling types to want to get an A to
satisfy their own values, and they naturally want to preserve group harmony. So, although the reasons for the enacted behavior may differ radically, the behavior itself would not be seen as significantly different.

Another reason the results were nonsignificant may be because only one dimension of the total four making up the MBTI was analyzed. It may be that certain combinations of the dimensions do tend to perceive more or less inequity or use certain conflict handling strategies, but looking at only one dimension was not sufficient to show this.

A summary of the discussion thus far is that inequity and conflict are clearly related. Greater inequity and conflict was associated with conflicts revolving around people than those centered on the task. People conflicts were managed with a distributive strategy and task conflicts with an integrative strategy. No relation to the perception of inequity or tendency to use a particular resolution strategy was found with regard to a thinking versus feeling personality preference.

LIMITATIONS

There are, of course, several limitations to the generalizability of this study. First off, all of the instruments administered were self-report instruments administered to a student population. Naturally the subjects themselves were very much aware of the fact that they were being used for research purposes. Thus, although due care was taken to ensure the confidentiality of the data, the subjects were aware
that they were not anonymous, as name identification was required on every instrument. Thus, some amount of "social desirability" was most likely reflected in their answers. Also, there should have been more information required from those subjects who reported they had no conflict. The way this study was conducted, each subject had to fill out the MBTI and the final conflict/equity questionnaire. However, if they perceived no conflict occurring in their group during the quarter, they left the open-ended questionnaire blank, simply writing their name and "No Conflict" on it. Thus, it is possible that some of the "no conflict" subjects were simply too lazy or unmotivated to fill out the questionnaire. Perhaps if they had had to answer the same amount of questions about why they had no conflict, more incidents of conflict would have been reported.

Another problem encountered with this open-ended questionnaire was that the subjects occasionally described their resolution strategies in terms of outcomes instead of the actual strategy used. For example, in answer to the question: Did you ever suggest ways to resolve the problem? the answer would be, "Well, she finally gave in." This was very frustrating as it did not answer the question and was, therefore, uncodeable.

And, thirdly, occasionally a subject would describe a conflict situation that went on among other members of the group, but did not involve the subject who was describing it. Thus, an answer to the question: Did you ever suggest ways to resolve the problem? was, "No, I was not involved." This did not accurately qualify as avoidance, and
therefore seemed uncodeable. This problem was clearly the fault of the questionnaire instructions which stated, "This questionnaire is to be answered after each group meeting during which you feel you and/or your group experienced conflict."

Another limiting factor to this study was the use of only one Myers/Briggs dimension instead of two or even all four. As mentioned previously, one dimension analyzed by itself just may not be powerful enough to generate significant results. It is not uncommon to encounter difficulty in isolating the effects of personality variables. Although the studies by Bell and Blakeney (1977) and Jones and Melcher (1982) did find support for their predicted associations between need states and conflict handling modes, their correlation coefficients were low. Indeed, attitudes and behaviors are complex human phenomena which have historically resisted either strong or simple associations and explanations. It appears that most research studies using personality variables seem to increase the understanding of attitudes and behaviors by only a small amount at a time.

If this study were to be conducted again, I would recommend the following improvements. With regard to the open-ended conflict questionnaire:

1) Change the instructions to read, "This questionnaire is to be answered after each group meeting (up to three) during which you feel you, personally, experienced conflict with other members of your group." This would eliminate any descriptions of conflict that did not involve the
subject him or herself.

2) The addition of another question after "Did you ever suggest ways to resolve the problem?" which asks, "What was the outcome of the conflict?" This would, potentially, require the subject to make the distinction between his or her conflict handling strategies and the actual outcome.

3) The addition of a question asking the sex of the other member(s) involved in the conflict. This would possibly add more insight to the perception literature in gender differences such that consideration could be given to how attribution of conflict management strategies to same sex and opposite sex others correspond to conflict management strategy preference.

Next I would recommend an instrument designed to assess the group interaction of those subjects who felt they experienced no conflict. It is quite possible that all groups experienced some difficulty in topic selection or meeting times, but perhaps this was not thought to be an actual "conflict" but merely a joint discussion or brainstorming session. Thus it is necessary that the group interaction of every subject be described, thus eliminating the subjective definition of "conflict" and putting it into the hands of qualified coders.

Lastly I would analyze all four combinations of the MBTI dimensions in relation to amount of inequity perceived, amount and type of conflict perceived, and choice of resolution strategy. It is possible to analyze one dimension alone (e.g., thinking/feeling), two dimensions simultaneously (e.g., extraversion/Introversion and thinking/feeling),
three dimensions or all four.

One final mention of a limiting factor was that the subjects involved knew their membership in their group was a temporary one - ten weeks maximum. Therefore, it is possible that problems often got "glossed over" for the sake of the grade or because they knew this course would soon be over anyway. This, of course, would not be the case in an actual organizational work group as the individuals are expecting to work together ad infinitum. However, since the reward involved in this study was the actual grade earned in the course and they had to work together to achieve it, these results might be more applicable to an organizational setting than those derived from a laboratory setting.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

There appears to be enough evidence generated by this study and the research before it to conclude that perceived inequity may be a part of the perceptual/conceptual framework of an individual involved in an interpersonal conflict. However, it is less likely to be resolved in a productive integrative manner, but is more often avoided or attempts are made to force the restoration of equity.

Conflict that is centered around the task or job to be done appears more easily resolved in a problem-solving manner and has less perceived inequity associated with it. It is the contention of this author that these conflicts are better handled because they are seen as part of a shared
"objective reality."

It was hoped that examining certain personality tendencies might lend some insight into the subjective processes of the individual by locating personality-related behavioral differences, but unfortunately this did not happen with this particular study. It was thought that this could be due to the nature of this task situation. When viewed with the realization that personality variables are extremely hard to tap in any study, a possible conclusion is that characteristics of the situation may far outweigh characteristics of the person in determining a strategy for handling conflict.

However, this study was somewhat encouraging when examining the extreme type of one dimension which approached a significant demonstration that there may be a tendency for a certain personality type to prefer one strategy of handling conflict over another. It is believed that using more dimensions of the MBTI will be needed to establish this relationship more firmly.

Although the findings regarding personality were disappointing, research in this area should not be abandoned. Continued efforts with differing approaches to the personality variable should be utilized. For example, several personality variables that could have some bearing on conflict management strategies and have been extensively researched are locus of control (internals exhibit less conformity and dislike influence attempts, while externals exhibit more conformity), self-esteem (those high in self-esteem tend to rely less on their job environments and more on their own self-perceptions), and need states
(achievement, affiliation, power, etc.). Eventually it should be possible to establish the interactive effects of the personality and the situation.

Within the field of equity, more attempt should be made to explore and expand the concept of equity within the organizational realm. Very few studies of equity take place outside the laboratory, and most use a monetary reward in an attempt to stimulate perceptions of inequity. It is necessary to establish the locus of inequity in an actual field situation. Within this study the locus could generally be seen as a perception of unequal participation for a shared grade. However, delineating the causes of inequity within the organization could aid tremendously in future human resource development and organizational structuring.
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APPENDIX B

NAME_______________________________________________ GROUP I.D. *________

This questionnaire is to be answered after each group meeting during which you feel you and/or your group experienced conflict. Answer the following questions with that conflict situation in mind. These questionnaires are to be put in the envelopes provided by your TA and will be treated with utmost confidentiality. Your answers will in one way affect your grade in 110, honesty will be appreciated.

1. What was the problem about?

2. Did the problem occur more than once? Yes  No

3. Was the other person aware that there was a problem? (If yes, explain how so)

4. Did you and that person ever discuss the problem? (If yes, explain briefly)

5. Did you ever suggest ways to resolve the problem? (Explain briefly)

6. Did the other person involved attempt to resolve the problem? (Explain briefly)

7. Did you talk to anybody else about the problem? (If yes, explain briefly)

8. Did you make any other attempts to solve the problem? (If yes, explain briefly)

9. Did you withhold any information from the other person? (If yes, explain briefly)
10. Did the other person withheld any information from you? (If you, explain briefly)

11. Did you get emotional or upset when you discussed the problem? (If you, explain briefly)

12. Did the other person involved get emotional or upset when you discussed the problem? (If you, explain briefly)

13. What other things did you say?

14. What adjectives would describe your behavior in the conflict situation? (Circle all appropriate adjectives)
   calm friendly honest pleasant emotional demanding compromising open
   aggressive avoiding demanding closed harsh forgiving accommodating
   dishonest uncompromising unfriendly unpleasant unforgiving

15. What adjectives describe the other person's behavior (Circle all appropriate adjectives)
   calm friendly honest pleasant emotional demanding compromising open
   aggressive avoiding demanding closed harsh forgiving accommodating
   dishonest uncompromising unfriendly unpleasant unforgiving

16. Any other comments you would like to add about the situation?

Thank you very much for your cooperation. If you have any concern about this questionnaire or how it will be used, please feel free to contact Dr. Victor D. Wall, Jr. Dept. of Communication.
Below are some statements that may or may not describe your feelings and behavior during your group work for Communication 110. Please respond to each statement in terms of the extent to which you Very Strongly Agree, Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, or Very Strongly Disagree. Circle the appropriate number in the column to the right of the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Very Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Very Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel that at least one member of my group deserves a lower grade than what we will get as a group.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel angry that I have to share my grade for this project.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I had to do more than my share of the work within my group.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I could not trust one, or more, of the other members to do their fair share of the work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Each member of my group contributed equally to the work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I would describe the amount of effort I put into the workshop project, in comparison to other group members, as “Much Higher.”</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I felt my ideas were stifled by my group.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My enthusiasm to work with the group was low.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I only stayed with my group because I had to do so</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I came away from most of my group meetings feeling resentful toward the group.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I would describe my amount of frustration, due to the behavior of other group members, as “Very High.”</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Overall, I am satisfied with my group’s performance for the project.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I am satisfied with the quality of my group’s work</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I came away from most of my group’s meetings feeling good about our work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Overall, I would describe my INTERACTIONS with other group members as “Very Satisfying.”</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I am “Very Satisfied” with the quality of my group’s work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. My group experienced much open conflict</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Our group interactions can best be described as “Friendly.”</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. There were a lot of arguments in our group meetings</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Our group members did not get along very well with one another.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I would describe the amount of open conflict experienced by our group as “Very High.”</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. My group members tended to agree on most issues</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. My group experienced very little open conflict</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Our group interactions can best be described as “Hostile.”</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Our group members got along very well with one another</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

CONFLICT CATEGORY SYSTEM
(Used for Question 1)

00  No answer/Don't know/Uncodable

10  Leadership (Those conflicts arising over efforts to control, dominate, exert power over, or lead the group.)

20  Unequal workloads (Those conflicts arising over unequal quantitative or qualitative member contributions toward task accomplishment.)

30  Personality differences (Those conflicts arising in differences due to interpersonal likes and dislikes.)

40  Procedural Matters (Those conflicts arising from problems of an organizational, procedural, or mechanical nature.) Examples: Conflicts over meeting places, meeting time, meeting length, how to approach the task.

50  Ideational/Substantive Matters (Those conflicts arising over ideas, goals, values associated with the substantive content of the task.) Examples: Conflicts over topic selection, how to present the material, what order to present the material in, what material to include.

60  Affective Matters (Those conflicts arising over misunderstandings which cause hurt feelings.)
APPENDIX E

CONFLICT MANAGEMENT STYLE CATEGORIES

1. Submission, Avoidance And Nonstrategies: Letting the issue resolve itself without explicit communication, avoiding or disregarding the issue or person, complying without providing input into the problem or solution.

2. Indirect Strategies: Indicating perceptions and feelings through indirect comments only, doing something to avoid a direct confrontation but working to indirectly resolve the conflict (i.e., like going to the instructor and requesting their intervention).

3. Noncoercive Compliance-Gaining: Requesting, demanding or persuading the other to change their behavior to eliminate the causes of the conflict.

4. Coercive Compliance-Gaining: Using threats or aggressive emotional displays to gain compliance (i.e., emotional, threat-oriented confrontations such as "telling the other person off").

5. Disclosure: Providing or eliciting information to facilitate understanding. Attempts to "agree to disagree" without actually solving the problem or conflict.

6. Problem-Solving: Same as disclosure except both parties willingly consider alternative solutions to the problem that are mutually acceptable.

7. Uncodable Response: This category was utilized when coders were unable to agree upon a suitable category above, or when coders agreed they could not ascertain the meaning of the respondent.
APPENDIX F
(Codebook)

Question 2: Did the problem occur more than once? Yes=1  No=2

Question 3: Was the other person aware?

00  No answer/Don't know/Uncodable
10  Assumption of knowledge (i.e., person had to have known, it was obvious, etc.)
20  Direct confrontation (I let him know that...)
30  Indirect acknowledgement (I tried to jokingly let him know...)

Question 4: Did you and that other person ever discuss the problem?

00  No answer/Don't know/Uncodable
10  Emotional Discussion (feelings expressed)
20  Open supportive discussion (indicating encouragement of the other, no domination or blame involved.)
30  Domination (I told him to do... with no element of hostility.)
40  Open Hostile discussion (I called him names...)
Questions 5 and 6: Did you suggest ways to resolve the problem?
Did the other person involved attempt to resolve the problem?

00 No answer/Don't know/Uncodable

10 Submission/Avoidance/Non-strategies (Letting the issue resolve itself without explicit communication, avoiding or disregarding the issue or person, complying without providing input into the problem or solution.)

20 Indirect strategies (indicating perceptions and feelings through confrontation but working indirectly to solve the conflict.)

30 Non-coercive compliance gaining (Requesting, demanding, or persuading the other to change their behavior to eliminate the causes of conflict.)

40 Coercive compliance gaining (Using threats or aggressive emotional displays to gain compliance (i.e., emotional or threat-oriented confrontations like “Telling the other person off.”)

50 Disclosure (Providing or eliciting information to facilitate understanding. Attempts to agree to disagree without actually solving the problem or conflict.)

60 Problem-Solving (Same as disclosure except both parties willingly consider alternative solutions to the problem that are mutually acceptable.)
Question 7: Did you talk to anybody else about the problem?

00 No answer/Don't know/Uncodable
10 Instructor
20 Other group members
30 Other class members
40 Friends/Roommates/Boy/Girlfriend
50 Parents
60 Siblings
70 Counselor/School Official

Question 8: Did you make any other attempts to solve the problem?

00 No answer/Don't know/Uncodable
10 Avoidance
20 Domination/attempts to persuade by one or two members.
30 Majority vote.
40 Compromise
50 Consensus/Collaboration/Problem-solving

Questions 9 and 10: Did you withhold any information?
Did the other person withhold any information?

00 No answer/Don't know/Uncodable
10 Withheld Feelings (withheld the fact that respondent had feelings about the conflict, or withheld intensity of feelings.
20 Information (withheld facts, opinions, ideas)
30 Protection of Other (Withheld to avoid hurting the other person.)
40 Protection of Group (to avoid hurting group cohesiveness.)

Questions 11 and 12: Did you get emotional? Did the other person get emotional?

00 No answer/Don't know/Uncodable
10 Mildly upset (annoyed, irritated)
20 Moderately upset (anxious, tense)
30 Highly upset (angry, disgusted, hurt, cried about it, etc.)
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