2004

The role of gender, ethnicity and personality on conflict resolution style

Hazel Madariaga Cadelina
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Cadelina, Hazel Madariaga, "The role of gender, ethnicity and personality on conflict resolution style" (2004). *Master's Theses*. 2649.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.b5ne-8zqg>

https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/2649

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

THE ROLE OF GENDER, ETHNICITY AND PERSONALITY
ON CONFLICT RESOLUTION STYLE

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Psychology Department

San Jose State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

by

Hazel Madariaga Cadelina

December 2004

UMI Number: 1425451

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI Microform 1425451

Copyright 2005 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

© 2004

Hazel Madariaga Cadelina

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

Dr. Megumi Hosoda

Dr. Howard Tokunaga

Lois Evans, Milpitas Montessori School, Inc.

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

Thea Wilkerson

ABSTRACT

THE ROLE OF GENDER, ETHNICITY AND PERSONALITY

ON CONFLICT RESOLUTION STYLE

by Hazel Madariaga Cadelina

The literature on gender and race/ethnic differences in conflict resolution style has been inconsistent. Research on some personality traits has demonstrated the existence of gender and race differences. Inconsistent findings on conflict style may be due to the lack of research on the factors that might be related to the relationship between gender, race, and conflict style. Thus, the present study examined how personality traits (i.e., communication apprehension, self-esteem, and locus of control) would be related to gender and conflict style, and race and conflict style. A total of 294 students completed a questionnaire assessing personality and conflict style. It was expected that these personality traits would moderate or mediate the relationships between gender and conflict style, and race and conflict style. Although results did not support these predictions, additional findings revealed that some personality traits were directly related to conflict style. Implications and limitations of the study are discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work would not have been possible without the guidance and encouragement of Megumi Hosoda. I am very grateful for her endless support. I wish to also thank Howard Tokunaga and Lois Evans for all their valuable assistance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Literature Review On Conflict Resolution Style	3
Conflict resolution styles	3
Gender differences in conflict resolution style	4
Race/ethnicity differences in conflict resolution style	6
Personality Traits and Conflict Resolution Styles	9
Communication apprehension	9
Self-esteem	13
Locus of control	14
METHOD	16
Participants	16
Measures	16
Conflict resolution styles	16
Communication apprehension	18
Self-esteem	19
Locus of control	19
Demographics	20
Procedures	20
RESULTS	20

Overall Analyses	20
Tests of hypotheses	23
Research questions	24
Additional Analyses	25
DISCUSSION	27
Implications of the Study	29
Limitations of the Study and Future Research	30
CONCLUSION	31
REFERENCES	32
APPENDIX A. Tables and Figure	38
APPENDIX B. Questionnaire	48

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Descriptive Statistics and Bivariate Correlations	38
2. Moderating Effect of Self-Esteem on the Relationship Between Gender and Race/Ethnicity and the Nonconfrontation Style	39
3. Moderating Effect of Locus of Control on the Relationship Between Gender and Race/Ethnicity and the Nonconfrontation Style	40
4. Summary of the Relationship Between Personality Traits and the Nonconfrontation Style.....	41
5. Summary of the Relationship Between Personality Traits and the Confrontation Style.....	42
6. Summary of the Relationship Between Personality Traits and the Compromise Style.....	43
4. Summary of the Relationship Between Personality Traits and the Control Style.....	44

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. Interaction Effect of Communication Apprehension on the Relationship Between Gender and the Compromise Style	45

Introduction

Conflict is an omnipresent phenomenon that can permeate all forms of social interaction. Conflict is often defined as a perceived disagreement between two or more interdependent parties that arises from the perception of incompatible interests, viewpoints, processes, or goals in an interaction event (Ting-Toomey, 1994). Conflict can range from interpersonal discord to intergroup conflict (Ting-Toomey, 1994). It is a natural part of the human relations process. Conflict, in and of itself, is not necessarily constructive or destructive. It is the way conflict is handled that can result in positive or negative outcomes (Ting-Toomey, 1994).

Although there exists many factors (e.g., poor communication, body language) that can influence a conflict situation, conflict resolution style is one of the important factors that can have an impact on an already intense conflict episode (Ting-Toomey, 1994). Conflict resolution style is defined here as “the patterned responses or characteristic mode of handling conflict across a variety of communication situations” (Ting-Toomey et al., 1991, p. 277). According to the work of Sternberg and Dobson (1987), and Sternberg and Soriano (1984), individuals tend to exhibit quite consistent conflict management styles across a variety of situations both within and across the domains of interpersonal, interorganizational, and international conflict situations. This suggests that conflict resolution style might be related to some personality traits.

Although conflict is an important construct, not much is known about individual differences in conflict resolution style. Thus, the purpose of the present study was to better understand individual differences in conflict resolution style. More specifically,

the present study was designed to examine the role of gender, ethnicity, and personality traits on conflict resolution style.

The present study is important because today's workforce is becoming more diverse than ever before. The proportion of women and racial/ethnic minorities entering the workforce has increased dramatically in recent decades (HR Briefing, 2002). It has been estimated that women and racial/ethnic minorities will make up a significant portion of the workforce by 2006 (HR Briefing, 2002). More specifically, women will account for nearly half (47%) of all workers, whereas the number of Americans of African, Latino, and Asian heritage combined will make up nearly one-third of the workforce. With such diversification in the workplace, there might be different and perhaps incompatible interests, values, and viewpoints among men and women of different races/ethnicities. These differences in viewpoints or perspectives might lead to an increase in the occurrence of conflict among individuals in the workplace. Furthermore, when conflict occurs, there might be differences between men and women, and between Whites and racial/ethnic minorities in the way they handle it.

Thus, the investigation of how men and women, as well as how Whites and racial/ethnic minorities, differ in the way they resolve conflict is important, because such understanding might help to create a workplace that can manage conflict constructively. In the present study, Asian- and Latino Americans were used as exemplars of racial/ethnic minority, and communication apprehension, locus of control, and self-esteem were used as exemplars of personality traits. The sections below provide a brief description of styles of handling conflict, and reviews of literature on the relationship

between gender and conflict resolution style, and on the relationship between race/ethnicity and conflict resolution style. The personality variables—communication apprehension, locus of control, and self-esteem—were also discussed with respect to their relationship with conflict resolution style, race/ethnicity, and gender.

Literature Review on Conflict Resolution Style

Conflict resolution styles. The method by which individuals handle conflict is usually described in terms of a conflict resolution style, encompassing such labels as “forcing,” “withdrawal,” “smoothing,” “compromise,” and “problem-solving” (Blake & Mouton, 1964). When the forcing style is used, conflicts are managed by “controlling the expression of disagreement rather...than the cause” (Blake & Mouton, 1964, p. 33). When the withdrawal style is used, conflicts are managed by evasion or avoidance. When the smoothing style is used, conflicts are handled by appeasement, acceptance, and playing-down issues. The use of the compromise style involves the pulling together of differing views. Finally, the problem-solving style involves confrontation, where an attempt is made to resolve the conflict constructively.

In an attempt to focus more on communicative behaviors, Putnam and Wilson (1981) expanded the original work of Blake and Mouton (1964), and proposed that conflict management behaviors could be clustered into three main styles—nonconfrontation, control, and solution-orientation. According to Putnam and Wilson (1981), an individual using the nonconfrontation style employs indirect strategies for handling conflict. He or she avoids or withdraws from a disagreement through communicative behaviors such as silence, glossing over differences, and concealing ill

feelings. This conflict resolution style is similar to Blake and Mouton's (1964) withdrawal and smoothing style. An individual using the solution-orientation style, on the other hand, resolves conflict through confrontation or compromise. Here, the individual uses open and direct communication for handling conflict, and he or she resolves conflict through behaviors that aim to find a solution, integrate the needs of both parties, and to give in or compromise on issues. This conflict resolution style is similar to Blake and Mouton's (1964) compromise and problem-solving style. An individual using the control style also uses direct communication for resolving conflict. However, unlike the solution-orientation style, the control style involves arguing persistently for one's position, taking control of the interaction, emphasizing one's demands, and advocating one's position. This style is similar to Blake and Mouton's (1964) forcing style.

Gender differences in conflict resolution style. Although there exists a substantial number of studies that have examined gender differences in conflict resolution style, results seem to be inconsistent and inconclusive (e.g., Chusmir & Mills, 1989; Holt, 2001; Shockley-Zalabak & Morley, 1984a). Some studies showed that men and women differed in conflict resolution style (Frost, 1980; Holt, 2001; Nelson & Lubin, 1991), whereas other studies demonstrated that men and women did not differ in conflict resolution style (Chusmir & Mills, 1989; Guill, 1992; Korabik, Baril, & Watson, 1993; Shockley-Zalabak, 1981).

It has been suggested that men are more comfortable with winning in disputes and, therefore, have a tendency to compete in conflict situations, whereas women are more comfortable with finding a fair outcome that is acceptable to all and, thus, have a

tendency to accommodate (Frost, 1980). Consistent with the argument by Frost (1980), and the cultural stereotype that men are more aggressive and women are more cooperative (Hosoda & Stone, 2000), several studies have shown that women have a more cooperative orientation to conflict resolution than men, and that men are more competitive than women in resolving conflicts (e.g., Frost, 1980; Holt, 2001; Nelson & Lubin, 1991). For example, in their study, Nelson and Lubin (1991) asked 87 men and 11 women (consisting of an equal number of Republicans and Democrats) from the Indiana House of Representatives to complete a conflict resolution style questionnaire. The questionnaire assessed participants' preferences to use five different conflict resolution styles (i.e., forcing, problem-solving, compromise, withdrawal, and smoothing). Nelson and Lubin (1991) found that female state legislators used the accommodating conflict resolution style (i.e., nonconfrontation) more than male state legislators. Similarly, in her meta-analytic study of gender and conflict resolution style, Holt (2001) found that women were more likely to use the solution-orientation and nonconfrontation styles, whereas men preferred the control style in resolving conflicts.

However, other studies have shown that men and women do not differ in resolving conflicts (Chusmir & Mills, 1989; Guill, 1992; Korabik, Baril, & Watson, 1993; Shockley-Zalabak, 1981). For example, Shockley-Zalabak (1981) found no differences in the responses to conflict between male and female managers; the preference orders for conflict resolution style were identical for men and women in different situational contexts (i.e., personal, interpersonal, small group, and intergroup). Similarly, Guill (1992) asked 102 community college presidents to complete a

questionnaire designed to identify their preferred conflict resolution style when faced with personal and interpersonal conflict situations. Guill found no gender differences in the conflict resolution style among these male and female community college presidents. Finally, Korabik et al. (1993), using a non-traditional method to assess conflict resolution style, asked supervisors to role-play conflict situations and act out how they would resolve the conflict. The behavior of male and female supervisors during the role-play did not differ on any of the conflict management dimensions (i.e., solution-orientation, control, and nonconfrontation styles).

In summary, a review of the literature on gender differences in conflict resolution style reveals that although studies exist that find evidence for gender differences, the same number of studies have found no gender differences or produced contradictory, non-stereotypical results. Thus, at this point, it is not known whether men and women differ in the style they use in handling conflict.

Race/ethnicity differences in conflict resolution style. A number of studies have addressed the question of whether there are racial/ethnic differences in conflict resolution style (e.g., Holt, 2001; Kim & Kitani, 1998; Ting-Toomey et al., 2000). However, similar to the literature on gender and conflict resolution style, results have been inconsistent and contradictory. These results are conflicting, with some studies suggesting similarities between different racial/ethnic groups in handling conflict (Holt, 2001; Kim & Kitani, 1998; Ting-Toomey et al., 2000), whereas others indicate differences in conflict resolution style between racial/ethnic groups (Goldstein, 1998; Lind et al., 1994).

To illustrate, several studies have found differences in the way Whites, Asian Americans, and Latino Americans resolve conflict (Holt, 2001; Kim & Kitani, 1998). In her meta-analytic study, Holt (2001) found Asian Americans scored highest on the avoiding style across situations, whereas Whites scored highest on the problem-solving style. Likewise, another study of race/ethnicity and conflict resolution style demonstrated that Whites preferred the dominating style more than Asian Americans, whereas Asian Americans preferred obliging, avoiding, integrating, and compromising styles more than Whites (Kim & Kitani, 1998). Finally, Ting-Toomey et al. (2000) found Asian- and Latino Americans tend to use the avoiding style when resolving conflict.

One reason for the difference in conflict resolution styles among different racial/ethnic groups stems from cultural values (Ting-Toomey et al., 1991). Asian- and Latino Americans come from a collectivistic culture, whereas Whites come from an individualistic culture. Overall, individualistic cultures emphasize independence and individual needs. People from these cultures believe in asserting one's own judgment and autonomy. In contrast, collectivistic cultures value interdependence and harmony, are concerned with the needs of the entire group (Ting-Toomey et al., 1991). Those from collectivistic cultures often suppress their individual wishes and maintain harmony with others. Because of these differences in values and beliefs, Asian- and Latino Americans seem to use more passive, avoidance conflict resolution styles, and Whites seem to use more active, confrontational conflict resolution styles (Ting-Toomey et al., 1991).

However, several other investigators have shown that Whites, Asian-, and Latino Americans do not differ in resolving conflicts (Goldstein, 1998; Lind et al., 1994). For

example, in her examination of the difference between Whites and Asian American justice center mediators, Goldstein (1998) found that Whites did not differ from Asian Americans in conflict resolution style. Regardless of race/ethnicity, respondents indicated similar tendencies to confront, express emotion, self-disclose, dispute, and approach. Likewise, Lind et al. (1994) found relatively small differences in the conflict resolution style of their White, Asian-, and Latino American participants.

In summary, a review of the literature on racial/ethnic differences in conflict resolution style reveals that although studies exist that have found evidence for racial/ethnic differences, there are still other studies that have found no differences. Thus, it is not known whether Whites, Asian-, and Latino Americans differ in the way they resolve conflicts.

Given the above reviews of literature on gender differences and racial/ethnic differences on conflict resolution style, it is reasonable to assume there might be factors that mediate or moderate the relationship between gender and conflict resolution style, as well as the relationship between race/ethnicity and conflict resolution style.

Several studies have suggested the existence of moderating variables (i.e., managerial rank, sample population, managerial experience) on the relationship between gender and conflict resolution style. For example, Chusmir and Mills (1989) found that male and female managers did not differ in the conflict resolution style they used at work with their subordinates, peers, and superiors when managerial rank was held constant. Likewise, a study by Shockley-Zalabak and Morley (1984a), consisting of both student and employed participants, found that although male and female students differed

significantly in conflict resolution style such that male students preferred a competitive style and female students preferred a compromising style, male and female employees did not differ in conflict resolution style. Furthermore, Korabik et al. (1993) reported that although experienced male and female managers did not differ in conflict resolution style, women without managerial experience were more integrating, obliging, and compromising than men without managerial experience in resolving conflicts.

Thus, inconsistent findings in gender differences on conflict resolution style might be due to the relative lack of research attention to factors that might moderate this relationship. Although several studies have examined situational factors that moderate the relationship between gender and conflict resolution style, little attention has been paid to examine how individual difference variables (i.e., personality traits) might be related to how men and women, and Whites and racial/ethnic minorities handle conflict. As seen below, one personality trait (i.e., communication apprehension) has been shown to be related both to gender and race/ethnicity, as well as conflict resolution style. Likewise, several other personality traits (e.g., self-esteem, locus of control) have been shown to be related to gender and race/ethnicity. Thus, it may be that personality traits are related to the manner in which men and women, and Whites and racial/ethnic minorities handle conflict. The section below provides a literature review on a personality trait (i.e., communication apprehension) and conflict resolution style.

Personality Traits and Conflict Resolution Styles

Communication apprehension. Communication apprehension has generally been defined as "...an individual's level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or

anticipated communication with another person or persons” (McCroskey, 1977, p. 8). According to McCroskey (1977), most people fall somewhere in the middle between extremely anxious and extremely relaxed on the continuum of communication apprehension. Individuals with high levels of communication apprehension experience high levels of fear and anxiety when it comes to communicating with others, and feel more comfortable when alone than with others. Those with high apprehension will withdraw from and seek to avoid communication whenever possible. Those with low levels of communication apprehension experience low levels of communicative fear and anxiety, and actively seek out encounters with others (McCroskey, 1977).

Communication apprehension can be viewed as a trait or a state (McCroskey, 1982). Trait apprehension is characterized by fear or anxiety with respect to many different types of communication contexts and situations, from talking to a single person to giving a speech before a crowd. Here, levels of communication apprehension remain the same across different contexts. State apprehension, on the other hand, is specific to a given communication context or situation, such as giving a speech to a group of strangers. In this case, levels of communication apprehension may be high in one context and low in another. Because most recent research (e.g., Ayres, 1992; Blood, Blood, Tellis, & Gabel, 2001; Opt & Loffredo, 2000) involving communication apprehension has taken the perspective that communication apprehension is a personality-like predisposition, or general orientation of the individual toward communication across communication contexts, the present study also examined communication apprehension as a trait.

In her study, Jaasma (1997) demonstrated gender and racial/ethnic differences in communication apprehension. Using college students enrolled in communication courses, Jaasma had students complete a questionnaire measuring classroom communication apprehension. Results indicated that female students were more communicatively apprehensive than male students. Jaasma suggests that women might be more communicatively apprehensive than men due to their lower self-esteem, fear of evaluation, and their perception of incompetence.

Furthermore, results showed that White students were less apprehensive than both Asian- and Latino American students. Jaasma suggests that this may partially be due to Asian- and Latino Americans' perception of incompetence with respect to communicating in English, their second language. Several other studies (e.g., Okazaki, 1997; Okazaki, 2000; Okazaki, Liu, Longworth, & Minn, 2002) have examined racial/ethnic differences in social anxiety, a construct similar to communication apprehension in that it involves the fear of communicating with others. Two studies, which utilized Asian American and White college students, demonstrated that Asian Americans scored higher than Whites on social anxiety (Okazaki, 1997; Okazaki et al., 2002). In another study, Okazaki (2000) measured differences in social anxiety between Asian American and White college students by measuring it through a face-to-face interview and self-report. In both contexts (i.e., interview and questionnaire), Asian Americans reported more social anxiety than Whites.

Furthermore, several researchers (e.g., Aida, 1993; Shockley-Zalabak & Morley, 1984b) have shown that levels of communication apprehension are related to conflict

resolution style. In one study, Shockley-Zalabak and Morley (1984b) asked 161 employees and college students to complete questionnaires designed to measure their levels of communication apprehension and identify their conflict resolution style. Specifically, results showed that communication apprehension was negatively related to conflict assertiveness but unrelated to cooperativeness. Individuals with high communication apprehension were more likely to be nonconfrontational than those with low communication apprehension, whereas individuals with low communication apprehension were more likely to use the control and solution-orientation styles than those with high communication apprehension. Similarly, Aida (1993) found that married couples in which both spouses expressed a high level of communication apprehension were more likely to use one-sided, non-interactive indirect strategies (e.g., withdrawal) during conflict situations than by couples in which both spouses were less apprehensive in communicating with their partners. No differences in conflict resolution style were found in couples in which one spouse was high and one spouse was low in communication apprehension levels.

Based on the review above, the following hypotheses were tested.

Hypothesis1: Communication apprehension will mediate the relationship between gender and nonconfrontation style such that women will have higher levels of communication apprehension than men. High levels of communication apprehension, in turn, will be related to the use of the nonconfrontation style (i.e., avoiding or withdrawing from a disagreement through behaviors such as silence, glossing over differences, and concealing ill feelings).

Hypothesis 2: Communication apprehension will mediate the relationship between race/ethnicity and nonconfrontation style such that racial/ethnic minorities (Asian- and Latino Americans) will have high levels of communication apprehension than Whites. High levels of communication apprehension, in turn, will be related to the use of the nonconfrontation style.

Self-esteem. Self-esteem is defined as “the overall value that one places on oneself as a person” (Judge & Larsen, 2001, p. 72). Those with high self-esteem view themselves as worthy, are well liked by others, and are competent in various areas (e.g., social and cognitive), whereas those with low self-esteem view themselves as worthless, disliked by others, and incapable of doing many tasks (Berk, 1998).

Results from the large empirical literature on gender and self-esteem have consistently shown that males outscore females on measures of global self-esteem (e.g., Kling, Hyde, Showers, & Buswell, 1999; Quatman & Watson, 2001; Thomas & Daubman, 2001). In one study (Thomas & Daubman, 2001), high school juniors and seniors were asked to complete a questionnaire assessing self-esteem. Results showed that girls’ self-esteem was significantly lower than boys’ self-esteem. Furthermore, results of Kling et al.’s (1999) meta-analysis on gender differences on self-esteem indicated a significant gender difference in self-esteem, favoring males.

In their study, Mintz and Kashubeck (1999) investigated whether racial/ethnic differences existed in self-esteem. After having 185 Whites and Asian American college students complete a self-esteem questionnaire, results demonstrated that Asian American women had lower self-esteem levels than White women. In their meta-analysis, Twenge

and Crocker (2002) examined racial/ethnic differences in self-esteem among 712 participants. The results indicated that Whites had higher self-esteem than other racial minority groups, including Latino- and Asian Americans.

Unfortunately, to the author's knowledge, no studies have examined the relationship between self-esteem and conflict resolution style. Furthermore, given gender and race/ethnicity differences in self-esteem, it is reasonable to assume that self-esteem might be related to gender and conflict resolution style, and race/ethnicity and conflict resolution style. However, the nature of such relationships is not known. Thus, the following research questions were posited.

Research Question 1: What will be the nature of the relationship among gender, self-esteem, and nonconfrontation style? Will self-esteem mediate or moderate the relationship between gender and nonconfrontation style?

Research Question 2: What will be the nature of the relationship among race/ethnicity, self-esteem, and nonconfrontation style? Will self-esteem mediate or moderate the relationship between race/ethnicity and nonconfrontation style?

Locus of control. To the author's knowledge, no one has studied the relationship between locus of control and conflict resolution style. However, based on the description of individuals who have an external or an internal locus of control, it is highly probable that those with an external locus of control might handle conflict situations differently from those with an internal locus of control. Judge and Larsen (2001) have defined locus of control as one's "perceived degree of control in life" (p. 72). A person with an internal locus of control believes that his/her behavior controls his/her life. A person with an

external locus of control, on the other hand, believes that his/her life “is controlled by luck, chance, fate, or powerful others” (p. 72).

Research on race/ethnicity and locus of control has indicated that Whites have a more internal locus of control than other ethnic groups, including Asian- and Latino Americans (Hsieh, Shybut, & Lotsof, 1969; McLaughlin & Saccuzzo, 1997). In his examination of gender and locus of control, Wade (1996) reported that men were more internal than women.

As mentioned earlier, no studies have examined the relationship between locus of control and conflict resolution style. Furthermore, given gender and racial/ethnic differences in locus of control, it is reasonable to assume that locus of control might be related to gender and conflict resolution style, and race/ethnicity and conflict resolution style. Thus, the following research questions were posited.

Research Question 3: What will be the nature of the relationship among gender, locus of control, and nonconfrontation style? Will locus of control mediate or moderate the relationship between gender and nonconfrontation style?

Research Question 4: What will be the nature of the relationship among race/ethnicity, locus of control, and nonconfrontation style? Will locus of control mediate or moderate the relationship between race/ethnicity and nonconfrontation style?

In summary, the literature on gender differences and racial/ethnic differences in conflict resolution style has been inconclusive. However, research on some personality traits has clearly demonstrated the existence of gender and race/ethnic differences.

Therefore, it can be expected that personality variables might moderate or mediate the relationships between gender and conflict resolution style, and race/ethnicity and conflict resolution style. Lack of research attention on personality traits on conflict resolution style might explain the inconsistent gender and race/ethnicity findings. However, to date, there has been no attempt to examine how gender, personality traits, and conflict resolution style are related, as well as how race/ethnicity, personality traits, and conflict resolution style are related. Thus, the present study was the first attempt to examine how personality traits would be related to the relationship between gender and conflict resolution style, and the relationship between race/ethnicity and conflict resolution style.

Method

Participants

A total of 294 college students at a large state university located in Northern California participated in the present study. The participants ranged in age from 16 to 54 years old ($M = 21$, $SD = 5.21$). The sample was diverse in terms of its ethnic composition: 39% Asian American ($n = 114$), 30% White ($n = 88$), 18% Latino American ($n = 54$), 6% African American ($n = 18$), 3% mixed race ($n = 10$), and 3% ($n = 10$) did not specify their race/ethnicity. Due to the small number of African American and mixed-race participants, they were excluded from the analyses. Thus, the final sample consisted of 256 participants.

Measures

Conflict resolution styles. Conflict resolution style was measured by the Organizational Communication Construct Instrument (OCCI; Putnam & Wilson, 1982;

see Appendix for the items). This measure contains three subscales, each measuring a distinct conflict resolution style: nonconfrontation, control, and solution-orientation (which is comprised of confrontation and compromise). Although Putnam and Wilson (1982) believe that there are three main conflict resolution styles, for the present study, the solution-orientation subscale was considered as consisting of two different conflict resolution styles (i.e., confrontation and compromise), creating a total of four distinct conflict resolution styles—nonconfrontation, confrontation, compromise, and control. In the original measure, each item is measured on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = *always*, 7 = *never*). However, for the present study, the scale responses were reversed (1 = *never*, 7 = *always*). To determine a participant's conflict resolution style, the items for each of the four subscales were summed and averaged to yield a score for each type of style.

Twelve items were used to measure the nonconfrontation style. Sample items include “I steer clear of disagreeable situations,” and “I downplay the importance of a disagreement” ($\alpha = .80$). Seven items measured the control style. Sample items include “I assert my opinion forcefully,” and “I argue insistently for my stance” ($\alpha = .78$). Six items measured the confrontation style. Sample items include “I suggest solutions which combine a variety of viewpoints,” and “I offer creative solutions in discussions of disagreements” ($\alpha = .78$). Five items measured the compromise style. Sample items include “I offer trade-offs to reach solutions in a disagreement,” and “I will go 50-50 to reach a settlement with the other person” ($\alpha = .64$). Since it was possible that some participants may have never worked before, for the present study, items that contained

the word “supervisor” in the original scale were replaced with the word “the other person” or “the other party” to better fit the sample at hand.

The OCCI was selected to measure conflict strategies in the present study because research on the reliability and validity of the OCCI has demonstrated that it is a reliable and valid instrument with high discriminatory power, moderate construct validity, and strong predictive validity (Putnam & Wilson, 1982).

Communication apprehension. Communication apprehension was measured by the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension 24 (PRCA-24; McCroskey, 1982; see Appendix for the items). This measure consists of a total of 24 items and is designed to assess communication apprehension across four communication contexts (i.e., dyadic, group, meeting, and public speaking). Participants responded to each item on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*). The PRCA-24 was selected because it is the most widely used measure of communication apprehension and because its reliability and construct, predictive, and content validity are well established (McCroskey, 1978; McCroskey, Beatty, Kearney, & Plax, 1985). Scores were summed and averaged.

Although McCroskey (1982) treated the communication apprehension variable as a categorical variable (i.e., individuals are either high or low in apprehension), the present study found the majority of the participants to be neither high nor low, but rather in the middle and, therefore, treated communication apprehension as a continuous variable. An example of an item that measures communication apprehension in the dyadic context is “I have no fear of speaking up in conversations.” An example of an item that measures

communication apprehension in the group context is “I am tense and nervous while participating in group discussions.” An example of an item that measures communication apprehension in the meeting context is “I am afraid to express myself at meetings.” An example of an item that measures communication apprehension in the public speaking context is “I feel relaxed while giving a speech.”

To determine each respondent’s overall communication apprehension level, the subscores for the communication contexts (i.e., group discussion, meetings, interpersonal, and public speaking) were summed and averaged. The higher the score, the more apprehensive a person is ($\alpha = .95$).

Self-esteem. Self-esteem was measured by items in Core Self-Evaluations Measure (Judge & Larsen, 2001; see Appendix for the items). This scale contains 10 items, and is designed to assess one’s level of self-esteem. Each item is measured on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*). An example of an item that measures self-esteem is “I feel that I have a number of good qualities.” The items were summed and averaged to determine a participant’s score for self-esteem. The higher the score, the higher one’s self-esteem is ($\alpha = .88$).

Locus of control. Locus of control was measured by items in the Core Self-Evaluations Measure (Judge & Larsen, 2001; see Appendix for the items). This scale contains eight items, and is designed to assess one’s locus of control orientation. Each item is measured on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*). An example of an item that measures locus of control is “My life is determined by my own actions.” The items were summed and averaged to determine a respondent’s

score for locus of control. The higher the score, the more internal one's locus of control is ($\alpha = .61$).

Demographics. In the final section of the survey, participants were asked to provide information concerning their gender, age, race/ethnicity, major, and employment.

Procedures

Questionnaires were distributed in class to students willing to participate. Participants were provided with a consent form and a questionnaire, which contained the Organizational Communication Construct Instrument (Putnam & Wilson, 1982), Personal Report of Communication Apprehension 24 (McCroskey, 1982), and Core Self-Evaluations Measure (Judge & Larsen, 2001). The questionnaire, consisting of four sections, assessed respondents' personality traits and conflict resolution style, and asked for their demographic information. Section one measured participants' conflict resolution style, section two measured their level of communication apprehension, section three measured their personality traits (i.e., self-esteem, locus of control), and section four asked for their demographic information. Participants were assured that information they provided was confidential and anonymous. After they completed the questionnaire, participants were provided a written debriefing sheet and received extra credit from their professors for participation.

Results

Overall Analyses

Hierarchical regression analyses were used to test Hypotheses 1 and 2, and Research Questions 1 through 4. More specifically, when personality traits (e.g.,

communication apprehension, self-esteem) were hypothesized or posited to mediate the relationship between predictors (e.g., gender, race) and the outcome variable (i.e., nonconfrontation style), procedures developed by Baron and Kenny (1986), and Judd and Kenny (1981) were followed. According to Baron and Kenny (1986), and Judd and Kenny (1981), four steps need to be taken to show that a variable (e.g., communication apprehension) mediates the relationship between a predictor variable (e.g., gender, race) and an outcome variable (e.g., nonconfrontation style). In the first step, one has to show that the predictor variable (e.g., gender or race/ethnicity) is correlated with the outcome variable (e.g., nonconfrontation conflict style). For the second step, it must be shown that the predictor variable is related to the mediator (e.g., communication apprehension). In the third step, one must demonstrate that the mediator is related to the outcome variable. Finally, the last step must show that the predictor variable is no longer related to the outcome variable after the mediator variable is entered in the regression.

When the personality traits were posited to moderate the relationship between predictors (e.g., gender, race) and the outcome variable (i.e., nonconfrontation style), main effects (e.g., gender, race, and nonconfrontation) were entered in the first step, and interactions between the two (e.g., gender x communication apprehension, and race/ethnicity x communication apprehension) were entered in the second step. Statistical significance of a change in R^2 in the second step indicates the existence of the interaction effect.

Because of the relatively large number of hypotheses and research questions in the present study, each hypothesis and research question was tested at Type I error rate of

.025. Table 1 presents the correlations among all the measured variables. As can be seen in Table 1, inconsistent with the research findings, the present study did not find gender differences on communication apprehension ($r = -.05, p > .05$), self-esteem ($r = .08, p > .05$), or locus of control ($r = .08, p > .05$). However, with regard to communication apprehension, there was a difference between Whites and Asian Americans ($r = .31, p < .01$), but not between Whites and Latino Americans ($r = .07, p > .05$). More specifically, Asian Americans ($M = 3.07, SD = .69$) had higher levels of communication apprehension than Whites ($M = 2.57, SD = .68$). Furthermore, there was a race/ethnicity difference in self-esteem between Whites and Asian Americans ($r = -.21, p < .01$) such that Asian Americans ($M = 3.57, SD = .63$) had lower levels of self-esteem than Whites ($M = 3.88, SD = .70$).

The nonconfrontation style was significantly related to communication apprehension ($r = .35, p < .01$), self-esteem ($r = -.28, p < .01$), and locus of control ($r = -.27, p < .01$). The more communicatively apprehensive, the lower self-esteem, or the more external one's locus of control, the more one is likely to use the nonconfrontation style.

With regard to other conflict resolution styles, results showed that the confrontation style was significantly and positively related to gender ($r = .13, p < .05$). More specifically, women ($M = 4.64, SD = .75$) were more likely to use the confrontational style than men ($M = 4.43, SD = .80$). In addition, the confrontation style was related to communication apprehension ($r = -.28, p < .01$), self-esteem ($r = .38, p < .01$), and locus of control ($r = .33, p < .01$). The less communicatively apprehensive, the

higher self-esteem, or the more internal one's locus of control, the more likely one is to use the confrontation style.

The compromise style was significantly related to gender ($r = .16, p < .01$) such that women ($M = 4.35, SD = .77$) were more likely to use this style than men ($M = 4.10, SD = .72$). The compromise style was not related to any of the personality traits. The control style was related to both communication apprehension ($r = -.24, p < .01$) and locus of control ($r = .16, p < .01$). The less communicatively apprehensive, or the more internal locus of control, the more one is likely to use the control style.

In terms of the relationships among the personality traits, communication apprehension was negatively related to self-esteem ($r = -.43, p < .01$) and locus of control ($r = -.37, p < .01$). Self-esteem was significantly related to locus of control ($r = .55, p < .01$).

The following section presents the hypotheses and the research questions pertaining to mediating effects of personality traits.

Tests of hypotheses. Hypothesis 1 stated that communication apprehension would mediate the relationship between gender and nonconfrontation style. Hypothesis 2 stated that communication apprehension would mediate the relationship between race/ethnicity and nonconfrontation style.

Results showed that gender ($\beta = -.09, p > .025$), Race 1 (i.e., the comparison between Whites and Asian Americans; $\beta = .14, p > .025$), and Race 2 (i.e., the comparison between Whites and Latino Americans; $\beta = -.11, p > .025$) were not related to nonconfrontation style. This means that men and women, and Whites and racial/ethnic

minorities (i.e., Asian Americans, Latino/a) did not differ in their use of nonconfrontation style. These results indicate that the first step of the mediator analysis was not supported. As a result, the findings of the present study provided no support for the hypotheses that communication apprehension would mediate the relationship between (a) gender and nonconfrontation style, and (b) race/ethnicity and nonconfrontation style.

Research questions. The present study also posited four research questions regarding the relationships among demographic variables (i.e., gender and race/ethnicity), personality traits (i.e., self-esteem, locus of control), and nonconfrontation style. Specifically, the present study explored the nature of the relationship among (a) gender, personality traits (i.e., self-esteem, locus of control), and nonconfrontation style, and (b) race/ethnicity, personality traits (i.e., self-esteem, locus of control), and nonconfrontation style. More specifically, these research questions posited whether the above-mentioned personality traits (i.e., self-esteem, locus of control) mediate or moderate the relationship between (a) gender and nonconfrontation style, and (b) race/ethnicity and nonconfrontation style.

As mentioned earlier, gender and race/ethnicity were not related to nonconfrontation style. This indicates that the first step of the mediator analysis was not supported. This further suggests that two personality traits (i.e., self-esteem, locus of control) did not mediate the relationship between (a) gender and nonconfrontation style, and (b) race/ethnicity and nonconfrontation style.

With respect to the research questions pertaining to whether personality traits (e.g., self-esteem, locus of control) moderate the relationship between (a) gender and

nonconfrontation style, and (b) race/ethnicity and nonconfrontation style, Tables 2 and 3 show the results of the moderator analyses. As can be seen in these tables, an examination of R^2 change in the second steps were not significant, indicating that none of the personality traits moderate the relationship between gender and nonconfrontation style and the relationship between race/ethnicity and nonconfrontation style. It was demonstrated, however, that there exists a direct relationship between a personality trait and nonconfrontation style. Specifically, self-esteem ($\beta = -.25, p < .025$) and locus of control ($\beta = -.21, p < .025$) were related to nonconfrontation style such that the lower self-esteem, or the more external locus of control, one is more likely to use the nonconfrontation style. In addition, gender ($\beta = -.09, p > .025$) and race/ethnicity (Race 1, $\beta = .14, p > .025$; Race 2, $\beta = -.12, p > .025$) were not related to nonconfrontation style. These findings indicate that personality traits, rather than demographic variables, seem to be an important factor for predicting conflict resolution style.

Additional Analyses

Although the main interest of the study was to examine how demographic variables (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity), in relation to personality traits, would be related to nonconfrontation style, an investigation of how these variables would be related to the other conflict resolution styles (i.e., confrontation, compromise, control) was also conducted, using regression analyses. Results of the regression analyses demonstrated that communication apprehension moderated the relationship between gender and compromise style ($R^2 = .07, p < .025$). Further analyses (see Figure 1) showed that the

difference in compromise style preference between high levels of communication apprehension and low levels of communication was larger for men than for women.

In addition, because demographic variables (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity) were not related to conflict resolution style, but the personality traits were related to many of the conflict resolution styles, regression analyses were conducted in which all the personality variables were entered into an equation. Tables 4 through 7 show the results of the relationships between the personality traits and all of the different conflict resolution styles. Results showed that communication apprehension ($\beta = .24, p < .001$), but not self-esteem ($\beta = -.11, p > .05$) and locus of control ($\beta = -.13, p > .05$), predicted the use of the nonconfrontation style. In other words, people with higher communication apprehension were more likely to use the nonconfrontation style (see Table 4). Similarly, communication apprehension ($\beta = -.15, p < .05$), locus of control ($\beta = .15, p < .05$), and self-esteem ($\beta = .23, p < .01$) predicted the use of the confrontation style (see Table 5). Therefore, individuals with lower communication apprehension, an internal locus of control, and higher self-esteem were more likely to use the confrontation style when faced with a conflict situation. In addition, only communication apprehension ($\beta = -.18, p < .01$) predicted the use of the control style (see Table 7). Therefore, those with lower communication apprehension were more likely to use the control style when dealing with conflict. Interestingly, no personality traits were found to predict the use of the compromise style (see Table 6). These results suggest that communication apprehension seems to be an important personality trait in predicting the various styles of conflict resolution.

In sum, in the present study, demographic variables (i.e., gender and race/ethnicity), except for a few instances (i.e., gender was related to both confrontation and compromise styles) were not directly or indirectly related to any of the conflict resolution styles, but it was the personality traits that were consistently related to different conflict resolution styles. Among these personality traits, communication apprehension consistently predicted different conflict resolution styles.

Discussion

A review of the literature on gender and racial/ethnic differences in conflict resolution style has been inconsistent. Findings on gender differences in conflict resolution style reveal that although studies exist that find evidence for clear-cut gender differences, the same number of studies have found no gender differences or produced contradictory, non-stereotypical results. Likewise, while some studies on conflict resolution style have found support for racial/ethnic differences, similar studies have found no support for such racial/ethnic differences. Thus, at this point, it is not known whether men and women, and Whites and ethnic minorities differ in the style they use in handling conflict.

Therefore, an examination of other factors might help to explain such inconsistency. Although previous studies (e.g., Korabik et al., 1993; Shockley-Zalabak & Morley, 1984a) have examined situational factors (e.g., managerial experience, sample population) that might moderate the relationship between gender and conflict resolution style, little attention has been paid to examine how individual differences variables (i.e., personality traits) might be related to how men and women, and Whites and racial/ethnic

minorities handle conflict. Therefore, the present study was conducted in order to explore the role of personality traits for the relationship between gender and conflict resolution style, and the relationship between race/ethnicity and conflict resolution style. Specifically, the present study explored the role of personality traits by examining whether several personality traits (i.e., communication apprehension, self-esteem, and locus of control) would moderate and/or mediate the relationships between gender and conflict resolution style, and between race/ethnicity and conflict resolution style.

It was predicted that communication apprehension mediates the relationships between gender and nonconfrontation style, and between race/ethnicity and nonconfrontation style. However, findings did not support these predictions. Likewise, other personality traits (e.g., self-esteem, locus of control) did not mediate or moderate the relationship between gender and nonconfrontation style, and race/ethnicity and nonconfrontation style. Furthermore, with the exception of the moderating effect of communication apprehension on gender and compromise style, these three personality traits did not mediate or moderate the relationship between gender and other style (e.g., confrontation, control), and race/ethnicity and other conflict resolution styles (e.g., confrontation, control).

However, additional results demonstrated that several personality traits were directly related to the nonconfrontation, confrontation, and compromise conflict resolution styles. Specifically, the higher one's communication apprehension level, one is more likely to use the nonconfrontation style and less likely to use the confrontation and control styles. In addition, the higher one's self-esteem and the more internal one's

locus of control, one is more likely to use the confrontation style. In sum, in the present study, demographic variables (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity) were not related to any of conflict resolution styles, but it was personality traits that were consistently related to different conflict resolution styles.

Implications of the Study

Because personality traits seem to play a dominant role in conflict resolution, future studies on conflict resolution style should not focus solely on gender and/or race/ethnicity. Perhaps, future research should examine other personality traits that might explain the cognitive and behavioral processes that underlie conflict resolution. These findings could be useful in the training and consulting fields. When conducting seminars or workshops on communication and/or conflict resolution skills, trainers might emphasize that in order to be an effective communicator, one does not need to be a man or a woman, or White or Asian—effective conflict resolution is not sex- or race-based. Rather, trainers could emphasize that it is personality that predicts one's conflict resolution style. Given that personality, not gender/race, is related to conflict resolution style, one's ineffective conflict resolution style may be improved by working on his or her self-esteem or communication apprehension. Trainers could introduce procedures that reduce communication apprehension or increase self-esteem, which may, in turn, enhance one's effectiveness in resolving conflict. Moreover, the present findings should help to combat the common beliefs that men and women, as well as Whites and ethnic minorities, deal with conflict differently, that men and women use conflict resolution styles that are congruent with gender role stereotypes, and that women and ethnic

minorities are not as effective at conflict management as are men and Whites. These findings dispute reservations about women's and ethnic minorities' ability to handle conflict situations. These findings can also be applied to interpersonal contexts.

Traditional couples therapy is focused on men and women's different ways of talking as well as ethnic background when explaining couples' communication difficulties or their inability to resolve conflict effectively (Tannen, 1990). Perhaps this focus needs to be reconsidered. In the counseling setting, sex- and ethnic-difference stereotypes should be set aside when assessing conflict resolution style, and attention should be focused on other factors, such as self-esteem and communication apprehension, which could result in more effective therapy.

Limitations of the Study and Future Research

While the results of this investigation are informative, it had two important limitations, each of which suggests directions for future research. First, the sample consisted of college students. Whether comparable findings will be demonstrated in a non-student sample remains to be investigated. The results of this study may not apply well to real-life situations, particularly to the organizational setting, where conflict is prevalent. Future studies should, for example, examine the conflict resolution styles of managers, since they encounter different kinds of conflict at work on a regular basis. Managers, because of their position and experience, may resolve conflict much differently than college students. An additional limitation of the study concerns the use of perceptual self-report data. Participants' predictions of the conflict resolution style they would use may not be indicative of the conflict resolution style they would actually

use when faced with conflict. A more desirable alternative would be to utilize both self-report data and actual behavior data. For example, in the work setting, researchers could gather data on managers' actual conflict resolution style by obtaining performance evaluations from their subordinates.

Conclusion

This study was conducted to explore the role personality traits play in conflict resolution style. More specifically, the study examined whether communication apprehension, self-esteem, and locus of control moderate and/or mediate the relationships between gender and conflict resolution style, and race/ethnicity and conflict resolution style. Although it was found that neither gender nor race/ethnicity predicted conflict resolution style, additional findings revealed that communication apprehension, self-esteem, and locus of control predicted different conflict resolution styles. The results of this study provide an opportunity for trainers, consultants, and counselors to incorporate methods in their seminars that can help their clients become effective in resolving conflict and communicating. This study also provides suggestions for future researchers interested in conflict management research. Future research should examine the conflict resolution styles of managers to see if the results can be generalized to those who encounter conflict daily. Future research should also investigate other personality traits that might explain the cognitive and behavioral processes that underlie conflict resolution style.

References

- Aida, Y. (1993). Communication apprehension and power strategies in marital relationships. *Communication Reports*, 6(2), 116-121.
- Ayres, J. (1992). Personal ads: An exploratory investigation into the relationships among ad characteristics, communication apprehension, and contact. *Communication Reports*, 5(2), 67-72.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173-1182.
- Berk, L. E. (1998). *Development through the Lifespan*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The Managerial Grid*. Houston: Gulf.
- Blood, G. W., Blood, I. M., Tellis, G., Gabel, R. (2001). Communication apprehension and self-perceived communication competence in adolescents who stutter. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 26(3), 161-178.
- Chusmir, L. H., & Mills, J. (1989). Gender differences in conflict resolution styles of managers: At work and at home. *Sex Roles*, 20(3-4), 149-163.
- Frost, J. H. (1980). The influence of female and male communication styles on conflict strategies: Problem areas. *Communication Research and Broadcasting*, 3, 126-136.
- Goldstein, S. B. (1998). Responses of Asian American and European American mediators to a Conflict Communication Scale. *Mediation Quarterly*, 15(3),

181-186.

- Guill, J. A. (1992). Conflict management style preferences of community college presidents (Doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, 1991). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 52(12A), 4163.
- Holt, J. L. (2001). Impact of gender, organizational role, and multicultural status on conflict resolution style preference (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 2000). *Dissertation Abstracts International-Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*, 61(8B), 4457.
- Hsieh, T., Shybut, J., & Lotsof, E. (1969). Internal versus external control and ethnic group membership. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 33(1), 122-124.
- Jaasma, M. A. (1997). Classroom communication apprehension: Does being male or female make a difference? *Communication Reports*, 10(2), 219-228.
- Judd, C. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1981). Process analysis: Estimating mediation in treatment evaluations. *Evaluation Review*, 5, 602-619.
- Judge, T. A., & Larsen, R. J. (2001). Dispositional affect and job satisfaction: A review and theoretical extension. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(1), 67-98.
- Kim, M., & Kitani, K. (1998). Conflict management styles of Asian- and Caucasian-Americans in romantic relationships in Hawaii. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 8(1), 51-68.
- Kling, K. C., Hyde, J. S., Showers, C. J., & Buswell, B. N. (1999). Gender differences in

- self-esteem: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125(4), 470-500.
- Korabik, K., Baril, G. L., & Watson, C. (1993). Managers' conflict management style and leadership effectiveness: The moderating effects of gender. *Sex Roles*, 29(5), 405-420.
- Lind, E. A., Huo, Y. J., & Tyler, T. R. (1994). ...And justice for all: Ethnicity, gender, and preferences for dispute resolution procedures. *Law and Human Behavior*, 18(3), 269-290.
- McCroskey, J. C. (1977). Oral communication apprehension: A summary of recent theory and research. *Human Communication Research*, 4, 78-96.
- McCroskey, J. C. (1978). Validity of the PRCA as an index of oral communication apprehension. *Communication Monographs*, 45, 192-203.
- McCroskey, J. C. (1982). *An introduction to rhetorical communication* (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- McCroskey, J. C., Beatty, M. J., Kearney, P., & Plax, T. G. (1985). The content validity of the PRCA-24 as a measure of communication apprehension across communication contexts. *Communication Quarterly*, 33(3), 165-173.
- McLaughlin, S. C., & Saccuzzo, D. P. (1997). Ethnic and gender differences in locus of control in children referred for gifted programs: The effects of vulnerability factors. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 20(3), 268-283.
- Mintz, L. B., & Kashubeck, S. (1999). Body image and disordered eating among Asian American and Caucasian college students: An examination of race and gender differences. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 23(4), 781-796.

- Nelson, D.T., & Lubin, B. (1991). Performance of state legislators on the Conflict Mode Instrument. *Organization Development Journal*, 9(1), 79-80.
- Okazaki, S. (1997). Sources of ethnic differences between Asian American and White American college students on measures of depression and social anxiety. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 106(1), 52-60.
- Okazaki, S. (2000). Asian American and White American differences on affective distress symptoms: Do symptom reports differ across reporting methods? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 31(5), 603-625.
- Okazaki, S., Liu, J. F., Longworth, S. L., & Minn, J. Y. (2002). Asian American-White American differences in expressions of social anxiety: A replication and extension. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 8(3), 234-247.
- Opt, S. K., & Loffredo, D. A. (2000). Rethinking communication apprehension: A Myers-Briggs perspective. *Journal of Psychology*, 134(5), 556-570.
- Putnam, L., & Wilson, C. E. (1981). *The Organizational Communication Conflict Instrument*. Unpublished measurement scale, Purdue University.
- Putnam, L. L., & Wilson, C. E. (1982). Communicative strategies in organizational conflicts: Reliability and validity of a measurement scale. In M. Burgoon (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 6*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Quatman, T., & Watson, C. M. (2001). Gender differences in adolescent self-esteem: An exploration of domains. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 162(1), 93-117.
- Shockley-Zalabak, P. S. (1981). The effects of sex differences on the preference for utilization of conflict styles of managers in a work setting: An exploratory study.

- Public Personnel Management Journal*, 10, 289-295.
- Shockley-Zalabak, P. S., & Morley, D. D. (1984a). Sex differences in conflict style preferences. *Communication Research Reports*, 1(1), 28-32.
- Shockley-Zalabak, P. S., & Morley, D. D. (1984b). An exploratory study of relationships between preferences for conflict styles and communication apprehension. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 3(3), 213-218.
- Sternberg, R. J., & Dobson, D. M. (1987). Resolving interpersonal conflicts: An analysis of stylistic consistency. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 794-812.
- Sternberg, R. J. & Soriano, L. J. (1984). Styles of conflict resolution. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47(1), 115-126.
- Thomas, J. J., & Daubman, K. A. (2001). The relationship between friendship quality and self-esteem in adolescent girls and boys. *Sex Roles*, 45(1-2), 53-65.
- Ting-Toomey, S. (1994). Managing intercultural conflicts effectively. In L. Samovar & R. Porter (Eds.), *Intercultural Communication: A Reader* (7th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Ting-Toomey, S., Gao, G., Trubisky, P., Yang, Z., Kim, H. S., Lin, S. L., & Nishida, T. (1991). Culture, face maintenance, and styles of handling interpersonal conflict: A study of five cultures. *The International Journal of Conflict Management*, 2, 275-296.
- Twenge, J. M., & Crocker, J. (2002). Race and self-esteem: Meta-analyses comparing Whites, Blacks, Hispanics, Asians, and American Indians and comment on

Gray-Little and Hafdahl (2000). *Psychological Bulletin*, 128(3), 371-409.

Wade, J. (1996). An examination of locus of control/fatalism for Blacks, Whites, boys, and girls over a two-year period of adolescence. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 24(3), 239-248.

Workforce will be half female, one-third minority. (2002, January 1). *HR Briefing*, 3001, 1-2.

APPENDIX A

Tables and Figure

Table 1

Descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations

Variable name	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1 Non-confrontation Style	3.45	.81										
2 Confrontation Style	4.56	.77	-.11									
3 Compromise Style	4.26	.76	.17**	.46**								
4 Control Style	4.13	.88	-.18**	.13*	-.01							
5 Gender ^a	1.65	.48	-.09	.13*	.16**	.11						
6 Race 1 ^b	.10	.88	.08	.02	.11	-.04	-.00					
7 Race 2 ^c	-.13	.73	-.04	.10	.01	.03	-.04	.55**				
8 Communication Apprehension	2.79	.74	.35**	-.28**	.04	-.24**	-.05	.31**	.07			
9 Self-esteem	3.77	.70	-.28**	.38**	.08	.09	.08	-.21**	-.01	-.43**		
10 Locus of Control	3.47	.46	-.27**	.33**	.03	.16**	.08	-.09	.06	-.37**	.55**	

^a Gender (1 = Male; 2 = Female).^b Race 1 is a comparison between White (-1) and Asian (1).^c Race 2 is a comparison between White (-1) and Latino (1).

* .p < .05.

** .p < .01.

Table 2

Moderating effect of self-esteem on the relationship between gender and race/ethnicity and the nonconfrontation style

Step	Variable	β	R^2	ΔR^2
1	Gender ^a	-.06		
	Race 1 ^b	.07		
	Race 2 ^c	-.07		
	Self-esteem	-.25*	.08*	
2	Gender			
	Race 1			
	Race 2			
	Self-esteem			
	Gender x Self-esteem	.32		
	Race 1 x Self-esteem	-.15		
	Race 2 x Self-esteem	-.32	.08	.00

^a Gender (1 = Male; 2 = Female).

^b Race 1 is a comparison between White (-1) and Asian (1).

^c Race 2 is a comparison between White (-1) and Latino (1).

* $p < .025$.

Table 3

Moderating effect of locus of control on the relationship between gender and race/ethnicity and the nonconfrontation style

Step	Variable	β	R^2	ΔR^2
1	Gender ^a	-.07		
	Race 1 ^b	.10		
	Race 2 ^c	-.08		
	Locus of control	-.21	.07*	
2	Gender			
	Race 1			
	Race 2			
	Locus of control			
	Gender x Locus of control	-.04		
	Race 1 x Locus of control	.02		
	Race 2 x Locus of control	-.87	.08	.01

^a Gender (1 = Male; 2 = Female).

^b Race 1 is a comparison between White (-1) and Asian (1).

^c Race 2 is a comparison between White (-1) and Latino (1).

* $p < .025$.

Table 4

Summary of the relationship between personality traits and the nonconfrontation style

Personality	β
Communication apprehension	.24***
Self-esteem	-.11
Locus of control	-.13
*** $p < .001$.	

Table 5

Summary of the relationship between personality traits and the confrontation style

Personality	β
Communication apprehension	-.15*
Self-esteem	.23**
Locus of control	.15*
* $p < .05$.	
** $p < .01$.	

Table 6

Summary of the relationship between personality traits and the compromise style

Personality	β
Communication apprehension	.07
Self-esteem	.11
Locus of control	-.02

Table 7

Summary of the relationship between personality traits and the control style

Personality	β
Communication apprehension	-.18**
Self-esteem	-.03
Locus of control	.11
** p < .01.	

Figure 1

Interaction effect of communication apprehension on the relationship between gender and the compromise style

APPENDIX B

Questionnaire

PART I: CONFLICT RESOLUTION

Directions: Think of disagreements you have encountered with another person. Then indicate below how frequently you engage in each of the described behaviors during conflict situations. DO NOT respond to the items with a particular disagreement in mind. Instead, keep in mind your experience with conflicts, in general.

Never 1	Very Seldom 2	Seldom 3	Sometimes 4	Often 5	Very Often 6	Always 7
------------	------------------	-------------	----------------	------------	-----------------	-------------

- ___ 1. I blend my ideas with the other person to create new alternatives for resolving a disagreement.
- ___ 2. I shy away from topics which are sources of disputes.
- ___ 3. I make my opinion known in a disagreement.
- ___ 4. I suggest solutions which combine a variety of viewpoints.
- ___ 5. I steer clear of disagreeable situations.
- ___ 6. I give in a little on my ideas when the other person also gives in.
- ___ 7. I avoid the other party when I suspect that he or she wants to discuss a disagreement.
- ___ 8. I integrate arguments into a new solution from the issues raised in a dispute.
- ___ 9. I will go 50-50 to reach a settlement.
- ___ 10. I raise my voice when I'm trying to get the other person to accept my position.
- ___ 11. I offer creative solutions in discussions of disagreements.
- ___ 12. I keep quiet about my views in order to avoid disagreements.
- ___ 13. I give in if the other party will meet me half way.
- ___ 14. I downplay the importance of a disagreement.
- ___ 15. I reduce disagreements by making them seem insignificant.
- ___ 16. I meet the other person at a mid-point in our differences.

- ____ 17. I assert my opinion forcefully.
- ____ 18. I dominate arguments until the other person understands my position.
- ____ 19. I suggest we work together to create solutions to disagreements.
- ____ 20. I try to use the other party's ideas to generate solutions to problems.
- ____ 21. I offer trade-offs to reach solutions in a disagreement.
- ____ 22. I argue insistently for my stance.
- ____ 23. I withdraw when the other person confronts me about a controversial issue.
- ____ 24. I side-step disagreements when they arise.
- ____ 25. I try to smooth over disagreements by making them appear unimportant.
- ____ 26. I insist my position be accepted during a disagreement.
- ____ 27. I make our differences seem less serious.
- ____ 28. I hold my tongue rather than argue with the other person.
- ____ 29. I ease conflict by claiming our differences are trivial.
- ____ 30. I stand firm in expressing my viewpoints during a disagreement.

PART II: COMMUNICATION WITH OTHERS

Directions: This section concerns your feelings about communicating with other people. For each of the statements below, please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

- ____ 1. I dislike participating in group discussions.
- ____ 2. Generally, I am comfortable while participating in group discussions.
- ____ 3. I am tense and nervous while participating in group discussions.
- ____ 4. I like to get involved in group discussions.

- _____ 5. Engaging in a group discussion with new people makes me tense and nervous.
- _____ 6. I am calm and relaxed while participating in group discussions.
- _____ 7. Generally, I am nervous when I have to participate in a meeting.
- _____ 8. Usually, I am comfortable when I have to participate in a meeting.
- _____ 9. I am very calm and relaxed when I am called upon to express an opinion at a meeting.
- _____ 10. I am afraid to express myself at meetings.
- _____ 11. Communicating at meetings usually makes me uncomfortable.
- _____ 12. I am very relaxed when answering questions at a meeting.
- _____ 13. While participating in a conversation with a new acquaintance, I feel very nervous.
- _____ 14. I have no fear of speaking up in conversations.
- _____ 15. Ordinarily I am very tense and nervous in conversations.
- _____ 16. Ordinarily I am very calm and relaxed in conversations.
- _____ 17. While conversing with a new acquaintance, I feel very relaxed.
- _____ 18. I'm afraid to speak up in conversations.
- _____ 19. I have no fear of giving a speech.
- _____ 20. Certain parts of my body feel very tense and rigid while giving a speech.
- _____ 21. I feel relaxed while giving a speech.
- _____ 22. My thoughts become confused and jumbled when I am giving a speech.
- _____ 23. I face the prospect of giving a speech with confidence.
- _____ 24. While giving a speech, I get so nervous I forget facts I really know.

PART III: PERSONALITY TRAITS

This section asks about your personality traits. For each of the statements below, please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement.

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Moderately Disagree
- 3 = Slightly Disagree
- 4 = Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 5 = Slightly Agree
- 6 = Moderately Agree
- 7 = Strongly Agree

- _____ 1. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others.
- _____ 2. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
- _____ 3. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.
- _____ 4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.
- _____ 5. I feel that I do not have much to be proud of.
- _____ 6. I take a positive attitude toward myself.
- _____ 7. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
- _____ 8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.
- _____ 9. I certainly feel useless at times.
- _____ 10. At times I think I am no good at all.
- _____ 11. I am strong enough to overcome life's struggles.
- _____ 12. At root, I am a weak person.
- _____ 13. I can handle the situations that life brings.
- _____ 14. I usually feel that I am an unsuccessful person.
- _____ 15. I often feel that there is nothing that I can do well.
- _____ 16. I feel competent to deal effectively with the real world.

- _____ 17. I often feel like a failure.
- _____ 18. I usually feel I can handle the typical problems that come up in life.
- _____ 19. Whether or not I get to be a leader depends mostly on my ability.
- _____ 20. When I make plans, I am almost certain to make them work.
- _____ 21. When I get what I want, it's usually because I'm lucky.
- _____ 22. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
- _____ 23. I can pretty much determine what will happen in my life.
- _____ 24. I am usually able to protect my personal interests.
- _____ 25. When I get what I want, it's usually because I worked hard for it.
- _____ 26. My life is determined by my own actions.
- _____ 27. My feelings are easily hurt.
- _____ 28. I'm a nervous person.
- _____ 29. I'm a worrier.
- _____ 30. I am often tense or "high strung."
- _____ 31. I often suffer from "nerves."
- _____ 32. I am often troubled by feelings of guilt.
- _____ 33. My mood often goes up and down.
- _____ 34. Sometimes I feel miserable for no reason.
- _____ 35. I am an irritable person.
- _____ 36. I often feel fed up.
- _____ 37. I often worry too long after an embarrassing experience.
- _____ 38. I often feel lonely.

PART IV: DEMOGRAPHICS

Directions: This section asks questions pertaining to yourself.

1. Your gender: Male _____ Female _____
2. Your age: _____ years
3. Your ethnicity (check one):
Caucasian _____ African American _____ Latino/Latina _____ Asian American _____
Native American _____ Other (specify): _____
4. Your major _____
5. Are you currently working? Yes _____ No _____
6. If you answered YES in #5, what is your job title? _____
7. How many years of work experience do you have? _____
8. If you were NOT born in the U.S., how many years have you lived in the U.S.? _____
years