

Agreeableness and Conflict Management Styles: A Cross-Validated Extension

Meera Komarraju

Southern Illinois University Carbondale

Stephen J. Dollinger

Southern Illinois University Carbondale

Jennifer Lovell

Southern Illinois University Carbondale

We integrated the personality and conflict management (I/O psychology) literature and established the Big Five personality traits and their facets as predictors of conflict management styles. 621 participants completed the Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory-II and the NEO PI-R personality scale. Agreeableness and its facets explained significant amount of variance (4-23%) in conflict management styles. Machiavellian individuals (less straightforward, compliant and modest) preferred to dominate, compliant individuals were less trusting, and altruistic individuals preferred to self-sacrifice for an integrative solution. By randomly splitting the sample, the key findings were cross-validated. Our results are relevant to selection decisions and designing training programs.

INTRODUCTION

Interpersonal conflict is an inevitable element of personal and work relationships and there are marked differences in how individuals respond to disagreements. Some might avoid conflict as unpleasant and worrisome (Tepper, Duffy, & Shaw, 2001), whereas others may approach it aggressively and boldly (Baum & Shnit, 2003). Is it possible that these varied responses to conflict situations are shaped by individual differences in personality? Are some individuals more prone to creating conflict in their workplace interactions? Is there a conceptual fit between personality dimensions and conflict management styles? A few researchers have attempted to answer these questions by providing empirical evidence that the Big Five personality factors predict conflict management styles. However, less is known about how specific Big Five facets might predict conflict management. We address this gap by bringing together the literatures on personality and conflict management, and extending our understanding of how the specific facets of the Big Five, particularly Agreeableness, predict conflict management styles amongst peers.

RELEVANT PRIOR RESEARCH

Conflict Management and Concern for Self and Others

Typologies of conflict management styles capture the various ways in which opposing parties deal with disagreements (Blake & Mouton, 1964; Rahim, 1983a; Thomas, 1976). A widely used typology conceptualizes conflict management as a balancing act between two contrasting dimensions: showing concern for self and showing concern for others (Rahim, 1983a). Within this framework, a dominating style shows high concern for self and low concern for others, an integrating style reflects high concern for self and high concern for others, and an avoiding style depicts a low concern for self and for others. Conceptually, these two conflict management dimensions of concern for self and concern for others map on to two personality dimensions that are most closely related to social behavior: control/dominance/hostility versus submissiveness/affiliation/friendliness (Fiske, Cuddy, & Glick, 2007).

Individual differences in temperament and psychological needs are linked to preferred ways of managing conflict. For instance, individuals who are less concerned about others adopt a harsh hostile-dominant style; and those who are sympathetic use a socially effective style (Gold, 1999). Those focusing on differences between self and others are more competitive whereas those focusing on similarities are cooperative (Stapel & Koomen, 2005). Further, strong dominance needs are linked to a competing style, strong affiliation needs to an accommodating style, strong nurturance needs to a compromising style, and strong achievement, endurance, and nurturance needs with an integrating style (Schneer & Chanin, 1987; Utley, Richardson, & Pilkington, 1989). Thus, Agreeableness-related dispositional qualities like trust, tolerance, or nurturance are related to greater concern for others.

Agreeableness and Concern for Self and Others

The prominent Big Five personality model offers a logical framework for analyzing conflict management styles. Within this model, Agreeableness pertains to maintaining positive relations with others (Graziano & Eisenberg, 1997; Jensen-Campbell & Graziano, 2001). It predicts behaviors such as minimizing interpersonal conflict (Graziano, Jensen-Campbell, & Hair, 1996), maintaining intragroup cooperation (Graziano, Hair, & Finch, 1997), and utilizing negotiation (Graziano & Tobin, 2002). Conceptually, Agreeableness is closely associated with “communion” in the two-dimensional model of Bakan (1966) and Wiggins (1991).

Agreeableness might defuse conflict through its link to anger regulation and inhibiting negative affect (Ahadi & Rothbart, 1994). Highly agreeable individuals rate their partners positively and are more likely to use negotiation to resolve conflict; disagreeable individuals rate their partners negatively and use power assertion to resolve conflict (Graziano, Jensen-Campbell, & Hair, 1996). Further, high Agreeableness is associated with conflict avoidance and failing to engage in constructive resistance; and low Agreeableness combined with high conscientiousness is associated with confronting an abusive supervisor (Tepper, Duffy, & Shaw, 2001). Finally, high Agreeableness combined with high extraversion is positively related to a problem solving approach, and low Agreeableness combined with high extraversion is associated with imposing one’s own goals on others (Nauta & Sanders, 2000).

Even when hostile thoughts provide triggers for anger and aggression, highly agreeable individuals respond less aggressively and effectively regulate/inhibit the anger-revenge relationship (Meier & Robinson, 2004; Meier, Robinson, & Wilkowski, 2006; Wilkowski & Robinson, 2008). They more readily access prosocial thoughts when faced with aggression cues to diffuse angry thoughts and feelings (Meier et al, 2006). Thus, Agreeableness seems to be conceptually and empirically linked to increased levels of self-control when experiencing interpersonal conflict (Ahadi & Rothbart, 1994; Jensen-Campbell & Graziano, 2001). Agreeableness appears to work in tandem with Neuroticism and Extraversion when it comes to negotiating conflict situations. Highly neurotic individuals get angry when they are also low on agreeableness (Ode, Robinson, & Wilkowski, 2008), and highly extraverted individuals adopt a competing style if they are less agreeable whereas less extraverted individuals are more likely to adopt an accommodating style if they are more agreeable (Wood & Bell, 2008).

Big Five and Conflict Management Styles

Only a handful of studies have examined the link between the Big Five personality traits and various models of conflict management styles. Previously, the five broad factors (and not the facets) have been examined in relation to Rahim's (1983a) conflict management styles, and positive associations between Agreeableness and Neuroticism with avoiding, Extraversion with dominance, and Extraversion, Conscientiousness and Openness with the integrating style have been noted (Antonioni, 1998; Park & Antonioni, 2006). Moberg (1998, 2001) examined the Big Five facets in predicting conflict management but did so using Putnam and Wilson's (1982) Organizational Communication and Conflict model rather than Rahim's model and reported that although 10% of the variance in the non-confrontation style was explained by three broad domain scores (neuroticism, openness, and conscientiousness), 24% of the variance in the same variable was explained by five facet scores (self-consciousness, openness to ideas, straightforwardness, compliance, and competence). Thus, the limited research that has examined the Big Five facets suggests that they are likely to provide a more fine-grained perspective on conflict management styles and deserve closer study.

Current Study

Although some researchers have examined dispositional and personality factors in relation to conflict management, the conceptual fit between the Big Five personality facets and conflict management styles has not been sufficiently investigated and need to further examined. The current study addresses this gap by examining the Big Five (broad factors and facets) as predictors of college students' conflict management style when dealing with their friends, colleagues, or roommates. Based on prior empirical evidence and the theoretical logic that an individual's personal disposition may incline them towards a style that is congruent with their way of thinking and feeling about conflicts, we hypothesized the following:

- 1) Given its conceptual and empirical relevance, and because Agreeableness, is reflected in a high concern for others and low concern for self, we predicted that it would be the strongest predictor of conflict management styles.
- 2) Low Agreeableness and high Extraversion would be positively associated with a dominating style which is reflected in a low concern for others and high concern for self.
- 3) High Openness as well as high Conscientiousness would be positively associated with an integrating/compromising style which is reflected in a moderate to high concern for self and others.
- 4) High Neuroticism would be positively associated with an avoiding style which is reflected in a low concern for self and others.

We did not have any specific predictions for the Big Five facets and the five conflict management styles due to the limited research in this area of study. For this reason, we obtained a large sample to cross-validate our findings.

METHOD

A survey including the NEO PI-R (Costa & McCrae, 1992), the Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory-II (ROCI-II, Form C for peers; Rahim, 1983b), and demographic background items (sex, major, year of study, and ethnicity) was completed by 621 undergraduate students. Data collection occurred in small group sessions and students received partial course credit for participation. The sample consisted of 45% males and 55% females, 93% between 18-23 years of age, with most being freshmen (61%) or sophomores (20%), and a few juniors (10%) and seniors (8%). The sample was predominantly European American (67%), followed by African American (22%), Latino American (4%) or of other ethnic origins (7%).

Conflict management styles were assessed using the 28-item ROCI-II, Form C (Rahim, 1983b; 2001). Responses to this instrument are categorized into one of five conflict management styles used when

interacting with peers (integrating, obliging, avoiding, compromising, and dominating). Sample items for each conflict management styles include, integrating style (I try to bring all our concerns out in the open so that the issues can be resolved in the best possible way), obliging style (I give in to the wishes of my peers), avoiding style (I attempt to avoid being “put on the spot” and try to keep my conflict with my peers to myself), compromising (I usually propose a middle ground for breaking deadlocks), and dominating (I sometimes use my power to win a competitive situation). Prior research has established acceptable psychometric properties for this scale including test-retest and internal consistency reliability coefficients for the subscales (Rahim, 2001). Further, convergent and discriminant validity as well as confirmatory factor analysis of the five styles have been established on different samples and at different organizational levels (Rahim & Magner, 1995). The alpha coefficients for the present study were: integrating, 7-items (.81), obliging, 6-items (.73), avoiding, 6-items (.76), compromising, 4-items (.64), and dominating, 5-items (.71).

The NEO PI-R (Costa & McCrae, 1992) consists of 240 items designed to measure the Big Five personality factors (Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness) as well as six facets for each of these five factors. Sample items for each of the five personality traits include, Neuroticism (I often get angry at the way people treat me), Extraversion (I am dominant, forceful, and assertive), Openness (I often enjoy playing with theories or abstract ideas), Agreeableness (I really like most people I meet), and Conscientiousness (I’m a productive person who always gets the job done). Psychometric properties of the NEO-PI-R have been well-established and the Cronbach coefficient alpha values for each of the Big Five factors for this study ranged between .86 and .90.

RESULTS

Given our large sample and that facet-level results were exploratory; we report inferential statistics that were significant at $p < .001$ and, for cross-validation across two randomly split subsamples, at $p < .01$.

Correlation Analyses

Several of the Big Five dimensions were significantly associated with each of the conflict management styles (See Table 1). The dominating style was positively associated with Extraversion and Conscientiousness and negatively associated with Agreeableness. Second, the avoiding style was positively associated with Neuroticism and Agreeableness and negatively associated with Extraversion and Openness. Third, the obliging style was positively associated with Neuroticism, Extraversion, and Agreeableness. Finally, the integrative and compromising styles were positively associated with Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness, and negatively associated with Neuroticism.

Cross-Validation

To provide additional empirical evidence, we sought to establish the robustness of our findings by cross-validating our results across two samples. First, we randomly split our large data set of 621 participants into two samples (317 participants in sample 1 and 304 participants in sample 2) for internal replication. For each sample, a multiple correlation was computed between the Big Five factors as predictors and a conflict style as the outcome variable. For cross-validation, b weights from sample 1 regression analyses were used to predict the same conflict management style in sample 2. For further confirmation, backwards cross-validation was also conducted by reversing this process (sample 2 b weights applied in sample 1 data). These results indicate a significant and positive association between the predicted and actual scores and support the reliability of our findings (see Table 2).

Regression Analyses (Big Five Broad Factors)

Hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted to provide a focused representation of Agreeableness and the remaining Big Five personality dimensions predicting each of the conflict

management styles. First, five separate regression analyses were conducted with Agreeableness entered in the first block and the remaining four broad personality factors entered in the second block as predictors of each conflict management style. In the interest of parsimony, only those significant at the .001 level are reported (see Table 3). Beginning with the model that explained the most variance for the dominant style, 16% of the variance was explained by Agreeableness, $F(1, 619) = 117.41, p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .16$. An additional 10% was explained by Extraversion and Conscientiousness, $F(5, 615) = 43.19, p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .25$. For avoidance, 4% of the variance was explained by Agreeableness, $F(1, 619) = 23.11, p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .03$. An additional 10% of the variance was explained by Neuroticism $F(5, 615) = 19.76, p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .10$. For the obliging style, 5% of the variance was explained by Agreeableness, $F(1, 619) = 34.46, p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .05$ and an additional 6% was explained by Neuroticism, $F(5, 615) = 15.40, p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .05$. For the compromising style, 5% of the variance was explained by Agreeableness, $F(1, 619) = 29.04, p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .04$, and an additional 5% was explained by Extraversion, $F(5, 615) = 14.35, p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .06$. Finally, for the integrating style, 4% of the variance was explained by Agreeableness, $F(1, 619) = 25.17, p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .04$, and an additional 11% by Openness, Extraversion, and Conscientiousness, $F(5, 615) = 21.17, p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .10$.

Similarly, five separate regression analyses were conducted with Agreeableness entered in the first block and the remaining four of Big Five broad personality factors entered in the second block as predictors of each conflict management style; this was done for each of the two split samples (see Table 4). Across both samples, Agreeableness emerged as a significant predictor in step 1 for each of the five conflict management styles. In step 2, Extraversion significantly predicted the dominating style and Neuroticism significantly predicted avoiding and obliging styles across the two samples.

Regression Analyses (Big Five Facets)

To closely examine the facets of the Big Five factors, we conducted another set of five separate regression analyses and reported only those significant at the .001 level (see Table 5). First, 23% of the variance in the dominating style was explained by low scores on Straightforwardness, Compliance and Modesty (facets of Agreeableness), $F(6, 614) = 30.28, p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .22$. Second, 10% of the variance in the use of the avoiding style was explained by increased levels of Compliance and decreased levels of trust (facets of Agreeableness), $F(5, 614) = 11.85, p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .10$ and an additional 8% by Self-consciousness (facet of Neuroticism), $F(12, 608) = 10.97, p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .06$. Third, 7% of the variance in the obliging style was explained by increased levels of Compliance (facet of Agreeableness), $F(6, 614) = 7.14, p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .06$. Fourth, 10% of the variance in the use of the compromising style was explained by increased levels of Altruism (facet of Agreeableness), $F(6, 614) = 11.79, p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .10$. Fifth, 10% of the variance in the integrating style of conflict management was accounted for by increased levels of Altruism (facet of Agreeableness), $F(6, 614) = 11.34, p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .09$. In short, the best predictor of each of the five conflict management styles was a facet of Agreeableness albeit a different one for almost all the conflict styles.

Similarly, we conducted another set of five separate regression analyses with the facets of the Big Five factors that had previously emerged as significant predictors of each conflict management style on each of the two subsamples (see Table 6). Across both samples, Straightforwardness predicted the dominating style, Compliance predicted the avoiding and obliging styles, and Altruism predicted the compromising and integrating styles.

Finally, since compromising and integrating styles tend to overlap in Rahim's model and altruism (an Agreeableness facet) predicted both these styles, we examined whether they were distinct. For this, we conducted stepwise regression analyses with altruism in step 1 and included the facets that had emerged as significant predictors in the previous analysis in the second step. In step 2, warmth significantly predicted the compromising style; whereas the facets of positive emotions, ideas, dutifulness, feelings, and deliberation significantly predicted the integrating style. Thus, although these styles overlap and are associated with Agreeableness, they are slightly distinct at the facet level. In particular, the integrating

style involves a greater degree of conscious choice for achieving a win-win solution and a greater degree of complexity with a wider range of facets predicting it.

DISCUSSION

The results of our study provide strong support for a conceptual fit between the Big Five factors and conflict management styles, and more specifically, establish Agreeableness as a key predictor of various conflict management styles. Additionally, we document the robustness of our findings by cross-validating them in split samples both exceeding 300 participants. A particularly interesting contribution is the finding that different facets of Agreeableness explained significant variance in each of the five conflict management styles. For example, low scores on straightforwardness, compliance and modesty were the strongest predictors of the dominant style, implying that more Machiavellian or deceitful individuals preferred to dominate those with whom they disagreed. Compliant individuals were less trusting of others and their passive approach of avoiding conflict reflects an evasion of disharmony. Compliant individuals also preferred to be obliging and sacrifice their needs for others. Finally, altruistic individuals were most likely to be self-sacrificing and willing to compromise in finding an integrative solution.

The present study's results confirm and clearly extend previous research by Antonioni (1998) who only examined the broad personality factors of Extraversion, Openness, and Conscientiousness as being positively associated with the integrating style. Our research has also gone further in identifying new and interesting results regarding the significant role of Agreeableness and its various facets in predicting each of the different types of conflict management styles. Human resource managers involved in selection and placement decisions or designing training programs could use these results in helping employees reduce conflict escalation by developing meta-cognitive skills for self-regulating thoughts and response styles (Gold, 1999). These findings could be used along with existing self-help books, lectures, and training programs in teaching behaviors like compromising and integrating skills and open styles of behaving. There is evidence that cognitive training exercises can be used to train individuals in controlling aggressive responses by self-activating helpful thoughts when faced with a hostile situation (Meier, Wilkowski, & Robinson, 2008).

We are limited in our ability to generalize our results from college students and their conflicts with peers to other settings like employees in an organization. Conflicts in college could be less consequential because college students can change roommates and friends, or graduate and move on. Additionally, no causal conclusions can be drawn as our data are cross-sectional and only one method of data collection was used (i.e., self-report), and this may have affected participants' responses. Future research studies could examine the role of other personality traits as well as various types of conflicts with various levels of employees. Examining the effects of personality in managing conflict situations within longitudinal interpersonal relationships might reveal causal connections, confounding variables, or interactions between personality traits. Such research could potentially address the limitations of using self-report measures of personality to explain other self-reported constructs. Further, researchers could also investigate the effectiveness of training programs focusing on interpersonal skills (e.g., compromising and communicating) as mediators of the relation between personality and conflict management, and whether personality (e.g., Openness) moderates training effects. Finally, it would be useful to examine whether interventions that focus on reinforcing Agreeableness related qualities have lasting effects on how individuals manage conflict. Overall, our study provides robust empirical support for the role of Agreeableness and its various facets and offers a compelling conceptual framework for explaining why individuals differ in how they manage conflict situations.

REFERENCES

Ahadi, C. & Rothbart, M. K. (1994). Temperament, development and the Big Five. In C. F.

- Halverson, D. Kohnstamm, & R. Martin (Eds.), *Development of the structure of temperament and personality from infancy to adulthood* (pp. 189-208). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Antonioni, D. (1998). Relationship between the big five personality factors and conflict management styles. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 9*, 336-355.
- Bakan, D. (1966). *The duality of human existence*. Boston: Beacon.
- Baum, N., & Shnit, D. (2003). Divorced parents' conflict management styles: Self-differentiation and narcissism. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage, 39*, 37-58.
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The managerial grid*. Houston, TX: Gulf.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *NEO PI-R: Professional Manual: Revised NEO PI-R and NEO-FFI*. Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc., Florida.
- Fiske, S.T., A.J.C. Cuddy, and P. Glick (2007). Universal dimensions of social cognition: warmth and competence. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 11*, 77-83.
- Gold, J. M. (1999). Understanding conflict response styles: The use of the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis (R) with adolescents. *Professional School Counseling, 3*, 52-56.
- Graziano, W. G., & Eisenberg, N. (1997). Agreeableness: A dimension of personality. In R. Hogan, J. A., Johnson, & S. R. Briggs (Eds.), *Handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 795-824). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Graziano, W. G., Hair, E. C., & Finch, J. F. (1997). Competitiveness mediates the link between personality and group performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*, 1394-1408.
- Graziano, W. G., Jensen-Campbell, L. A., & Hair, E. C. (1996). Perceiving interpersonal conflict and reacting to it: The case for agreeableness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 820-835.
- Graziano, W. G., & Tobin, R. M. (2002). Agreeableness: Dimension of personality or social desirability artifact? *Journal of Personality, 70*, 696-727.
- Jensen-Campbell, L. A., & Graziano, W. G. (2001). Agreeableness as a moderator of interpersonal conflict. *Journal of Personality, 69*, 323-362.
- Kilmann, R. H., & Thomas, K. W. (1977). Developing a forced-choice measure of conflict-handling behavior: The "MODE" instrument. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 37*, 309-325.
- Meier, B. P., & Robinson, M. D. (2004). Does quick to blame mean quick to anger? The role of agreeableness in dissociating blame and anger. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*, 856-867.
- Meier, B. P., Robinson, M. D., & Wilkowski, B. M. (2006). Turning the other cheek: And the regulation of aggression-related primes. *Psychological Science, 17*, 136-142.
- Meier, B. P., Wilkowski, B. M., & Robinson, M. D. (2008). Bringing out the agreeableness in everyone: Using a cognitive self-regulation model to reduce aggression. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 44*, 1383-1387.

- Moberg, P. J. (1998). Predicting conflict strategy with personality traits: Incremental validity and the five factor model. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 9, 258-285.
- Moberg, P. J. (2001). Linking conflict strategy to the five-factor model: Theoretical and empirical foundations. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 12, 47-68.
- Nicholls, J. G., Licht, B. G., & Pearl, R. A. (1982). Some dangers of using personality questionnaires to study personality. *Psychological Bulletin*, 92, 3, 572-580.
- Ode, S., Robinson, M. D., & Wilkowski, B. M. (2008). Can one's temper be cooled? A role for agreeableness in moderating neuroticism's influence on anger and aggression. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 42, 295-311.
- Park, H., & Antonioni, D. (2007). Personality, reciprocity, and strength of conflict resolution strategy. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 41, 110-125.
- Putnam, L. L., & Wilson, C. (1982). Communicative strategies in organizational conflict: Reliability and validity of a measurement scale. In M. Burgoon (Ed.), *Communication yearbook* (Vol. 6, pp. 629--652). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Rahim, M. A. (1983a). A measure of styles of handling interpersonal conflict. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 368-376.
- Rahim, M. A. (1983b). *Rahim organizational conflict inventories: Professional manual*. Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc. Palo Alto, CA.
- Rahim, A., & Magner, N. R. (1995). Confirmatory factor analysis of the styles of handling interpersonal conflict: First-order factor analysis and its invariance across groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 122-132.
- Rahim, M. A. (2001). *Managing conflict in organizations*. Quorum Books, Westport, CT.
- Schneer, J. A., & Chanin, M. N. (1987). Manifest needs as personality predispositions to conflict-handling behavior. *Human Relations*, 40(9), 575-590.
- Stapel, D. A., & Koomen, W. (2005). Competition, cooperation, and the effects on others on me. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 1029-1038.
- Tepper, B. J., Duffy, M. K., & Shaw, J. D. (2001). Personality moderators of the relationship between abusive supervision and subordinates' resistance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 974-983.
- Utley, M. E., Richardson, D. R., & Pilkington, C. J. (1989). Personality and interpersonal conflict management. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 10(3), 287-293.
- Wilkowski, B. M., & Robinson, M. D., (2008). The cognitive basis of trait anger and reactive aggression: An integrative analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 12, 3-21.
- Wiggins, J. S. (1991). Agency and communion as conceptual coordinates for the understanding and measurement of interpersonal behavior. In D. Cicchetti & W. Grove (Eds.), *Thinking critically in psychology: Essays in honor of Paul E. Meehl* (pp. 89-113). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Wood, V. F. & Bell, P.A. (2008). Predicting interpersonal conflict resolution styles from personality characteristics. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 45, 126-131.

APPENDIX

TABLE 1
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, RELIABILITIES, AND CORRELATIONS

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Neuroticism	2.95	.42	.90									
2. Extraversion	3.48	.39	-.21	.88								
3. Openness	3.43	.37	-.06	.33	.86							
4. Agreeableness	3.26	.36	-.18	.21	.19	.86						
5. Conscientious	3.28	.38	-.38	.25	.03	.15	.87					
6. Integrating	3.83	.56	-.18	.27	.26	.20	.22	.81				
7. Obliging	3.30	.59	.16	.11	.01	.23	-.06	.24	.73			
8. Avoiding	3.05	.70	.23	-.13	-.11	.19	-.04	-.06	.33	.76		
9. Compromising	3.68	.58	-.10	.24	.21	.21	.15	.63	.31	.05	.64	
10. Dominating	3.33	.70	.02	.18	.05	-.40	.14	.14	-.03	-.07	.10	.71

Note: *N* = 621.

The alpha reliability coefficients are in boldface along the diagonal.

Correlations (absolute values) $\geq .09$ are significant at $p < .05$

Correlations (absolute values) $\geq .11$ are significant at $p < .001$ (two-tailed).

TABLE 2
MULTIPLE CORRELATIONS PREDICTING CONFLICT MANAGEMENT STYLES FROM THE BIG FIVE

Conflict Management Styles	Sample 1	Cross-validation ^a	Sample 2	Cross-validation ^b
	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i>
Dominating	.49	.52	.54	.47
Avoiding	.37	.37	.38	.36
Obliging	.31	.36	.36	.31
Compromising	.37	.24	.31	.31
Integrating	.46	.24	.35	.36

Note: All multiple *R*s are $p < .001$.

Sample 1 *N*=317 (51% of the total sample)

Sample 2 *N*=304 (49% of the total sample)

^aThese correlations applied the Sample 1 *b* weights to the data in Sample 2.

^bThese correlations applied the Sample 2 *b* weights to the data in Sample 1.

TABLE 3
HIERARCHICAL MULTIPLE REGRESSIONS WITH AGREEABLENESS IN THE FIRST
BLOCK AND THE REMAINING BIG FIVE PERSONALITY DIMENSIONS IN THE SECOND
BLOCK AS PREDICTORS OF THE FIVE CONFLICT MANAGEMENT STYLES

Factor		Predictor	Beta***	ΔR^2	R ² total
Dominating	Step 1	Agreeableness ^f	-.40	.16	.16
	Step 2	Extraversion ^f Conscientiousness	.23 .17	.10	.26
Avoiding	Step 1	Agreeableness ^f	.19	.04	.04
	Step 2	Neuroticism ^f	.27	.10	.14
Obliging	Step 1	Agreeableness ^f	.23	.05	.05
	Step 2	Neuroticism ^f	.22	.06	.11
Compromising	Step 1	Agreeableness ^f	.21	.05	.05
	Step 2	Extraversion	.14	.05	.10
Integrating	Step 1	Agreeableness ^f	.20	.04	.04
	Step 2	Openness	.19	.11	.15
		Extraversion Conscientiousness	.14 .14		

Note: *** $p < .001$.

*** All the beta values are significant at the .001 level.

^f= this is the largest beta and is replicated at the .01 level in the randomly split two halves of the sample

TABLE 4
HIERARCHICAL MULTIPLE REGRESSIONS WITH AGREEABLENESS IN THE FIRST
BLOCK AND THE REMAINING BIG FIVE PERSONALITY DIMENSIONS IN THE
SECOND BLOCK AS PREDICTORS OF THE FIVE CONFLICT MANAGEMENT
STYLES FOR SAMPLE 1 AND SAMPLE 2

Factor	Sample 1			Sample 2			
	Predictors	Beta	ΔR^2	Predictors	Beta	ΔR^2	
Dominating							
Step 1	Agreeableness	-.35***	.13	Step 1	Agreeableness	-.44***	.20
Step 2	Extraversion	.19***		Step 2	Extraversion	.27***	.09
	Conscientiousness	.23***	.11				
Avoiding							
Step 1	Agreeableness	.17**	.03	Step 1	Agreeableness	.21**	.05
Step 2	Neuroticism	.29***	.11	Step 2	Neuroticism	.25***	.09
Obliging							
Step 1	Agreeableness	.19***	.04	Step 1	Agreeableness	.27***	.07
Step 2	Neuroticism	.21***	.06	Step 2	Neuroticism	.21***	.04
Compromising							
Step 1	Agreeableness	.27***	.07	Step 1	Agreeableness	.16**	.03
Step 2	Openness	.21***	.07	Step 2	Extraversion	.20***	.07
Integrating							
Step 1	Agreeableness	.24***	.06	Step 1	Agreeableness	.16**	.03
Step 2	Openness	.34***	.15	Step 2	Extraversion	.19**	.06

Note: ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Split File=1, Sample 1 N= 317; Split File=2, Sample 2 N= 304

TABLE 5
HIERARCHICAL MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSES WITH THE FACETS OF THE BIG FIVE PERSONALITY DIMENSIONS AS PREDICTORS OF EACH OF THE FIVE CONFLICT MANAGEMENT STYLES

Factor		Predictors	Beta***	ΔR^2
Dominating Style	Step 1	Straightforwardness ^f	-.31	.23
		Compliance	-.18	
		Modesty	-.15	
Avoiding Style	Step 1	Compliance ^f	.29	.10
		Trust	-.17	
	Step 2	Self-Consciousness	.16	.08
Obliging Style	Step 1	Compliance ^f	.15	.07
Compromising Style	Step 1	Altruism ^f	.31	.10
Integrating Style	Step 1	Altruism ^f	.26	.10

Note: ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

*** All the beta values are significant at the .001 level.

^f= this is the largest beta and is replicated at the .01 level in the randomly split two halves of the sample

TABLE 6
HIERARCHICAL MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSES WITH THE FACETS OF THE BIG FIVE PERSONALITY TRAITS AS PREDICTORS OF EACH OF THE FIVE CONFLICT MANAGEMENT STYLES FOR SAMPLE 1 AND SAMPLE 2

Sample 1				Sample 2		
Factor	Predictors	Beta	ΔR^2	Predictors	Beta	ΔR^2
Dominating						
Step 1	Straightforwardness	-.37***	.22	Step 1	Straightforwardness	-.37*** .26
	Compliance	-.28***				
Step 2	Assertiveness	.20***	.15			
Avoiding Style						
Step 1	Trust	-.22***		Step 1	Compliance	.28*** .10
	Compliance	.31***	.11			
Step 2	Self-Consciousness	.16***	.10			
Obliging Style						
Step 1	Compliance	.17**	.06	Step 1	Compliance	.17** .08
Compromising Style						
Step 1	Altruism	.33***	.13	Step 1	Altruism	.33*** .10
				Step 2	Warmth	.31*** .15
Integrating Style						
Step 1	Altruism	.27***	.13	Step 1	Altruism	.25*** .08

Note: ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$
Split File=1, Sample 1 N=317; Split File=2, Sample 2 N=304