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Purpose of the Study

This study was to look at: (1) the orientation subjects' had toward the resolution of conflict situations, and (2) associations between personality traits, selected demographic characteristics and subjects' orientation to conflict resolution.

Procedures

Eighty-seven subjects, 23 male and 64 female college students, were given a pre- and post-assessment on their orientation to conflict resolution via the Modified Conflict Resolution Inventory (MCRI). They were administered two personality scales: Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (general need traits) and Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis (socially oriented traits); they filled out a demographic
data questionnaire and responded to a Relevance of Conflict Resolution instrument. An intervening variable of training in a Need approach to conflict resolution was given to assure subjects had an exposure to this approach. Training was not assessed as to its effectiveness.

Subjects were classified on the dependent variable, their orientation to conflict resolution, as Issue or Need oriented. The Need orientation followed after the work of William Glasser (1967), who defines two basic psycho-social needs of man as: (1) the need to love and be loved, and (2) the need to feel worthwhile to oneself and others.

Two sets of judges were used to rate subjects on the dependent variable classifications. Three regular judges' ratings were used as the subjects' classifications, the other set of judges' ratings were used for reliability assessment.

Findings

All 87 subjects were rated as Issue oriented on the pre-MCRI; 31 of the subjects shifted to the Need orientation on the post-MCRI. Independent variable scores were associated with the post-MCRI assessments through a step-wise discriminant analysis. Two independent variables—heterosexuality from EPPS and activation from RCR—were significant in the discriminant function, but each represented so many mis-classifications as to have relatively little value
as discriminators. Significance in the discriminant function is based only on a difference between groups' means and not on the amount of variance accounted for.

Interpretation

The General Systems Theory perspective was used to interpret the findings. The 31 subjects who changed from an Issue to a Need orientation were ones who had received and processed information that allowed the Need selection on the posttest. None of the subjects had the prerequisite information to make a pre-test Need selection—training was essential.

The General Systems perspective is that substantive differences, i.e., scores on personality traits, are not important in looking at behaviors. Subjects' goals and purposes are important as they fit in the environmental milieu. It is the purpose of the subject and not a score on a trait that must be looked at for understanding behavior. Processing of information is what determines the goals or purposes as they change in time.

The independent variable of activation was seen as the most valuable, though it needs refinement, because it started to look at information about the subjects' purposes vis-a-vis conflict situations.

Conclusions

1. There were no personality traits or demographic character-
istics which had substantive differences that gave good discrimination between Issue and Need orientation to resolution of conflicts by the subjects.

2. A behavioral selection can only be made when the prerequisite information is present for the selection. In looking at behaviors, it is far more economical to look at information processed, which is used by the individual to set and modify goals and purposes, than to look for cause and effect relationships.

3. Further development of the MCRI and RCR would help refine these instruments for greater use in research and training or therapy.
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ASSOCIATIONS BETWEEN PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS AND AN ORIENTATION TO CONFLICT RESOLUTION WITH A GENERAL SYSTEMS INTERPRETATION

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Conflict is ever present in interpersonal relationships. The unique qualities of each person's perception, values, goals, attitudes, experiences, motivations and feelings or emotions, though probably similar to others' in some respects, give each person a different frame of reference for his behavior. This unique frame of reference allows for individual perceptions of conflicts ranging from those of no consequence to those of extreme consequence.

Conflict and its resolution are concerns of non-married and married couples, families, teachers, counselors and others. Practically all text books for courses in "marriage and family" (see for example Blood, 1966; Stroup, 1966; Bowman, 1970; Folkman and Clatworthy, 1970; and Landis and Landis, 1973) have one or more chapters dealing with conflict and adjustment and ways of handling the conflict. In The Student's Guide to Marriage and Family Life Literature: An Aid to Individualized Study, Kirkendall and Adams (1971) list 320 separate entries for reference to "marital conflicts and their resolution," with hundreds of additional listings on various areas of adjustment. Each adjustment area has a potential conflict base; for
example, finances or in-laws could each cause conflicts to develop in interaction between partners.

Several years ago it was suggested that the field of marital adjustment and/or nonadjustment which may result in divorce was almost a virgin field for research (Kirkpatrick, 1957). This condition still exists according to Cutler and Dyer (1973). They indicate that studies of adjustment fall into two important categories oriented towards product or process; however, very few studies have dealt with the process.

Of those who have looked at the process of conflict, Strodbeck (1959), Olson and Ryder (1970), Olson (personal communication 1973 and 1974) and Sprey (1973) have been concerned with the order and types of interaction. Their work classifies the "hows" and "whats" of the conflict interaction. Others (Patterson, Hops and Weiss, 1973; and Weiss, Hops and Patterson, 1973) have dealt with modifications of the couple's behavior in conflict interaction between a pre- and post-assessment. Intervention training based on each couple's selection of "likes" and "dislikes" items was given between the behavioral assessments. However, while these studies are valuable in their efforts to identify some of the processes of conflict resolution, neither of these two major types of research addresses itself to the motivation behind conflict resolution interaction.

The general concern of this study was the exploration of a
segment of motivation giving rise to conflict resolution interaction. The theoretical basis for this study came from William Glasser's (1967) approach in psychotherapy. His basic premise is that people suffer when two basic psychosocial needs are not met in an appropriate way: (1) the need to love and be loved, and (2) the need to feel worthwhile to oneself and others. The motivational function of conflict resolution interaction in this study was based on the assumption that behavior of individuals is goal oriented and directed, at least in part, and strained towards the fulfillment of these basic needs.

As an outgrowth of using Glasser's (1967) thesis in teaching and counseling, the author developed a model, the Conflict Resolution Model (CRM), to help individuals see the relationship between the particular issue of a conflict situation and their underlying psychosocial needs. The use of the principles and procedures of the CRM for conflict resolution is hereafter referred to as the Need orientation because the resolution is based on underlying psychosocial needs and not the issue per se. Resolution of conflict which does not consider the basic psychosocial needs but focuses on the issue in the conflict situation is referred to as the Issue orientation. A third approach wherein no solution is given to conflict situations is referred to as No-Solution.

The CRM was used in this study to give information to the subjects about the Need orientation to conflict resolution. The CRM was
not assessed but appears in the form used by the subjects as Appendix A.

The Purpose of the Study

This research had two general purposes:

1. To explore the orientation which the subjects of this study used to solve conflicts, and

2. To assess the importance that selected personality traits and demographic characteristics had on the subjects' orientation to conflict resolution.

Through the use of the CRM in previous times, the author noted that some individuals used the Need orientation while others used the Issue orientation in given conflict situations. This gave rise to the question: Are there some characteristics of individuals which would differentiate between those who used the Need and those who used the Issue orientation? That question served as the basis of this study.

People respond differently to conflict situations because they are different. The characteristics or personal attributes of each individual are what make him uniquely himself. These attributes are multiple in nature, and include age, life style, values, goals, perceptions and attitudes. How some of these attributes are related to conflict resolution was another concern of this study.
Conflict Resolution Orientation--The Dependent Variable

The dependent variable under study was the orientation to conflict resolution used by the subjects. This variable was divided into three nominal categories: Need, Issue and No-Solution. This dependent variable denotes behavior rather than attributes. As behavior it varies, unlike mathematical variables, by occurring or not occurring (Black and Broderick, 1972).

The Need orientation followed after the basic psychosocial needs described by Glasser (1967) to: (1) love and be loved, and (2) feel worthwhile to oneself and others. Resolutions to conflicts that follow the Need orientation look for relationships between the issue or incident that gave rise to the conflict and basic psychosocial needs of each individual. Alternatives which are selected for conflict resolution serve to better fulfill the basic needs of the individuals in interaction vis-a-vis the conflict.

The Issue orientation to conflict resolution is one wherein the alternatives for resolution apply directly to the issue or incident that gave rise to the conflict without explicitly seeking fulfillment of the basic psychosocial needs. These alternatives give direction for interaction, such as compromising, taking turns, communicating more, apologizing or each going his own way.

In the No-Solution approach to conflict resolution, there is no
solution or direction for interaction offered.

There are others (Murray, 1938 and Maslow, 1954) who define needs in a different way than Glasser (1967), but it was Glasser's definition of needs that was used to determine the mode of operation followed in conflict resolution for this study.

The selection of Glasser's (1967) definition of basic psycho-social needs was based on a functional approach. He states two types of needs: physiological and psychosocial, similar to Maslow (1954) but he also states that the therapist is seldom required to deal with the physiological needs. So it is in interpersonal conflict interaction--physiological needs would be far less important than psychosocial needs. Therapy or training for conflict resolution must be aimed toward the psychosocial needs, an idea that is supported by Anderson (1967), Patterson et al. (1973) and Weiss et al. (1973). The basis on which change is made--training in an educational model or treatment in therapy--must be simple enough to be applicable to the individuals (Miller, Nunnally and Wackman, 1973; Patterson et al., 1973; and Weiss et al., 1973).

It was assumed that the need of loving and being loved can be understood and applied by college students. A definition of love (Jourard, 1964) that can be used by individuals suggests that loving and being loved is behavior that promotes the growth and happiness of the person--to be decided by the receiver of the behavior. The
need of feeling worthwhile to oneself and others involves standards of action by the individual who assumes responsibility for them (Glasser, 1967). Improper standards and/or actions often result in conflict (Mowrer, 1964).

The psychosocial needs defined by Glasser (1967) are simple enough and yet comprehensive enough to help individuals work through motivational bases of interpersonal conflict. The use of these ideas would be fully supported by Maslow's (1941 and 1962) ideas of Being (B) love, versus Deficiency (D) love, the first of which leads to self-actualization within a limited conflicting environment.

Personal Attributes and Characteristics—The Independent Variables

Independent variables in the study were three types of personal attributes and characteristics of the individual: (1) Relevance of Conflict Resolution, (2) Personality traits, and (3) Demographic characteristics. The selection of these variables was based on the work of several individuals (Gardner, 1965; Massey, Frank and Lodahl, 1968; Banta, 1970; Hurvitz, 1970; Kessler, 1970; Olson and Ryder, 1970; Frank, Massy and Wind, 1972; Edwards, 1973; and Plummer, 1974) whose work, along with others', will be reviewed more fully in the literature review.

In a very direct way, Olson and Ryder (1970) indicate the need for measuring the relevance of the task, i.e., conflict resolution
relevance. In a less direct way, Plummer (1974) indicates that the purpose of behavior needs to be understood in trying to understand why people behave the way they do. Literature of "problem solving" (Banta, 1970) and of "cognitive performance" (Kessler, 1970) suggests psychographic characteristics that correlate to ability to fulfill tasks. Massy et al. (1968) have suggested the use of general psychographic and socially oriented psychographic characteristics, as well as demographic characteristics, as important in looking at people's behavior.

Relevance of Conflict Resolution

Scores from Relevance of Conflict Resolution as independent variables are concerned with the purpose, utility, goal orientation or value an individual perceives in the task. Others (Hurvitz, 1970; Olson and Ryder, 1970; and Plummer, 1974) have suggested the importance of evaluating the relevance of the task. The more relevant the task is to the individual, the greater is the effort expended towards its accomplishment in a positive way (Gardner, 1965 and Edwards, 1973). The Relevance of Conflict Resolution, as an instrument, was divided into four subvariables: Value to Others, the general concern a subject sees in conflict situations of others; Value to Self, the personal concern a subject sees in conflict situations involving himself; Activation, the benefit seen by the subject in using the Need orientation for resolving conflicts in present, immediate and ultimate
future personal interactions; and Use, the current use of the Need orientation approach.

Personality Traits: General Need and Socially Oriented.

The psychographic characteristics suggested by Banta (1970) and Kessler (1970) are very similar to the general psychographic characteristics described by Massy et al. (1968). The best representation of these general characteristics for analyzing behavior is found in the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS), Massy et al. (1968). The EPPS looks at 15 general personality need traits, which are: achievement, deference, order, exhibition, autonomy, affiliation, intraception, succorance, dominance, abasement, change, nurturance, endurance, heterosexuality and aggression.

Behavior occurs within a social context, and socially oriented analysis could provide understanding of the behavior apart from the general personality traits (Frank et al., 1972). The Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis (T-JTA) assesses traits which are based on a continuum with the following dimensions: nervous-composed, depressive-lighthearted, active social-quiet, expressive responsible-inhibited, sympathetic-indifferent, subjective-objective, dominant-submissive, tolerant-hostile and impulsive-self disciplined.

The T-JTA covers some traits similar to the EPPS. For example, self-discipline and order correlate at .50—the highest
correlation, with 127 of the 135 correlations below .30 and some traits unrelated; for example, active-social is uncorrelated (.00) with aggression (see, Taylor and Johnson, 1967, p. 21). These correlations are not high, and the traits being assessed have a social context orientation which may help describe subjects who solve conflicts using different approaches.

Demographic Variables

The demographic variables which have been used most in behavioral studies have been sex, age, marital status, socioeconomic class and others, such as stage of the life cycle, geographic location and mobility, depending on the purpose of the study (Frank et al., 1972). The specific demographic characteristics used as independent variables in this study were: age, sex, marital status, relationship interaction, based on current living arrangements and past dyadic pairs, academic achievement, socioeconomic status and section of training.

Terms and Definitions

This section includes definitions for the dependent and independent variables which need clarification.
Conflict Resolution Orientation

For the purposes of this study, the orientation towards conflict resolution of an individual was defined as the manner or way of approaching conflict situations to bring resolution. This dependent variable, orientation to conflict resolution, was divided into three types of approaches to conflict resolution: Need, Issue, and No-Solution. An individual (subject) could only select one mutually exclusive approach for a given conflict situation. The subjects were classified in one of three discrete categories.

Need orientation: Defined as looking for and stating how the basic needs of loving and being loved and/or feeling worthwhile to oneself and others is related to the specific issue in the conflict situation. Alternatives were selected to work toward Need fulfillment.

Issue orientation: Defined as stating some change of behavior that did not relate the issue of the conflict to the basic psychosocial needs. Compromising, talking about the problem, apologizing, taking turns, backing off and putting down were examples of possible alternatives that would effect the Issue of the conflict.

No-Solution approach: Defined as not giving any solution for the given conflict situation. This could be accomplished by rewording the conflict, by stating that individuals should have talked about it beforehand, or by suggesting directly, "I have no solution."

Relevance of Conflict Resolution

The relevance of the task of conflict resolution was defined as the concern one has about conflict situations based on how he thinks
others respond to conflicts, how he responds personally to conflicts, and what actions he has taken vis-a-vis the conflict resolution model.

There were four scores that were used as independent variables.

1. Value to Others: Defined as personal feelings one has about conflict situations in the life of others.

2. Value to Self: Defined as personal feelings one has about conflict situations in one's own life.

3. Activation: Defined as a personal assessment of the value of training in the Need approach in the person's current, immediate future and ultimate future interaction vis-a-vis conflicts.

4. Use: Defined as the application of the Need orientation to current conflict situations.

Psychographic Characteristics

Psychographic variables are defined as personality and life style (Frank et al., 1972), but were delimited to general personality need traits and socially oriented personality traits for this study.

The general personality traits followed Edward's (1959, p. 11) definitions for the EPPS.

The socially oriented personality traits followed Taylor and Johnson's (1967, pp. 4-6) definitions for the T-JTA.

Demographic Characteristics

Demographic variables are descriptors which locate a person within various aggregates of the population, such as a relative age group and socioeconomic status (Frank et al., 1972). The following
descriptors used in this study need further clarification.

1. **Relationship Interaction**: Based on type of current relationship (such as going steady, engaged and married) with the length of time, past relationships of a dating nature with a time element, and current living arrangements with an intensity of interaction element.

2. **Academic Achievement**: Based on GPA, academic honors, units of credit in progress, outside work load, and average hours of study per week.

3. **Socioeconomic Status**: Based on the father's education, income and occupation; represented as a composite, continuous score.

4. **Section of Training**: Based on the day section of FL 222 or the Tuesday and Wednesday sections of FL 223--resulting in three categories.

### Independent/Dependent Variable Interaction

The associations assessed in this study were:

1. **The importance of Relevance of Conflict Resolution**, as measured by individual items, to the subjects' classification on the dependent variable of Need or Issue orientation or No-Solution.
   a) The importance of Value to Others in discriminating between subjects who used the Need or Issue or No-Solution approach.
   b) The importance of Value to Self in discriminating between subjects who used the Need or Issue or No-Solution approach.
   c) The importance of Activation in discriminating between subjects who used the Need or Issue or No-Solution approach.
   d) The importance of Use in discriminating between subjects who used the Need or Issue or No-Solution approach.

2. **The importance of psychographic variables which have an inner psychological orientation** (general personality need traits as measured by EPPS) to subjects' classification on the dependent variable of Need or Issue orientation or No-Solution.
3. The importance of psychographic variables which have a social orientation (personality traits as measured by T-JTA) to subjects' classification on the dependent variable of Need or Issue orientation or No-Solution.

4. The importance of demographic variables such as age, sex, marital status, relationship interaction, academic achievement, socioeconomic status and training section to subjects' classification on the dependent variable of Need or Issue orientation or No-Solution.

In an indirect way, an additional assessment was made of pre- and post-assessments of subjects' orientation to conflict resolution to see if there had been any shift in orientation. Associations between dependent and independent variables must be made on two or more classifications on the dependent variable.

**Need-Oriented Training--The Intervening Variable**

Need-oriented training was included in courses the subjects were enrolled in to give some assurance that the subjects had the necessary information to allow the selection of a Need approach to the given conflict situations. The training program or the efficiency of the knowledge of each subject was not being assessed; however, to look for relationships between the independent variables and dependent variable of Need orientation to conflict resolution there needed to be some assurance that the subjects had been at least exposed to this approach.

In a pilot study, 35 subjects responded to the MCRI, an instrument developed to assess subjects on the dependent variable, on a test-retest basis over a five-week period. They received no training.
Two judges rated all responses on both tests as **issue-**oriented. It was concluded that subjects lacked the necessary information to make **need-**oriented responses.

Additional support for using an intervening variable between pre- and post-dependent variable assessment came from the work of Patterson *et al.* (1973) and Weiss *et al.* (1973) who say that when differences cannot be settled by discussion, the interaction of the individuals turns aversive. Especially during conflict situations, individuals must have some explicit direction to follow or they revert to the use of more and more aversive actions. These aversive actions may continue to a point of physical violence (Straus, 1974). Though individuals may have developed some efficiency in fulfilling their basic psychosocial needs in regular interaction, they need some extra help or direction during times of stressful interaction, i.e., conflict (Olson, personal communication, 1973; Patterson *et al.*, 1973; and supported by Straus, 1974).

**Summary**

This study was concerned with the interaction of personal attributes and characteristics and the selection of an operation for processing given conflict situations. It was exploratory of three types of factors and attributes (relevance of conflict resolution, personality traits,
and selected demographic variables, as independent variables) and their association in the selection or non-selection of a Need-based approach to conflict resolution (after Glasser, 1967).
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter is divided into two major sections: The Conflict Resolution Model and related research.

Conflict Resolution Model

The purpose of this section of the review of literature is to identify the conceptual framework of the model used in this study.

Glasser's Conceptual Framework

Glasser's framework was developed for an individual therapeutic setting. Glasser holds a medical degree with a specialty in psychiatry. During his psychiatric training period, he became concerned with the effectiveness of psychiatric treatment for helping patients recover from their illnesses. He developed his own model over a period of time. He first postulated that people needing help suffer because they lack fulfillment of their basic needs. Whatever the person's problem, his behavior has meaning and validity for him. He needs a new way of approaching the world (reality) that allows for more complete need fulfillment. There are four parts to reality therapy which govern the therapist's role in the interaction. They are: (1) intense personal involvement, (2) facing reality, (3) rejecting
irresponsible behavior, and (4) learning better ways to behave. Elaboration of each step follows.

**Intense Personal Involvement**

To fulfill the basic needs, defined as (1) loving and being loved, and (2) feeling worthwhile to oneself and others, a person must be involved with others, one at the very minimum, but hopefully more. The person suffering may have inappropriate or incomplete involvement with others. Consequently, the therapist must be involved in the therapeutic relationship to help fulfill the basic needs of the client at the present time.

It is the intense personal involvement with the therapist which allows the therapist to help the client change his behavior. The therapist (counselor) must feel and exhibit an attitude of: I Care About You. Through caring about the client, the therapist can evaluate the client's behavior rather than interpret it. The therapist has a relationship with the client based on the person he is and not on a "transference" relationship. This allows the client to start to fulfill his needs in an effective way.

Following the intense personal involvement with the counselor (therapist), the client is assisted toward becoming more appropriately involved with others outside the therapeutic relationship. That is the goal of reality therapy.
Facing Reality

Having gained involvement with the counselee (client), the therapist's next step is to help the counselee face reality. Reality is defined as being responsible for one's own behavior within society's framework. Responsible behavior, in Reality Therapy terms, is the ability to fulfill one's needs and do so in a manner which does not deprive others of the ability to fulfill their needs. A responsible person will do that which gives him a feeling of self worth and a feeling he is worthwhile to others.

The therapist cannot accept excuses from the client for his behavior. The therapist does not work in an atmosphere of changing the patient through his (the patient's) insight and permissiveness. He confronts the client with his behavior. The client is where he is in interaction because of actions on his part. He is to be responsible. Others may have contributed to environmental influences, but only the client can work on and control his responses in the interaction. He must do this to fulfill his needs. Reality for the client is that a society exists and that his needs must be fulfilled within that framework.

The attempt to make him responsible for his behavior is not centered on making him happy, but on giving him power to do something about the behavior that creates unhappiness. Unhappiness is not a cause of but a companion to irresponsible behavior. Irresponsible behavior may give immediate satisfaction but ultimately results in
evil, pain and suffering to oneself and/or others. Responsible behavior is performed when the satisfactions which ultimately occur are greater than the immediate effort or sacrifice associated with it.

Rejecting Irresponsible Behavior

The third task for the therapist (counselor) is to help the counselee reject irresponsible behavior. As the counselor proceeds with this interaction, he keeps this thesis in mind: that regardless of the various "psychiatric problems," the treatment is the same. The client's problem results from his irresponsible behavior. People do not act irresponsibly because they are "ill" (suffering); they are "ill" (suffering) because they act irresponsibly--once organic causes are eliminated. Using personal involvement which has developed between the counselor-counselee (client/therapist)--within the organizational relationship of I Care About You, the counselor assists the counselee in rejecting irresponsible behavior by being responsible himself and by not letting irresponsibility of others interfere with the counselee.

We never blame others for the patient's irresponsibility or censure Mother, Father, or anyone deeply involved with the patient no matter how irresponsible they are or were. The patient cannot change them; he can only learn better ways to live with them or without them. We never encourage hostility or acting out irresponsible impulses, for that only compounds the problem. We never condemn society (Glasser, 1967, p. 32).

Reality Therapy rejects the notion of mental illness--though it accepts the idea of suffering. It rejects the idea of change through
exploring past events, although it accepts the idea that past events have resulted in present conditions. It rejects the notion of an "unconscious" that needs to be understood as motivating or causing behavior. Reality Therapy places the weight of behavior directly on the client in the ongoing moment but offers the I Care About You support to help the client change his irresponsible behaviors.

As the client (counselee) takes responsibility for himself, he is ready to make changes that fulfill his basic needs.

Learning Better Ways to Behave

The focus on learning better ways to behave is built on the strong points of the client and how they may be expanded. He is to work on the present and not the past behaviors--the past has contributed to the present but cannot be changed; the past is of residual importance.

The accent is on changing behaviors for basic need fulfillment and not on changing attitudes. The therapist praises when the client acts responsibly and disapproves when he acts irresponsibly. This approach looks at the what of behavior rather than the why.

To help conclude his role in the interaction, the therapist needs to have the counselee become more and more involved in the lives of those around him. The client can himself become a therapist in being
personally involved with others, helping them face reality, helping them reject irresponsible behavior and learning better ways to behave.

**Basic Needs**

In concluding this section on Glasser's approach, the basic needs should be described further. For Reality Therapy there are two basic psychological needs which cause suffering unless they are fulfilled. These two psychosocial needs are: (1) the need to love and be loved, and (2) the need to feel worthwhile to oneself and others. These needs do not vary with age, sex or race. Everyone has the same needs but vary in their ability to fulfill them.

The need to love and be loved is two-sided. To love or to be loved is not sufficient; each person must do both. Of equal importance is the need to feel worthwhile to oneself and to others. Though feeling worthwhile and loving or being loved are related, feeling worthwhile is based on meeting satisfactory standards of behavior. A person can feel loved but not meet responsible standards. An overindulged child may feel loved but also want the parents to set meaningful standards for his behaviors. An attractive young woman also feels the uncomfortable feeling of not being worthwhile when she senses her recognition based on beauty alone. To be beautiful is fine, but not at the expense of not feeling worthwhile. Feeling worthwhile requires behaviors that meet personal goals and society's demands.
The therapist's role is to help each client to fulfill the basic needs that are lacking. Therapy is successful to the extent that new behaviors are responsible behaviors.

Conflict Resolution Model

The principles laid down in Glasser's (1967) definition of basic needs are those that lie at the crux of choosing alternative behaviors. In conflicting interaction, one or more of the areas of the basic needs are not properly fulfilled for one or more individuals. Need oriented conflict resolution helps the individuals see the basic needs involved in the conflicting interaction so that alternative behaviors can be selected for more efficient fulfillment of each individual's psychosocial needs. Behavior that is loving and/or allowing the person to be loved and which promotes the feeling of being worthwhile to oneself and to others is not conflicting interaction.

Related Research

The purpose of this section is to look briefly at others' work as it relates to the purpose of this study. Some of the material has a direct relationship in suggesting direction, while other material has an indirect relationship. This section deals with the literature in each of the following areas: relevance of conflict resolution, psychographic/
demographic concerns, approaches to conflict resolution, and training-intervening variable.

Relevance of Conflict Resolution

The value or purpose a person has for achieving a particular goal in a given way is the relevance of the task. Human performances vary according to the perceived relevance of the task. In viewing conflict resolution, it is important to determine the relevance of the conflict resolution type of task for the human systems.

Conflict research that is concerned with primary relationships in the sociocultural system, that is, husband-wife or parent-child or fiancé-fiancée interactions, has been the concern primarily of marriage counselors. The counseling situation is often concerned with conflict involving expectations of behaviors of the family or primary group interaction. The most open concern of the issue of relevance in the conflict resolution task is voiced by Olson and Ryder (1970) and Olson (personal communication, 1973). They suggest that one very important element in the study of couple interaction is finding a way of assessing the relevance of each particular task. Olson has attempted to assess relevancy by having the couple indicate if the conflict situations are similar to their own or to conflicts of couples they know.

In a less direct way, Hurvitz (1965) assesses role strain by
having the couple rank in order of importance 11 role behaviors from a desired and a performance point of view. The difference between the desired and performed order yields an Index of Role Strain in the interaction. The higher the Index of Role Strain, the greater the implied concern in the incongruent behaviors. In a later article, Hurvitz (1970) discusses the counselor using hypotheses derived by the counselees (clients) to explain or express the goal they or the other person has in particular behavioral patterns. These patterns of behavior are seen as goal-directed patterns which give purpose (relevance) for their continuation. Behaviors are changed in accordance with goals being set to supersede the previous goals of a particular person that interfered with the couple relationship.

From a communication approach to counseling, Bolte (1970) emphasizes the need for an understanding of behaviors from one person to another. He describes how behavior that may seem bizarre to others has relevance for the actor and how the actor can often clarify the purpose (relevance) of the behavior to the other person. Using "Self-Concept Validation" (Johnsen, 1968) as another approach to focus on marital counseling the counselor follows the assumption that interaction behaviors are goal-oriented, including the counselor-client relationship, which forms the basis for change. The higher the goal-orientation (relevance of the task), the greater the chance for change. Caseworkers (Beck, 1965) who have practiced marital
counseling, especially conflict resolution, have stressed the need for both partners wanting to work on the problem(s) at hand—relevance for the assisted task.

Researchers and practitioners involved in the study of and changes in conflict situations have pointed out the need to see the relevance of the task as seen by those performing the task.

A second important indication for a relevance measure comes from the theoretical framework. All authors of the new (modern or general) systems theory advocate looking at man (human and socio-cultural levels of system) as being goal-oriented versus being goal-directed. To be goal-directed is simply to have a pre-determined goal to be accomplished. To be goal-oriented means that goals can be set, modified or discarded according to information processed by the individual at a given time. Goal-orientation is purposeful interaction, but it is not bound to the original goal state. Having achieved a particular goal, the human being can set another one—goal-oriented—which continues throughout the life of the person (Maruyama, 1963; Buckley, 1967; von Bertalanffy, 1968; Speer, 1968; Black and Broderick, 1972; and others).

MacKay (1961) suggests that semantic information theory development has been lacking because research has failed to see the communication process involving the sender and receiver as goal-oriented, self-adaptive systems. Viewing the channel and the nature
of the signal flow has been incomplete.

Wherein a human is goal-oriented versus goal-directed, it is imperative that the person be assessed as to the relevance he sees in the tasks he performs. The human can be asked to rate the importance of particular tasks or to make an assessment of attitudes or desires or goals involved in the task.

A third indication for the importance of assessing the relevance of tasks comes from professionals in the field of Home Management. Their central concern has been how individuals and families establish goals for the allocation of resources. Management is the major means of achieving the goals, while the managers are challenged to use resources for purposes considered most important to them (Nickell and Dorsey, 1970; Oppenheim, 1972; and Gross, Crandall and Knoll, 1973). The more current look at individuals and families as they create and carry out goals has taken a systems theory approach which makes the goals dynamic to the system within variously defined levels of environment (Gross, et al., 1973).

To help capitalize on the importance of the relevance of a task, Edwards says,

The concept of goals has proven to me most effective as the principle concept for teaching students about managerial behavior of individuals and family units in a household setting . . . What is of greater importance to us than our own goals and their achievement? (Edwards, 1973, p. 1).
She goes on to suggest that the meaningfulness of our work gives meaning to our lives—a strong implication for seeing the relevance of tasks at hand.

Gardner (1965) talks about the preeminence of goals in imparting significance to human behavior and looking at behavior via the goals or purpose it has for the individual. The state of happiness for man is not to have achieved gratification, ease and comfort of completed goals, but it comes in the striving toward meaningful goals.

The fourth area concerned with behavior of individuals, which is indirectly related to the purpose of this study, is that of Market Segmentation. Market Segmentation is the concept of dividing people into groups having similar wants and demands so that firms can create marketing tactics and products that fit a given segment best. The work done in this area has been directed at consumer behavior—the what and whys of purchases and purchase patterns. The field of Market Segmentation has shifted considerably from what is defined as general characteristics— independent variables—to situation specific characteristics, that is, the shift has come from broad categories of group type characteristics to more specific situations of individual type characteristics. This shift has given rise to "life style segmentation" (Plummer, 1974), which places emphasis upon the purpose (Relevance) of the purchase to the consumer—the emphasis of looking at people's intents more than product factors.
With information about consumers' wants and needs (purposes), the firms can make changes in products or advertising of products to bring them in line with what the consumer wants. A consumer behaves in the market place under a number of circumstances: durable vs. non-durable goods, frequent vs. seldom purchases, promotional items or circumstances vs. regular purchases, all of which have indicated a need to look at the consumer's purposes rather than predict behavior from particular purchases (Engle, Fiorillo and Cayler, 1972; Frank et al., 1972; and Plummer, 1974). Principles of market segmentation suggest the importance of looking at a relevance for the task vis-a-vis this study.

**Psychographic/Demographic Concerns**

The purpose of this section of related research is to show some usefulness of looking at personality traits--one aspect of psychographics--and descriptor variables--demographics--in this study.

The Cincinnati Autonomy Test Battery (CATB) developed and tested by Thomas Banta is designed to assess the autonomous qualities of pre-school children and the effects of various training programs for development of autonomous qualities. "The word 'autonomy' . . . refers to self-regulating behaviors that facilitate effective problem solving (Banta, 1970, p. 424)." His thesis is that autonomous behavior starts around 18 months of age and continues through
life. Banta undertook an extensive review of literature vis-a-vis the development of the 14 variables used in the CATB (Banta, 1970). The variables he used in his CATB would be supportive of the use of general personality need traits and socially oriented personality traits used in this study. Likewise, the variables reviewed by Kessler (1970) on cognitive development would support the use of general personality need traits and socially oriented personality traits.

Hurvitz (1965a) finds no clear-cut association between control roles (defined as authoritarian, conservative and traditional or democratic, liberal and companionship), marital strain and role deviation with marital adjustment. He proposes the use of sociological instruments to measure the above concepts, but also proposes to add to them psychological instruments to assess personality traits.

In looking at conflict in interpersonal relations as related to values and value systems, Sikula (1970) concludes that values and value systems parallel personality traits. His study does not find any value or value systems that are "determinants" or "predictors" of conflict versus non-conflict situations with roommates. He recommends the use of personality traits, like need for achievement and aggression, when considering individuals in the conflict/non-conflict interaction.

More than any other field, the field of Market Segmentation has been systematically concerned with psychographic and demographic
variables. Its researchers have had the interest and financial backing of business firms in trying to understand human consumption behavior. By selecting appropriate descriptor variables, these firms hope to segment the market so as to best meet the needs of the consumers—therein to their own advantages. Some variables can be measured directly: age, sex, marital status; while others can only be measured indirectly: personality traits, preferences, attitudes.

Frank et al. remarked:

The most widely used bases for market segmentation have been sex, age, marital status, number and age of children, ethnic origin, and geographical location and mobility of a household. The first four are often combined into a stage-of-life-cycle index. The primary reasons for the popularity of demography is its ease of measurement, the accessibility to these segments by various communications and distribution media, and the relatively large size of segments based on any of these variables (1972, pp. 29-30).

The authors then discuss each of these variables and look at socioeconomic characteristics, describing some of the differences between groups. They continue:

The shortcomings of demographic and socioeconomic characteristics as bases for segmentation have led to various attempts to segment markets based on personality and lifestyle characteristics (1972, p. 50).

They suggested personality traits can be seen in terms of general characteristics, socially oriented characteristics and person-oriented characteristics. The authors specifically suggest the EPPS as a useful measurement of the general "needs" personality traits.
The socially oriented measurement comes from the T-JTA.

In conclusion, there are suggested variables that relate to behavior of a psychographic and demographic nature.

**Approaches to Conflict Resolution**

The purpose of this section of the review of literature is to look at different research approaches to conflict resolution.

**Instrumentation of conflict resolution approaches.** One of the first attempts to look at measurement of conflict situations of couple was the Revealed Differences Technique (RDT) developed by Strodtbeck (1951). The RDT is a procedure whereby a couple discusses conflict situations, known to both, and works out a joint decision. The person who has the greatest power or authority and/or who does the most talking and directing of the discussion is the one who wins--his or her decision is ultimately accepted as the joint decision. This approach allows for analysis of the different modes and techniques of influence to be studied. The content and process analysis helps reveal the balance of power.

Strodtbeck studied three groups of individuals who differed in the balance of power in couple pairs. A Texas group was representative of equalitarian relationship; a Mormon group was representative of a patriarchial relationship; and a Navajo group was representative of a matriarchal relationship. The hypothesis was that the
balance of power would be in the direction of the group's norms. This hypothesis was supported at the .05 level of confidence. There was also a positive relationship between the amount of time each partner talked and the balance of power.

In an Inventory of Marital Conflict (IMC) developed by Olson and Ryder (1970), 18 standardized conflict situations are used where individual members each respond separately and then jointly to the situations. Their task is to determine who is most responsible in each conflict situation. The 18 situations consist of six non-conflict situations where the description of interaction is loaded to favor the male and female three times each. The remaining 12 situations are given from different points of view to create a need for resolution between the couple. The scoring of the IMC is similar to that of the RDT, wherein the joint decision of the couple favoring one individual's position credits a win score. An Inventory of Family Conflicts (IFC) is being developed by Olson (personal communication, 1974) which has family-type conflict situations versus marital-type situations on the IMC. A new system for coding interaction is being developed to be used by both the IMC and IFC.

Olson's research assessed the relationship between "self-reports" of marital power of the individuals and "observed" results of marital power. Thirty-five couples answered a questionnaire that contained 27 decision-making situations. Each member worked
through the 27 items separately and then jointly. No relationship was found between a couple's "self-report" and observed powers in joint discussion interaction.

A relevancy score is utilized in the research on the IMC and IFC, which is determined by giving one point if the couple knows of some other couple or family who has a conflict similar to the one described and two points if the couple or family is (has) experiencing (ed) a similar type of conflict. Olson and Ryder (1970) were very critical of Stodtbeck's RDT for not using standardized situations and not giving relevancy scores.

Both the RDT and IMC/IFC methods of viewing conflicts allow for description of interaction, but neither give any conceptual or theoretical framework for the dynamics of conflict. Likewise, they give no treatment base. If these two approaches are to be of any value to a practioner, they need to suggest a treatment procedure or offer a framework for the dynamics. To be able to describe who speaks to whom and who has the most power or authority is of little value when a couple is deadlocked in a conflict situation and is seeking help.

From a different point of view, Sprey (1973) is looking at the grammar--rules of interaction--of couple communication about conflict areas. His work is currently exploring what possible rules go into conflicts where there is agreement between husband and wife
about the conflict situation in the family and where there is disagree-
ment between husband and wife about the family conflict situations.
His direction for building a framework for family management is to
test hypotheses about family interaction on problem situations. The
theory will follow the hypotheses testing. He is currently having
families fill out lengthy questionnaires from which he will draw the
hypotheses to be tested. Beginning parameters for hypotheses fall
into two areas: (1) whether the family sees a problem in terms of
direct control, indirect control or no control for management, and
(2) whether the knowledge, attitudes and awareness of the problems
facing the family are shared by husband and wife. To date there has
been nothing published on any of his research.

Another approach takes an applied look at conflict resolution.
The University of Oregon and the Oregon Research Institute (Patter-
son et al., 1973) approach is along the lines of a behavior modifica-
tion program of teaching couples the skills of pinpointing problems,
defining behaviors, negotiating contracts and using "love" days where
extra attention is placed on "Pleases"-type behaviors. The concep-
tual framework concerning conflict came out of case studies and
experimental experiences in the intervention program as it under-
went development. The Oregon groups' finding on conflict dynamics
is that the couple demands behavior change from one another—first
as "request" and then as a "discussion of a disagreement." If
satisfaction isn't achieved in the first two stages, they progress to a "coercion process" using aversive stimuli. The use of some aversive stimuli can then escalate to greater intensity of aversive stimuli—name calling, sarcasm—to the point where some couples use physical violence. The demand for change of behavior may come about because of other changes in the behavior of one or both of the couple or from poorly defined agreements in the beginning.

The intervention program of the Oregon groups is designed to specifically help the couples: (1) decrease the time on "description of problems"; (2) make fewer excuses; (3) deny responsibility less; (4) make fewer accusations; (5) generally reduce aversive behavior—criticism, disagreements; (7) outline rewards and penalties for specific behaviors in a clearer manner; and (8) better pinpoint behaviors needing change.

Two separate studies have been reported by the Oregon groups. Each study had five couples who met with the counselors on a separate (as a couple) basis. The weekly sessions ranged from 10 - 60 days for Study I and 56 - 91 days for Study II. Both studies showed significant change in behaviors at the terminal point compared with baseline behavior data. There were significant increases in pleasure rates, problem solving, time spent together, and positive verbal and non-verbal behaviors, while there were significant decreases in putting down, not tracking, problem description and negative verbal and
nonverbal behaviors. The total amount of time spent in verbal communication by the couples increased. Furthermore, there was a shift toward equal time in communication of problems away from much one-sidedness in the communication about problems for baseline data.

**Summary**

The review of literature has looked at Glasser's (1967) framework of basic needs, which have been defined as: (1) the need to love and be loved, and (2) the need to feel worthwhile to oneself and others. His definition of basic needs was used to determine the categorical placement of the subject on the dependent variable.

The importance of gaining measurement about the relevance of the task was reviewed from the points of view of Conflict Resolution, General Systems Theory, Home Management and Market Segmentation. Each of these areas points out the need for relevance measures which were used as independent variables in this study.

The use of psychographic and demographics as independent variables was also reviewed. The literature suggested personality traits of a general need orientation and a social orientation. The demographic variables were descriptors of the subjects.

The last part of the literature review looked at conflict resolution research approaches. The conclusion was that none of the
research so far evaluates a motivational base behind the conflicts—that was the purpose of this study.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

Eighty-seven subjects participated in this study. They were enrolled in two sections of Family Living (FL 223) and one section of Marriage Preparation (FL 222). These subjects consisted of 23 males and 64 females; they had an age range from 18 to 27 years. Nineteen were single or dating occasionally, 24 were dating steadily, 37 were pinned or engaged and 7 were married--none were divorced or widowed. The subject's background, via their father's standing, was: education ranged from less than 7 years to 22 years of formalized training with the median of 14 years; income ranged from $7,000 to over $50,000 with a modal range of $12,000 to $15,000.

Procedures

The subjects were given pre- and post-assessments on conflict resolution. Training (the intervening variable) was given to each subject in the class setting to assure exposure to the Need-oriented approach for post-conflict resolution measurement. A behavioral selection (operation) can only be used when information necessary for the selection is present for the individual's use (Black and Broderick, 1972). Previous work by this author suggested that the
information necessary for a Need-oriented approach to conflict resolution could not be assumed. A chi-square analysis comparison of pre- and post-measurements on orientation to conflict resolution was made to help answer the question of whether necessary information was available without training.

Each of the subjects was also assessed by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis, the Relevance of Conflict Resolution instrument and the Demographic Data Questionnaire.

Instruments

Modified Conflict Resolution Inventory

The Modified Conflict Resolution Inventory (MCRI) is an instrument that was developed to assess an Issue, Need or No-Solution modus operandi for third party conflict situation resolutions. This instrument has a description of three third party conflict situations. Three conflict situations were used after a pilot test indicated that three items were sufficient to determine the mode of operation in conflict resolution. The subjects were instructed to offer a solution to each problem and give some rationale for their decision.

Two forms of the MCRI were randomly assigned with one used as a pretest measure and the alternate form used for post-test measure (see Appendix B). Random assigning produced a crisscross
design which helped control for unequal items for situations. To further control for relative difficulty in the nature of the third party conflict, 14 judges rated 12 third party conflict situations. The judges, seven males and seven females, were instructed to rate each conflict situation using a scale of one to ten: one (1) if the situation seemed very easy and ten (10) if the situation seemed very difficult. A mean score and standard deviation were calculated for each situation. The 12 situations with the 14 judges' ratings appear as Appendix C.

Three pairs of conflict situations were randomly selected for Form A or B of the MCRI. Two set of pairs, for the alternate forms A and B, were immediately available with identical means of 4.0 and 7.57 for each pair and with a standard deviation from 2.23 to 2.45 and 1.19 to 1.83, respectively. The third paired situations had means ranging from 5.15 to 5.2, with standard deviations of 1.83 and 2.28, respectively.

To gain some additional assessment of the similarity in level of difficulty between the situations on the alternate forms, an analysis was made of Issue subjects who took alternate forms on the pre-test assessments. They were compared, using a chi-square analysis, on four descriptors: age, sex, marital status and socioeconomic status. There were no significant differences between subjects who started with one form versus the other. This helped to substantiate that
alternate forms were not important in influencing an Issue or Need orientation.

A measure of stability had been established in a pilot study wherein 18 subjects took Form A and 17 subjects took Form B on a test-retest basis over a five-week interval. Two independent judges, former FL 406 Projects students, rated all responses for both tests. Every response was rated as Issue oriented.

The scoring of the MCRI was accomplished by having three judges read each answer to the situation and mark each situation as to whether the solution fit the form of Issue, Need, or No-Solution. The judges were given the following instructions for scoring:

**Scoring procedures for the MCRI.** There are three general categories into which the responses will fall: Issue, Need or No-Solution.

The No-Solution category should be scored only if there is clearly no-solution offered. The subject may describe the problem using other words as a "no-solution" response, but if any direction is given for one or more members of the conflict, there is a solution--to be determined as issue or need oriented. Record a zero (0) if no solution is offered.

The Issue category should be scored when the solution to the problem comes directly from the issue itself or some form of compromise, without any reference as to how the solution meets the needs, of loving or being loved or feeling worthwhile to oneself or another, of one or both of the members. A solution such as apologizing or communicating or talking is issue oriented if the basic needs (psycho-social)
are not incorporated explicitly. Score the situation with an "I."

A Need solution is one that involves the basic psycho-social needs--loving and being loved or feeling worthwhile to oneself or others--in the solution to the problem. One or both members' basic needs may be used in the formulation of the alternative choices. Score the need level with an "N."

The final score, i.e., Issue, Need or No-Solution, for each subject was determined by the summation of three judges' first ratings on each of the three situations. Each judge scored the same three situations. A majority score, which was two or three judges' scores of Issue, Need or No-Solution on a single situation, determined the Issue, Need or No-Solution classification for that situation. Two or three situation scores of Issue, Need or No-Solution determined the final modus operandi as the dependent variable classification. Examples of judges' ratings of specific responses appears as Appendix D.

There were three different approaches that could be used in classifying subjects on the dependent variable: (1) rate within each situation across the three judges and then average the ratings on the three situations, (2) rate each of the three judges on the three situations and then average the judges' ratings, or (3) make a frequency count of all Issue, Need and No-Solution ratings for judges on all situations and then use the greatest frequency count for placement. The first approach was used on the rationale that subject's responses to
each situation was based on their perception of its content vis-a-vis their concern about conflicts.

A comparison of the three approaches resulted in one Issue and Need classification being reversed using within judges' ratings versus within situation ratings—but independent variable scores were similar enough to not effect results of the discriminant analysis; and three Need classifications would have been reversed using the frequency count versus either the within situation or within judges' ratings—but high independent variable scores for one subject would counteract low scores for another subject in the discriminant function leaving only one subject's scores to effect the discriminant function. There was 100% agreement on the total number of subject classifications via within judges or situation ratings, and there was 90% agreement on subject classifications via the frequency count and either within situation or within judges' ratings.

Three judges were selected, as regular judges, to work independently of each other and to each rate 522 separate responses to conflict situations made by the subjects on a pre- and post-measurement. These three regular judges were former Family Life 406 Projects students who had worked with the researcher and the CRM in a pilot study. They had worked as group facilitators and were familiar with the Need approach to conflict resolution. Because of this familiarity, they were given no special instruction on judging the
situations. Each received a copy of the scoring procedures and then met as a group to talk over any questions.

Three additional judges were selected to serve as special judges. They were current Family Life 406 Projects students who served as facilitators in one of the training sections. Each special judge received the scoring procedures. They received no special training for scoring. They were instructed to follow the scoring procedures and make their best judgment.

Three reliability assessments were made on the judges' ratings. The first was a comparison of the three regular judges between their first and second ratings of 60 randomly drawn responses from the 522 responses. There were 16 changes in 180 responses for 91.8% agreement. The second was a comparison of 30 subjects' classification between regular judges' first ratings and three special judges' ratings. There were two subject classification differences for a 93.4% agreement. The third reliability assessment was a within situation comparison for the regular judges on 150 randomly selected responses and for the special judges on 90 situation response ratings. There were 35 differences out of 450 responses for the regular judges and 21 differences out of 270 responses for the special judges. This resulted in within situation ratings for both sets of judges of 92.3% agreement. Inter-rater reliability was high enough to warrant the use of the regular judges' classification of subjects.
Relevance of Conflict Resolution Instrument

The importance to the individual of resolving conflicts is likely to be reflected in the approach selected for resolution of conflict. Olson and Ryder (1970) and Olson (personal communication, 1973, 1974) developed a scale for assessing the relevance of conflict resolution, but it was not appropriate for use in this study because it utilized married couple pair responses, and this study was looking at individuals for assessment.

To assess the relevance of the task of conflict resolution, an instrument, Relevance of Conflict Resolution (RCR), was developed (see Appendix E). Four categories were set up to help in the assessment: Value for Others, Value for Self, Activation and Use. These four categories each constituted an independent variable. The validity of each variable was based on face validity. The response the subject had to conflict resolution in the "Value to Others" and "Value to Self" sections was a direct assessment of his personal feelings. The response the subject had to the use of the model in conflict resolution for current situations and for immediate and ultimate future was also a direct assessment of his personal feelings. The number of usages of the Need approach in personal interactions was a measurement of effort given to conflict resolution vis-a-vis the Need approach.

A partial reliability check for stability was obtained on 18 persons--not subjects in this study--over a one-week interval. There
were a total of 504 responses. Stability was based on the changes in the total score for two subscales: Value to Others and Value to Self. The mean change for the variable, Value to Others, resulted in 93.4% stability rating, with stability scores ranging from 83.6% to 100%. The mean change for the variable, Value to Self, resulted in 87.7% stability rating, with a range of stability scores from 65% to 97.5%. With a mean stability rating near 90% for each subscale, the stability appeared adequate, based on a very small number of individuals over a one-week interval, for use in this exploratory study. The other two subscales of the RCR, Activation and Use, were not assessed for stability. This needs to be done before further use.

A detailed description of the four subscales follows:

**Value for others.** In this part of the assessment, the subjects were asked to rate the importance of conflict resolution to others as seen by themselves. This was a projected assessment, based on a seven-point scale from 0 to 6. The major questions with the subscales used in assessment were:

1. Conflicts of engaged couples I know are generally: (a) Minor to Major, (b) Frequent to Few, and (c) Disruptive to Beneficial.

2. Conflicts of married couples I know are generally: (a) Beneficial to Disruptive, (b) Major to Minor, and (c) Few to Frequent.

3. When a person has a conflict, he (she) generally makes it bigger than what it is: Yes to No.
4 - Some "common sense" would help most people resolve their conflicts: Yes to No.

5 - Special training on how to handle (manage) conflicts would be: Helpful to Of little value: (a) Engaged couples, (b) Married couples, (c) Everyone.

6 - Generally speaking, people should be concerned about conflicts: Less than they are to More than they are.

7 - My parents' way of handling conflict is (was): (a) Constructive to Destructive, (b) Not what I want to follow to What I want to follow.

8 - My friends' ways of handling conflict are: (a) Destructive to Constructive and (b) Not what I want to follow to What I want to follow.

9 - Conflicts remain unresolved because people don't: (a) Look at their problems; High percent to Low Percent, (b) Express themselves: Low percent to High percent, and (c) Know how: High percent to Low percent.

The score for this segment was treated as continuous and ranged from: 0 - 114.

**Value for self.** In this part of the assessment the subject was asked to view the importance of conflict for himself. The items used in this section were based on a seven-point scale from 0 to 6 and were:

1 - Conflicts I have that are of major concern to me are: (a) Resolved immediately to Still pending, and (b) Poorly resolved to Satisfactorily handled.

2 - Conflicts I have with other people are: (a) Easy to bring up to Very touchy, (b) Frequent to Few, and (c) Minor to Major.

3 - Special training on how to handle (or manage) conflicts would be: Helpful to me to Of little value to me.

4 - My concern about conflicts and their resolutions is: Greater than it should be to Less than it should be.
5 - My conflicts, which remain unresolved, are mainly because I don't: (a) Express myself: High percent to Low percent, (b) Look at the problems: How percent to High percent, and (c) Know how: Low percent to High percent.

The score for this segment with ten scales was treated as continuous and may range from 0 to 60.

The two sub-scales of the RCR, Value to Self and Value to Others, were assessed as to the independence of the items because both of these sub-scales seemed important in distinguishing subjects on the resolution of conflicts. The correlation between the 14 items, which comprise both sub-scales, suggested that each item was measuring some different information, see Table 1. The highest correlation is .46 which accounts for 21.16% of variance between the two items. This amount of variance is not considered of great importance in the context of inter-item correlation; however, additional items to the scales with factor analysis would allow for refined information on the scales. For example, item 5 from the sub-scale of Value to Others and item 12 from the sub-scale of Value to Self were each concerned with the subjects' perception of the value of special training for conflict resolution for others and self, respectively. These items measure some of the same information, but each item also measured different information.
Table 1. Inter-Item Correlation of RCR Sub-Scales: Value to Others (1-9) and Value to Self (10-14).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activation. This section of the instrument was concerned with the feelings of the subjects about the value of the training program and the conflict resolution model. Each subject was asked to write down the particular goal he (she) had for communication in marriage (or some permanent type relationship). There were three questions asked on this part of the instrument:

1 - Did the training program help you toward your goal of communication in marriage?

2 - Do you think this kind of experience we had in class would be important for other people?

3 - Have you used, or do you see a use for, the Conflict Resolution Model in your personal interaction:

   (a) Currently: Yes or No and with whom and how many times?

   (b) In the immediate future? and

   (c) In the ultimate future?

Questions one and two and items (b) and (c) of question three were judged on a five-point scale of: zero = none, 1 = a little, 2 = average, 3 = a lot and 4 = very much. Question one was doubled in weight because it directly assessed a goal set up by the subject. Item (a) on question three was scored one point for a yes and zero for a no. A judge rated the narrative of each response except for item (a). The scores of these three questions were summed to give an activation score as one independent variable treated in a continuous nature and ranged from 0 to 21.
Use. In addition to asking whether or not the Conflict Resolution Model was (or had been) used currently, there was a response called for: With whom and how many times? The use or lack of use was one independent variable, which was scored in discrete categories of: 0 - 2 uses, or 3 or more uses. Three or more uses were seen as going beyond the assigned usage and indicated relevancy to the subject's approach to Conflict Resolution.

**Edwards Personal Preference Schedule**

The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS, Edwards, 1959) is a forced choice test measuring 15 scales of personality traits. Each one was an independent variable. There are 225 questions from which the 15 scales are derived. The forced choice method is designed to control the "socially-desirable" qualities of the scores. The EPPS has norms for a college population and reports reliability scores of: internal consistency, on a split-half, of .60 to .87; and stability, over one week, of .74 to .88 on scale scores. A validity measure, using self-ratings on Murray's twenty needs as the criterion, is reported as: "Some subjects showed a high degree of agreement and others little or no agreement between their self-ratings and scores (Edwards, 1959, p. 21)." In Alfred B. Heilbrun's (1972) analysis of the EPPS, published as item #72 in Buros' *Seventh Mental Measurement Yearbook*, he states: "While the scanty evidence of
validity lends considerable scepticism to any recommendation of its use, neither is there hard core evidence that it does not have some predictive validity (p. 149). In evaluating the EPPS for assessment of general personality traits, Frank et al. (1972) states: 

"An examination of the various psychological studies using this test indicate that the test has adequate reliability for prediction on a group basis and concurrent and construct validity (p. 51)." The EPPS scores were treated as continuous scores.

**Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis**

The Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis (Taylor and Johnson, 1966) is composed of 18 factors on a bi-polar continuum giving nine personality traits, where each was used as an independent variable. The test consists of 180 questions where the subject marks whether or not the statement describes himself--allowing for socially desirable responses. The T-JTA has norms for a college population and reports reliability scores of: consistency, on a split-half, of .71 to .86; and stability, over a two-week interval, of .71 to .87 on scale scores. The measure of validity, based on psychologists' rating of the subjects and the test scores, is reported this way: "In many cases the predictions were closely duplicated by the test results. In others there were only slight variations on a few traits (p. 19)." Donald Mosher's (1972) analysis of the T-JTA, published as item #572 in
Buros' *Seventh Mental Measurement Yearbook*, suggests that internal consistency is very adequate, the traits are distinct traits, but validity is disappointingly meager. However, the test is carefully constructed, Mosher feels, and might very well be useful. The T-TJA scores were treated as continuous scores.

**Demographic Data Questionnaire**

The Demographic Data Questionnaire (DDQ) was composed to make assessments of pertinent demographic data. A copy of the DDQ and the weights assigned for continuous scales appear as Appendix F. Seven sets of demographic data used in this study were of a discrete or continuous nature. They follow:

1 - Age: Scored in two discrete categories; 21 years of age and younger or 22 years of age and older. This division of age was arbitrary.

2 - Sex.

3 - Marital Status: Scored for this study in six categories; single, steadily dating, pinned, engaged, engaged with partner enrolled in the course, or married. All married subjects' partners were enrolled in the course.

4 - Relationship Interaction: Score treated as a continuous score, summed from four assessments--past dating, present dating, present living arrangements and degree of interaction in present living arrangements.

5 - Academic Achievement: Score treated as a continuous score, summed from six assessments--college GPA, academic honors, time spent on all course work, credit hours carried, part or full time work load and time spent in training activities.
6 - Socioeconomics Status: Score treated as continuous score, summed from three assessments—father's occupation and education (after Hollingshead, 1958) and father's income. (This is after Frank et al.'s (1972) position that a continuous score on socioeconomic status is more viable than a discrete categorical placement.)

7 - Training Section: Scored in three categories of sections where subjects were enrolled.

In addition to data collected for the seven independent variables used in this study, other data were collected by the DDQ which were not used in this study.

In conclusion, there were 40 variables used as independent and three classifications on the dependent variable used for this exploratory study. Of the 40 independent variables, 30 were continuous, that is, a range of score rather than a specific category was given. Ten dependent variables were discrete, that is, the subject fit one category or another, such as sex—male or female. The three classifications on the dependent variable were discrete categories: Issue or Need or No-Solution.

**Statistical Analysis**

This study was exploratory of the relationship of relevance of conflict resolution, personality traits and demographic characteristics and the selections of an Issue, Need or No-Solution modus operandi of conflict resolution for third-party couple conflicts. Frank et al. (1972) described several ways of analyzing various forms of
data. They suggested the use of multiple regression if there is strong conviction about the relationship between the dependent and independent variables. They also suggested the use of discriminant analysis if the relationship between the dependent and independent variables falls into one of the following categories: "I think there is a relationship," "I wonder if there is a relationship" or "There might be a relationship." The uncertainty, or lack of a prior conviction, used in the discriminant analysis allows for a large number of possible associations to be seen. The Discriminant Analysis Package at O.S.U. allows for analysis of 40 independent and 40 dependent variables in one analysis.

Following the exploration of the possible association, via discriminant analysis, Frank et al. (1972) suggests that independent variables showing promise, the level of significance and degree of variance to be determined by the researcher, be used in a second analysis with a multiple regression technique on a second sample.

A second important reason for the use of the discriminant analysis is that it handles data of a nominal, ordinal, interval or ratio scale, whereas multiple regression analysis is based on the use of interval or ratio scales. Multiple regression analysis is also based on the idea that variables are independent, additive and linear or the prior specification of nonlinearity and/or interaction effects.

The analysis of this study used the Discriminant Analysis
Package with forty independent variables and three classifications on the dependent variable. The independent variables were both continuous and discrete in nature and included relevance of conflict resolution data, psychographic data and demographic data. The dependent variable was discrete in nature and fell into the categories of **Issue**, **Need** or **No-Solution**.

The discriminant analysis was a stepwise analysis of the independent variables that account for the greatest amount of incremental variation on the dependent variable.

Two of the instruments used in this study, the MCRI and the RCR, do not have established reliability data or validity measures, which meant that the data generated by them could best be seen at the nominal and ordinal scale, respectively.

The specific analyses of this study, as related to the purposes of the study, were:

1 - An analysis of relevance of conflict resolution variables to post-MCRI scores via discriminant analysis. This analysis was supplemented by a partial stability check over a one-week period and a correlation analysis of the 14 items which constituted Value to Others and Value to Self sections of the RCR.

2 - An analysis of general personality trait variables to post-MCRI scores via discriminant analysis.

3 - An analysis of socially oriented personality trait variables to post-MCRI scores via discriminant analysis.

4 - An analysis of selected demographic variables to post-MCRI scores via discriminant analysis.
5 - A comparison of pre- and post-MCRI responses made with a chi-square analysis vis-a-vis the concern of subjects having the necessary information for Need oriented conflict resolution.

Limitation of the Study

The limitations of this study were of four major types: the population, instruments and judges, type of study and the training program.

The Population

The population from which the sample for this study was drawn was that of the "college set," those who are or were attending some college. Each of the subjects was assumed to have above average intelligence, motivation toward learning and academic experience. The findings from this study are representative of the responses of a college population in part, because of the lack of random sample, and not of the general population.

In addition to the subjects coming from a college population, there was a factor of the motivation toward the training program based on prior knowledge, or lack of knowledge, of the content of the course. The FL 223 Tuesday evening section was composed of subjects who were told about the course at preregistration. The FL 223 Wednesday evening section was composed of one-half of the subjects having been told at preregistration; the other half were allowed to
register during the add period and they were not given the information. All subjects in the FL 222 day section were without prior knowledge of course content. The factor of motivation based on "self-selected" versus "imposed" training must be considered in the data findings.

Instruments and Judges

Two instruments were developed to assess the subjects. The data generated by these two instruments must be seen as nominally or ordinally scales, respectively, and suggestive rather than validated. Socioeconomic status on the DDQ also became ordinal in scale as it was modified to increase variation as a continuous score.

The judges were three in number. Five or seven or more judges may have increased the reliability of the summed scores for categorical placement on the dependent variable. The use of the three judges limited the reliability of the nominal data that was collected, and findings must be viewed from that perspective.

The Study

This study was exploratory rather than experimental. The nature of the exploration was suggestive for further study rather than conclusive about hypotheses.

In addition to the exploratory nature of the study, there was an imposed limit on the number of variables that could be assessed in
one analysis. This leaves other personality variables that could be viewed in relationship to the dependent variable.

The Training Program

One of the limitations of the training program (the intervening variable) was also one of the limitations of the instrument—the use of third party conflict situations. All training was geared to couples' conflict situations. The relevance of this type of training for the single or steadily dating subject may be questionable. In addition, the amount of motivation the subject had toward the training program may have effected the utilization as measured by the MCRI.

A second limitation to the training program was the nature of interaction with the variation of subjects between sections and the time variations between the FL 223 and FL 222 sections. Though the same (or similar) outlines and assignments were given, there was some adaptation to the specific groups. Because of feedback in one section, a few changes were made for the other two sections for particular content areas.

A third, and very important, limitation to the training program was its use with more subjects in a given section than it was designed for. This type of training program was geared for 4 to 6 couples or 8 to 12 individuals. There were twice too many subjects in the FL 223 sections and over three times too many in the FL 222 section.
The findings of the study must be viewed in terms of the extra, multiple number subjects per training section.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter has been to describe the subjects, measuring instruments, statistical analysis and the limitations of the study.

The subjects were students enrolled in the Marriage Preparation and Family Living courses, winter term, 1974, at Oregon State University.

The MCRI was developed to assess the subjects on the dependent variable. Validity and reliability had not been established. Reliability was based on the comparison of three judges' first and second ratings of 60 situations. An additional reliability check was based on three special judges' ratings of 30 subjects' responses (90 situations) compared to the first ratings of the regular judges. Both sets of judges were given a within-situation reliability check among themselves. Both sets of judges had been, or were presently, FL 406 Projects students who had worked, or were working, with the researcher. The dependent variable assessment was the occurrence or nonoccurrence of an operation for processing third party conflicts. Three categories were given as responses: Need (after Glasser, 1967), Issue and No-Solution.
The RCR was developed to assess the independent variable classification of personal attributes in four areas: Value to Others, Value to Self, Activation and Use. The instrument had face validity but had not had adequate reliability established. The data from these measures were treated as continuous, except for the "Use" which is discrete in terms of Yes or No.

The EPPS and the T-JTA which assess the independent variables of general personality need traits and socially oriented personality traits, respectively, were described. These data were treated as continuous scores.

The DDQ was constructed to assess the independent variables of age, sex, marital status, relationship interaction, academic achievement, socioeconomic status, and section of training. Relationship interaction, academic achievement and socioeconomic status were treated as continuous scores with the other items being discrete categories.

The statistical analysis used to see relationship between the independent variables (relevance of conflict resolution assessments, personality traits, and selected demographic characteristics) and the dependent variable (Need, Issue or No-Solution modi operandi as a behavioral selection) was a step-wise discriminant analysis. This procedure sorted through the variables to find the order of the discriminatory function of each variable. The comparison of responses
between pre- and post-MCRI (dependent variable) ratings was the use of chi-square analysis. In addition to those analyses, a correlation analysis of the RCR items and a comparison of level of difficulty between Forms A and B of the MCRI were made.

The limitations of this study were the nature of the population and instruments, and the number of judges and the type of study and training program used.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

A secondary purpose of the study was the concern of whether or not the subjects had the necessary information to allow for a Need orientation to conflict resolution without receiving the intervening variable (training via the Conflict Resolution Model). A pre- and post-MCRI comparison was made using a chi-square analysis, see Table 2. Three judges' separate ratings of all 522 responses resulted in 87 subjects being classified as Issue oriented on the pre-MCRI and 56 subjects being classified as Issue oriented and 31 subjects being classified as Need oriented on the post-MCRI.

This very definitely points out the importance for having the training. None of the 87 subjects at the time of pre-test had the necessary information to make a Need oriented selection for conflict resolution.

Table 2. Chi-Square Analysis of Pre- and Post-MCRI Ratings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Issue Subjects</th>
<th>Need Subjects</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-MCRI</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-MCRI</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = 35.33^*\]

*p < .005
As can be seen from Table 2, there was a significant change between pre- and post-MCRI assessments of the subjects. All subjects were rated as Issue oriented on the pre-MCRI. Thirty-one subjects shifted to a Need orientation rating on the post-MCRI. The discriminant analysis for associations between the independent variables and dependent variable classifications of Issue, Need, and No-Solution was made on the basis of post-MCRI ratings. This resulted in two categorical placements on the dependent variable: Issue and Need orientation. Therefore, the 40 independent variables were used in association with 56 Issue and 31 Need rated subjects on the dependent variable via the discriminant analysis.

Data Analysis

The statistical procedure of step-wise discriminant analysis was used to determine the associations between the dependent and independent variables. Two runs of the analysis were made. In the first run the variable of age was arbitrarily defined into two discrete categories. This was on the assumption that there was not a sufficient range of scores for use as a continuous variable. The variable of marital status was not converted into the six discrete categories it represented and therefore it was mis-used in the analysis as a continuous variable. The second discriminant analysis was made to correct the marital status variable and have it analyzed in six discrete
categories. Also in the second run, activation was called into first position so that it could be seen as a separate variable in analysis. The second run consisted of independent variables which, from the first analysis, seemed to have some indication of discriminating between dependent variable classifications with the following changes:

1 - Age was eliminated because it was not significant, see Table 3, and it represented confounded information on each subject because of the arbitrary division on this variable;

2 - Marital status was divided into six discrete categories;

3 - Activation was called in as the first variable in analysis; and

4 - All variables from the RCR, including non-promising ones, were included.

The position of each variable in the second run was in its relative place compared to the first run—except for activation which had been manipulated. Table 3 gives the rank order of independent variables and their F-values in the first run; Table 4 gives the rank order of the independent variables and their F-value in the second run. The F-value gives the significance of difference between the Means of the Issue Group and the Need Group.

As can be seen from Table 3, there were two variables that were significant in discriminating between group means. Also the order of entrance into the discriminant analysis is not based on the power of F-value for each variable, but they entered in the order of helping to discriminate between groups.
Table 3. Rank Order of Independent Variables in Step-Wise Discriminant Analysis with F-Value of Differences Between Issue and Need Groups' Means, First Run.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Heterosexuality</td>
<td>5.2638*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Activation</td>
<td>4.7187*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hostile-Tolerant</td>
<td>2.2345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dominance</td>
<td>.2876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Nervous-Composed</td>
<td>2.0537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Age</td>
<td>2.6509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Autonomy</td>
<td>3.1577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Change</td>
<td>.6831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Marital Status</td>
<td>.4692+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Relationship Interaction</td>
<td>2.6050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Subjective-Objective</td>
<td>.0113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Value to Self</td>
<td>.0793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Exhibition</td>
<td>.2937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Sympathetic-Indifferent</td>
<td>1.8607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Expressive Responsive-Inhibited</td>
<td>.1796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Impulsive-Self Disciplined</td>
<td>.2481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Dominance-Submissive</td>
<td>.1156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Deference</td>
<td>.0165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Succorance</td>
<td>.5781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Endurance</td>
<td>.1562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Nuturance</td>
<td>1.5657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Use</td>
<td>.0226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Affiliation</td>
<td>.8170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Academic Achievement</td>
<td>1.8038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>.7216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Achievement</td>
<td>.2583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Sex</td>
<td>1.2310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Abasement</td>
<td>.6381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Aggression</td>
<td>.0747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Training Section</td>
<td>.1219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Order</td>
<td>.1255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Intraception</td>
<td>.0114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Depressive-Lighthearted</td>
<td>.0004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Active-Social</td>
<td>.9364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Value to Others</td>
<td>.8820</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 level of confidence.
+Marital status was run as a continuous variable rather than as six discrete categories, which accounts for five more variables to total 40.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Activation</td>
<td>4.7817*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Heterosexuality</td>
<td>5.2638*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hostile-Tolerant</td>
<td>2.2345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dominance</td>
<td>.2876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Married</td>
<td>1.5274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Nervous-Composed</td>
<td>2.0537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Autonomy</td>
<td>3.1577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Change</td>
<td>.6831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Single</td>
<td>2.7922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Relationship Interaction</td>
<td>2.6050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Value of Self</td>
<td>.0793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Engaged</td>
<td>.5207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Value to Others</td>
<td>.7720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Steady Dating</td>
<td>2.0276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Engaged with Partner Present</td>
<td>.8857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Pinned</td>
<td>.2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Use</td>
<td>.0226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 level of confidence.

The F-value for each variable in the second run was the same as it was in the first run. The relative position of entrance was very similar. When marital status was divided into six categories and age was removed, the analysis was made with these variations which affected the order slightly near the end, i.e., shift in position of value to others and use.

Discriminant Analysis

"Discriminant analysis is a procedure for estimating the
position of an individual on a line that best separates classes or
groups (Cooley and Lohnes, 1962, p. 116). "Its purpose is to divide
(differentiate) groups based on the variables which are given. The
assumption was made that orientations to conflict resolution (the de-
pendent variables) were correctly classified. In this study the inde-
pendent variables were assessed as to their relationship to the depen-
dent variables. The use of discriminant analysis is to give a basis
for further study with significant independent variables, for example
in multiple regression (Frank et al., 1972).

In the step-wise discriminant analysis, the first variable (in-de-
pendent) to enter the discriminant function is the variable on which
groups have their greatest separation for a single variable. The
second variable to enter the discriminant function is one, when com-
bined with the first variable, which maximizes discrimination between
groups. The two independent variable scores are transformed into a
single, combined discriminant function score. This single discrimi-
nant function score is used in cross-classification with the dependent
variable classifications. Each additional independent variable score
is transformed, along with the preceding ones, into a single discrimi-
nant function score. The criterion on which discriminant analysis
function is based on the order of variable power in conjunction with
the previous variables to enter the discriminant function to discrimi-
nate between classes or groups.
The discriminant function score that best separates the groups is used in conjunction with the dependent variable classification to produce a classification matrix. Each matrix is a square matrix with as many rows and columns as there are dependent variable classifications. This is a forced classification scheme. If other categories (groups or classes) were available, a particular discriminant score may fit within a different group matrix; however, even then it must be forced into the total matrix.

The question as to how many independent variables should be used for cross-classification purposes was answered by Cooley and Lohnes (1962) to the effect that, the number of variables which will account for 80 to 90% of discrimination will contain most of the necessary information for discriminant purposes.

The next major concern about discriminant analysis was subject classification. The use of 10 variables accounted for the classification of 82% of the subjects. Table 5 shows the order of variable entrance into the discriminant function and the classification of subjects. Activation and heterosexuality were the two most powerful discriminators, see Table 5.

The use of hostile-tolerant scores in the discriminant function added to the separation of groups; however, this discrimination was based on information about subjects, from the variable of hostile-tolerant, that was very questionable, less than .10 level of confidence
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Subjects' Dependent Variable Classification Issue</th>
<th>Subjects' Dependent Variable Classification Need</th>
<th>Subjects' Discriminant Score Classification Issue</th>
<th>Subjects' Discriminant Score Classification Need</th>
<th>% Correct in Cross-Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Heterosexuality</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>(23)+</td>
<td>61++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(first run)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Activation</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(second run)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Activation, Heterosexuality</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hostile-Tolerant</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Activation, Heterosexuality</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hostile-Tolerant, Dominance</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Activation, Heterosexuality</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hostile-Tolerant, Dominance</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Activation, Heterosexuality</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hostile-Tolerant, Dominance, Married</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>Nervous-Composed, Autonomy, Change, Single and Relationship Interaction, respectively, were added to the first five variables for the next subject classification on independent variables.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

++Brackets, (), enclose subjects misclassified on dependent and independent variable classification.

++The number of correct classifications gives no indication of the amount of variance accounted for between groups.
that group means were different. The same for dominance: It added to separation of groups but the values used for discrimination were much less than at .10 level of confidence for different groups.

In looking at the selected variables it is important to see the Mean and Standard Deviation for each group. Table 6 shows the Means and S.D. for Issue and Need Groups and the Grand Mean. As can be seen from Table 6 only activation and heterosexuality discriminate significantly between the means of the Need and Issue oriented subjects. The question of classification of subjects on the dependent variable was still unanswered. The 82% of correctly classified subjects on dependent variable and discriminant score, see Table 5, was not an indication of the value of the independent variables. There were only two variables that can be seen as having valid data for the discriminant function: Heterosexuality and activation. The discriminant function is not concerned with the validity or reliability of the data from the variables. It is only concerned with the use of the data for separating groups in the discriminant function.

Of greater importance than the number of subjects correctly classified is the number of correctly classified on data that is significant. The two variables of heterosexuality and activation can be seen separately, per the two runs of the analysis, and combined. Even data from these two variables had to be seen as a trend (suggestive) rather than conclusive (Frank et al., 1972). Data that is of high
Table 6. Independent Variable Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Need and Issue Groups, Grand Mean and t-Test of Difference Between Group Means.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Need Group</th>
<th></th>
<th>Issue Group</th>
<th></th>
<th>Grand Mean</th>
<th>t-Test of Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S. D.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S. D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexuality</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>60.93</td>
<td>2.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activation</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>15.01</td>
<td>2.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile-Tolerant</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>58.11</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>35.29</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>.12+</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervous-Composed</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>62.95</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>58.57</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>57.18</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>.12+</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Interaction</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>47.37</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level of confidence.
† Married and single scores were discrete and entered as 1 or 0.
discriminatory value has F-values of differences between groups in the high 20's and 30's (Niess, personal communication 1974; and Pierce, personal communication 1974). The F-values of the two significant variables of this study were only 5.2 and 4.7, see Tables 3 and 4.

The variable heterosexuality was the most powerful discriminator between Need and Issue groups as a single variable. In conjunction with the dependent variable it classified, 33 of 56 Issue and 20 of 31 Need subjects correctly, see Table 5. There were 23 of 56 Issue and 11 of 31 Need subjects misclassified on this variable. By adding the columns it was seen that heterosexuality classified 44 subjects as Issue and 43 as Need. That meant that it had relatively little value in discriminating between Issue and Need subjects.

Subjects who were classified as Need on the dependent variable had higher scores on heterosexuality, see Table 6, than subjects classified as Issue on the dependent variable. That meant that Need oriented subjects had, per assessment, greater need for heterosexuality than Issue subjects with heterosexuality defined as:

To go out with members of the opposite sex, to engage in social activities with the opposite sex, to be in love with someone of the opposite sex, to be regarded as physically attractive by those of the opposite sex, to participate in discussions about sex, to listen to or to tell jokes involving sex, to become sexually excited (Edwards 1959, p. 11).
Activation was second to enter in the first run, see Table 3, but it was called in in first place on the second run. As a single variable it classified 32 of 56 Issue and 20 of 31 Need subjects correctly. It represented a misclassification of (24) of 56 Issue and (11) of 31 Need subjects. By adding the columns of activation it was seen that it classified 43 Issue and 44 Need subjects, see Table 5. That meant that it had relatively little value in discriminating between Issue and Need subjects.

Subjects who were classified as Need on the dependent variable had a higher score, see Table 6, than Issue classified subjects. That meant that Need oriented subjects responded with greater intention to use the Need approach to conflict resolution in their lives than Issue subjects did.

Heterosexuality and activation scores for each subject were transformed into a single discriminant function score for classification. In the combined way, they accounted for 34 of 56 Issue and 21 of 31 Need subjects being correctly classified. Misclassification on these combined variables was (22) of 56 Issue and (10) of 31 Need subjects not being properly classified. By adding the columns of the combined variables, heterosexuality and activation classified 44 Issue and 43 Need subjects, which resulted in relatively little value in discriminating between Issue and Need subjects.
Misclassification

Misclassification in discriminant analysis means that subjects are classified on the dependent and independent variables differently than expected. Using the dependent variable classification as the given, the misclassification represents scores on the independent variable more like another grouping than its own—in this study more like the opposite group.

Individual subjects' scores may be lost in respect to the significance of difference between group means. Data for the two independent variables—who's group means are significantly different—of heterosexuality and activation helped show misclassification for individual subjects, see Table 7. The dividing point on heterosexuality in the discriminant function was 60 and above for Need and 59 and below for Issue subjects; for activation the division was 16 and above for Need and 15 and below for Issue subjects.

As can be seen from Table 7, there were 24 Issue subjects who scored 60 and above on heterosexuality and another 24 who scored 16 and above on activation; there were 11 Need subjects who scored 59 and below on heterosexuality and another 11 subjects who scored 15 and below on activation. Because the subjects, whether Issue or Need, were not clearly differentiated by the independent variables of heterosexuality and activation there was relatively little value in using them as discriminators.
Table 7. Individual Scores on Heterosexuality and Activation for Need and Issue Subjects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heterosexuality Score</th>
<th>Need Subjects</th>
<th>Issue Subjects</th>
<th>Activation Score</th>
<th>Need Subjects</th>
<th>Issue Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90-99</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18, 17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 Need</td>
<td>24 Need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16, 20 Need</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24 Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15, 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13, 12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 Issue</td>
<td>32 Issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11, 9, 8, 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 Issue, 30 Issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were 11 who had been classified as Need oriented on the conflict resolution who were misclassified on the independent variable of activation. These 11 subjects were more like those of the issue oriented subjects. There were at least four possible explanations for the lack of these people to score higher on activation. First, there were those subjects who may have seen the training program as having little value for them. Second, there were those subjects who liked the ideas but who did not see application of them in their environmental milieu (social interactions)—but they could use the ideas on third party situations that did not involve their interaction with others. Third, there were those who may have responded to the Need approach as the thing they ought to do for dependent classification—but they would choose another approach to conflict resolution in their personal lives. Fourth, the lack of sensitivity of the measuring instrument as currently used (see explanation for future research).

There were 24 subjects who had been classified as Issue oriented on the dependent variable who were misclassified on activation. There were at least three possible explanations for these scores. First, there were those who may have seen the use for this information in their personal lives but find it difficult to identify with third party conflict situations. Second, there were those who may have wanted to be supportive of the program idea but did not have personal involvement with the ideas. Third, the lack of sensitivity of the instrument.
There was one case in point for the first explanation. Subject #33 described in my office how she and her fiance used the Need approach to work through some misunderstandings which developed during their four-month separation, yet she responded for unanimous Issue orientation on all three third party conflict situations. Her activation score was 17.

There were 11 subjects, rated as Need oriented, who were misclassified on the independent variable of heterosexuality. There were 23 subjects, rated as Issue oriented, who were misclassified on the independent variable of heterosexuality. A possible explanation for the misclassification may have come from the subject's desire for interaction with the opposite sex as defined by the measurement of heterosexuality. Some Issue subjects had high need for that interaction while some Need subjects had low need for that interaction. In either case the differences between Need and Issue oriented subjects on this variable are not clear enough to warrant much importance as a significant independent variable.

Non-Significant Variables

The remaining eight variables considered in analysis did not have significant differences between group means, but they did discriminate between Issue and Need oriented subjects. Subject classification was given for each of three variables: hostile-tolerant,
dominance and married as single additions to the discriminant score, see Table 5. Nervous-composed, autonomy, change, single and relationship interaction were added one at a time but a classification of subjects was given only after all five had been added to the previous five. Ten variable scores were transformed into a single discriminant score for subject classification. The value of their contribution in this analysis could not exceed their value as separate data items (after Black and Broderick, 1972).

One advantage of looking at the interaction with the use of non-significant data was to allow for a comparison of the interaction of the F-values for the discriminant function of the two significant variables: Heterosexuality and activation. Table 8 shows the F-value of each of these variables in the interaction.

Table 8. F-Value of Heterosexuality and Activation in Discriminant Function with Eight Non-Significant Variables, Per Second Run.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Heterosexuality</th>
<th>Activation</th>
<th>Accumulative Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (first run)</td>
<td>5.2638</td>
<td>4.7187</td>
<td>Heterosexuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (second run)</td>
<td>7.6763</td>
<td>7.1227</td>
<td>Activation (Both)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.5982</td>
<td>7.9210</td>
<td>Hostile-Tolerant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.6630</td>
<td>10.3291</td>
<td>Dominance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8180</td>
<td>11.2830</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.6442</td>
<td>11.4561</td>
<td>Nervous-Composed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.8203</td>
<td>10.8628</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.2721</td>
<td>12.3395</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.3226</td>
<td>9.1279</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.0344</td>
<td>8.9355</td>
<td>Relationship Interaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The F-value of each variable shifted as it was aligned and realigned with additional variable scores for estimating a line on which groups were separated. As can be seen from Table 8, activation was the more important variable around which the other variables shifted to help discriminate. Its F-value was highest at 12.3395 and it had a higher F-value for seven of the interaction functions. This meant that it was the most significant variable in interaction with the others.

In summary of the data it can be seen that two independent variables were significant for subject classification on the dependent variable at the .05 level of confidence for difference between group means. All other independent variables did not have significant difference between the means for the Issue and Need groups. They did enter the discriminant function to interact for separation of the groups. Thirty-four of 56 Issue and 21 of 31 Need subjects were correctly classified, but the (22) of 56 Issue and (10) of 31 Need subjects who were misclassified resulted in the two significant variables having relatively little value as discriminators. Activation was seen as having a higher F-value in interaction within the discriminant function than heterosexuality, suggesting it was the single most important independent variable—though in need of refinement—used in this study.
CHAPTER 5

DATA ANALYSIS VIA GENERAL SYSTEMS THEORY

The model for analysis purposes was selected from the Black and Broderick (1972) paradigm. Black and Broderick state: "It appears to us that those people whose questions demand that they look at adaptive-learning processes must turn to cybernetic-morphogenetic representations of the real systems they are interested in (1972, p. 36)."

Morphogenic models have a built-in capacity to systematically change the sequence of system events. The term morphogenesis comes from morpho, meaning form, and genesis, meaning origin or beginning. The derivation of the term emphasizes an important point: morphogenesis refers not to the way that individual elements in a model change their value, but rather to a built-in system capacity to change the "pattern" of relationship between the elements, resulting in an altered sequence of occurrence of system events (1972, p. 9). (Last italics added.)

The central concern of the cybernetic-morphogenetic model is the opportunity for change to take place based on information processed by the system (persons). Other models follow a mechanical or organismic approach wherein change is limited and/or occurs from transfer of energy rather than processing of information (Buckley, 1967). People adapt not only by making appropriate responses when they have information available, but also by seeking other information when it is not immediately available. People generate new informa-
tion. In an adaptive model, some kind of discovery mode is needed and a storage or memory bank to retain the information. People (social systems) fit the model of having a discovery mode and storage bank.

Hill (1971) is in agreement with Buckley (1967) and others (Haley, 1964; Brody, 1967; Sonne, 1967; Miller, 1969; Speer, 1970; and Black and Broderick, 1972) that people are goal oriented and need to be viewed as social systems that are complex and adaptive rather than equilibrium maintaining. He analyzed the family developmental framework vis-a-vis modern (general) systems theory and stated:

To recapitulate, the confrontation which we have undertaken has suggested a number of points where the use of the modern systems perspective would emancipate and liberate the family development framework from the shortcomings of the organismic and mechanical models from which the framework has drawn so many of its analogies. The socio-cultural systems of our society, of which the family is surely a prototype, may be assumed to be organized, internally and externally open, purposeful, self-regulating, and self-direction systems which are dependent on communication and information as the basis for organization and which are governed by the principle of maximizing viability. To become maximally viable, a system must possess effective morphogenic or positive feedback processes, and must have available to it a constant flow of varied and novel inputs, plus provision for information, storage and retrieval (1971, pp. 22-23).

General (Modern) Systems Theory was used to interpret the data of this exploratory study. Three major ideas must be understood about General Systems Theory to utilize it in analysis.

First, the modern (general) systems theory can operate in a
morphogenic-cybernetic mode. This means that the systems (subjects) use information available to it for its operations. If the system (subject) lacks information for processing a behavioral operation, it may seek to find the needed information. Other information received by the system (subject) may be stored and retrieved when seen as pertinent.

Second, the modern (general) systems theory is built on the idea of change through the processing of information and not on the exchange or transfer of energy at the human being level of system. The transfer of energy would be like measuring the amount of heat applied in an experiment or the amount of force the cue stick applied to the billiard ball. In processing information, a decision is based on what the information means to the person. Looking for causality via systems theory is impossible at the human level of behavioral interaction because a continual array of information is constantly being processed.

Third, the modern (general) systems theory is not concerned with the given substance (personality traits and characteristics of subjects in this study) per se, but with the organization of the substance. Systems (subjects) differ because of the organization of the substances (personality attributes), which may vary, into purposeful behaviors. New information to the system through the morphogenic-cybernetic processing may alter the organization of the substances to achieve and/or change goals. As a goal or purpose is changed via
processing of information, there would likely be little shift in personality traits—an increase or decrease of the trait. It is purposes which come out of processed information that General Systems is concerned with.

Other conceptual frameworks would interpret the results from this study from a different perspective than General Systems' information processing. For instance, the interactional framework (Stryker, 1964 and Schvaneveldt, 1966) would view change between the pre- and post-assessments of the MCRI on variations that come in: definitions of the situation, significant symbols, symbolic environment and adaptations. Between pre- and post-assessments there may have been a change in how the person defined the conflict situation. If interaction of a conflict nature had taken place with a significant person they may have developed a new set of significant symbols that would change their orientation to conflict. The change in definitions and symbols could result in an adaptation of the approach to conflict resolution.

The principle concern of the interactional approach is viewing the interaction of oneself with others. Its view of the significant variable of activation would be that a change in definition and/or finding different significant symbols would reinforce a change of behavior.

The role framework (Mangus, 1957; Dyer, 1962; and Burr, 1972) would view a change from pre- and post-assessments on the MCRI based on changes in role-expectations, role performance,
role-taking, role-making, role-conflict, sanctions and role-transition. The person who registered change may have entered into a role-conflict with another person and by trying out different ways of interaction (role-making) they may have reached new ways of meeting present circumstances (role transition). In the process there may have been clearer pictures of what was being expected and/or performed within given situations. Sanctions may have been applied to bring change in performance or expectations. Role theory's concern about the significant variable of heterosexuality might be whether the person's score on this variable gave the person incentive to resolve conflicts in a male and female situation but not in a male-male or female-female situation. Role expectations would be a concern of this variable. The primary focus of the role framework would be on role interactions of the individuals.

Preference for the General Systems perspective of viewing change on the MCRI was because General Systems' focus is with the information that is processed. This allows for subjects to make behavioral selections which help fulfill the person's goals and purposes. Reward (sanctions) may change behavior; but it is more likely that when alternative choices are made available to individuals they will choose in relation to their own set of goals without external reinforcement from others.

The following analysis of data must be considered as suggestive
rather than predictive. The purpose of the discriminant analysis was to explore associations between dependent and independent variables and not to look for causality.

**From Issue to Need--The Dependent Variable**

All 87 subjects were rated as using the **Issue** orientation on the pre-MCRI. Thirty-one subjects shifted to the **Need** orientation on the post-MCRI while 56 subjects remained **Issue** oriented. How can the change for 31 subjects be accounted for? What can be said of those 56 who did not change? The General Systems perspective, in the cybernetic-morphogenic mode of analysis, would look at the information available to the individuals for processing the particular third party conflict situations. The conclusion drawn for the pre-test assessment would be that none of the subjects had the necessary information to approach conflict resolution in a **Need** orientation, i.e., to look for the basic psychosocial needs of loving and being loved and feeling worthwhile to oneself and others as motivations behind conflicting interactions.

The conclusion drawn for 31 subjects on the post-MCRI would be that these subjects had information for processing which changed their organization of goals or purposes vis-a-vis conflict interaction; that is, they selected to resolve conflicts in a different manner than before. They had acquired the necessary information to select a
Need approach versus the Issue approach they had used. On the post-MCRI the 31 subjects selected to use the Need orientation, and they had information necessary for this selection. A behavioral selection (operation) can only be made when the prerequisite information to that selection (operation) is available (Black and Broderick, 1972).

It was concluded by this researcher, via the General Systems perspective, that all 87 subjects did not have the necessary information to make a Need oriented selection for resolution to third party conflict on the pre-MCRI. This was also supported by the pilot study, testing stability of the MCRI, wherein 35 subjects all used the Issue orientation for both pre- and post-assessment on a test-retest basis. They had received no training in the Need approach and therein could not make that behavioral selection (operation).

Data from this study did not answer the questions of why or how each of the 31 subjects changed and 56 subjects did not change. There was not a pre- and post-test measurement of personality traits. The variable that came the closest to looking at the subject's organization did not assess the specific situation and response for any of the subjects. Lack of specific information makes interpretation assumptive.

Some possible dynamics from a General Systems perspective involved to aid or hinder change are as follows. Each person's behavior has developed to meet, within toleration limits, the constrained variety (socialization) of conditional probabilities within his
environment. Individual perceptions of what behaviors will meet goals and purposes are divergent. New information processed by the individual is compared to the existing framework of reality. Information that extends the given framework and is relatively congruent can be assimilated rather rapidly; information that is too divergent from the internalized previous socialization may be rejected as irrelevant. Information about the Need approach is assumed to have had relevance and congruence for the 31 Need subjects. The meaning of the information about the Need approach for the 56 Issue subjects may not have been relevant and congruent. The lack of relevance and congruence may be in the social role situations these 56 subjects find themselves—the new information is not very pragmatic.

In addition, there was no assessment of the intensity of positive or negative feedback loops of subjects vis-a-vis conflict. Issue subjects may have had highly intense negative feedback loops—information which reinforces them to remain Issue oriented; Need subjects may have had low intensity of negative and some intensity of positive loops—thus allowing for change. The Issue approach by the 56 subjects on most of the situations may also represent a preference of some approach other than the Need approach. Other, more situation specific, information is needed to help understand individual organization vis-a-vis conflict situations—which is the intent of suggestions for future research.
Questions arose with regards to the training program—the intervening variable—giving a bias to the post-test results. Did the 31 subjects choose this Need approach to please the researcher? Can it be said that the post-assessment was nothing more than a measure that subjects can memorize?

The first question was one of motivation. Did they need to feel loved or loving and/or worthwhile to themselves or the researcher and therein choose to use the Need approach? Why were the other 56 subjects not motivated in the same way? The question of motivation lies behind all behavioral selections. These 31 subjects could now use the Need orientation—they acquired the prerequisite information—to process third party conflicts with sufficient clarity for three regular and three special judges to rate them as Need oriented on the post-assessment versus the pre-assessment of Issue oriented selection. Having the necessary information does not mean that they will select a Need oriented approach to every conflict they encounter. They will process the nature of the conflict and a mode for giving resolution and then make a selection for the resolution that meets with their goals and purposes at that time. The important point was: They could now make a Need oriented selection for conflict resolution whereas before they could not.

The second question about memorization was of little concern. The whole approach of the cybernetic-morphogenetic scheme is one of
processing information. If subjects (people) do not have the necessary information to make a selection they want, then they can go search for the information (Buckley, 1967 and Black and Broderick, 1972). If subjects (people) could not memorize there would be no morphogenic state-of-being.

The two concerns, motivation and memorization, carried a little more concern wherein the discriminant analysis was tied into the post-MCRI assessments. All 87 subjects could memorize the procedure of the Need approach to conflict resolution. This was seen by giving a quiz wherein all but one, who were present for the quiz, satisfactorily listed and explained the purpose of the procedures of the Need approach, see Appendix A. To memorize and to conceptualize are two different forms of processing information. Memorization is where the information is stored for retrieval on selected occasions, i.e., tests. Conceptualization is where the information is seen in relation to other information already stored. Conceptualization would be part of the reorganization of goals and purposes; memorization would do no more than fill a cell or two in the storage bank.

Behavioral selections (operations) are taken from conceptualized information, not memorized information. The selection of recalling memorized information comes, not from the memorized data per se, but from conceptualized information suggesting that memorized data will fill the requirement.
One further point, not all 31 subjects used the Need oriented approach on all three third party conflict situations—-even some subjects classified as Issue oriented used the Need approach on one situation. If the use of the Need orientation was to please or was a matter of memorization, why did they not choose to use the approach on all three situations? There was some selection besides pleasing and memorizing going on. Of those subjects who selected to use the Need approach on one or two situations, but not all three, there were 10 who selected to use it on the least difficult situation, 17 who selected to use it on the middle ranked situation and 14 who selected to use it on the most difficult situation, see Table 9. The nature of the conflict situation must be seen as a factor in the subjects' selection of an Issue or Need approach to its resolution.

As can be seen from Table 9, 15 subjects responded to two of the three situations with the Need orientation. They were classified as Need oriented on the dependent variable. Ten subjects responded with a Need orientation to one of the three situations; they were classified as Issue.

**Significant Independent Variables**

There were two independent variables that were significant which were associated with the dependent variable classification of Issue and Need orientation to conflict resolution. They were: Heterosexuality and activation. Eight other variables were added to
Table 9. Comparison of Need Responses to Conflict Situations of Different Levels of Difficulty Wherein Subjects Only Responded in the Need Orientation to One or Two Situations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Code Number</th>
<th>Level of Difficulty of Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to these to account for 82% of the subjects being correctly classified, however, this basis of classification was on data that did not have significant difference between the means for the groups.

Heterosexuality had the greatest power, as a single variable, to differentiate between subject classification of Need and Issue. It was defined as one's general concern about activities involving the opposite sex. A subject's score on heterosexuality offered little information, from the General Systems perspective, as to how the subject's goals or purposes had been organized in terms of using an Issue or Need orientation to conflict resolution. Was it that the Need subjects scored higher on this scale because they wanted, more than Issue subjects, to be accepted by members of the opposite sex? Would conflicts that involved two males or two females be of equal concern to Need subjects compared to conflicts between a male and female? Can it be assumed that each subject tried to identify with the same sexed third party person? Perhaps of equal or greater importance is the question, if a person shifted to a higher or lower score on the heterosexuality scale would it alter his approach to conflict resolution? Some Issue rated subjects had high scores while some Need subjects had low scores on this variable. For example, subject #1 was rated Issue oriented by all three judges but had a score of 99 on heterosexuality while scores above 60 were classified as Need on this variable; subject #62 was rated Need orientated, unanimously, but had
a score of 06 on this variable while scores below 60 were classified as Issue oriented on this variable.

Heterosexuality had differentiated between subject classifications best, as a single variable, but it did not offer information directly concerned with the subject's purposes or goals vis-a-vis conflict; therein it was not as economical a procedure as would be desirable (Selltiz, Jahoda, Deutch and Cook, 1959; Frank et al., 1972; and Plummer, 1974). Discriminant analysis is a forced fit of data. Had there been other categories into which the data from this variable may have fit, it may have had greater or lesser significance in discriminating.

Activation was the second most powerful discriminator between subject classifications. It accounted for only one less Issue subject than the variable of heterosexuality. Activation was defined as the subject's motivation toward the use of Need orientation for conflict resolution vis-a-vis his personal conflicts. Need subjects scored higher on this scale than Issue subjects. From the General Systems perspective, a subject's score on this variable was directly related to his purpose of solving conflicts in his own life. That meant the subject sees benefit or value in the Need orientation to help bring resolution to his conflict situation.

Activation was the variable that attained the highest F-value in the discriminant function. This meant that it was more important in
the interaction to discriminate between subject classifications. With one less Issue subject being identified as the only drawback compared to heterosexuality, activation was the most important variable used in this study because of its higher F-value in interaction and the most important reason was its information regarding the subject's use of the Need approach. A change up or down on this variable score would be a direct change on how the subject was responding to the Need orientation for conflicts in his life; however, this variable has great need of refinement.

The Need subjects appeared to be more interested in looking at underlying basic psychosocial needs of the issue versus the issue per se. This direct information about the subject's purposes would make it a more economical variable to follow after further refinement.

The non-significant variables: hostile-tolerant, dominance, married, nervous-composed, autonomy, change, single, and relationship interaction, were viewed quite similarly to heterosexuality as a variable from the General Systems perspective. They did not give direct information as to how the subject responded to the Issue or Need orientation to conflict resolution. Three of the variables may have had indirect concern. Married subjects tended toward a Need orientation, single subjects tended toward an Issue orientation and subjects classified as Need oriented tended to have higher relationship interaction scores suggesting more interaction in number or deeper in kind than
subjects classified Issue oriented. Does a change in relationship intensity--from being single to married--give greater reason for finding alternative ways for conflict resolution? Does it give greater reason to look at underlying motivation, when this type of approach is available, to conflict rather than issue resolution? For the other variables, they were uneconomical in the same sense as heterosexuality. Would a shift on anyone of them have had an influence on the approach to conflict? Would a change in the approach to conflict resolution have had any influence on a change in scores on these variables? Had any of these scores been significant for differentiating between groups they would have still offered little or no information about how the subject saw the Issue or Need orientation to conflict resolution.

Summary of Interpretation

The General Systems perspective is not as concerned about the nature of the substances (scores on personality traits) as it is with the organization of the subject's purposes and goals. The system (subject) or individual makes behavioral selections (operations) based on their view of what that particular behavior will do to reach the goal they have set up. A behavioral selection must be preceded with the prerequisite information for selection. Human systems (people) seek information for operations that allow them to move towards goal achievement. They also process other information they are exposed to and determine
whether or not is useful and should be stored for future processing or if it should be ignored. This processing of information is at the heart of the cybernetic-morphogenic model of reality. Through the processing of information, goals and purposes are set, achieved and/or modified in an ever ongoing process. The structure of the information is changed as goals are set, achieved or modified.

When a change took place in the 31 subjects who were classified as Need oriented on the dependent variable on post-MCRI ratings, what did change? From the bias that personality traits are rather stable over time, it can not be said that a change on personality traits caused or were even associated with the subjects classification change from Issue to Need. Rather, the important factor of change was that new information had been conceptualized—at least to a fair degree—wherein the organization for approaching conflict situations had been shifted in the direction of the Need orientation. Current data did not tell how or why the change or lack of change for the subjects.

To have not found measurement scores of particular personality variables that would clearly discriminate between Issue and Need subjects was of little concern to the General Systems perspective. Its concern was not to find elements for prediction, per se; its concern was to find information as to how the system was organized in terms of goals and purposes. There may have been some pragmatic direction for particular behaviors when the system was understood.
Heterosexuality had a little value in separating the two groups of Issue and Need; it had no information of value as to how they were separated. It was an uneconomical procedure. Activation had a little value in separating the two groups of Issue and Need; it gave a little more information as to how they were separated. It may be a more economical procedure, but it is in need of refinement.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter will be divided into four sections: purpose of study, application of results, future research and conclusions.

Purpose of Study

The purposes of this study were to explore how individuals approached conflict situations and to explore the associations between independent variables (personal attributes and characteristics) and the dependent variable classification of Need or Issue orientation to conflict resolution. Eighty-seven subjects participated in the study and 40 independent variables were used in a step-wise discriminant analysis program to determine their significant and non-significant associations and their power of discrimination.

All subjects responded in a manner to be rated as Issue oriented on the pre-MCRI. Thirty-one subjects shifted to be rated as Need oriented on the post-MCRI. Subjects were classified on post-MCRI ratings. Two independent variables were found to be significant at .05 level of confidence in distinguishing between Issue group and Need group means.

Heterosexuality was the most powerful single variable for discrimination and it accounted for 33 of 56 Issue oriented and 20 of 31
Need oriented subjects being classified correctly. It resulted in misclassification of 23 of 56 Issue and 11 of 31 Need subjects which gave it relatively little value as a discriminator. Activation was the second most powerful discriminator as a single variable. It accounted for 32 of 56 Issue oriented and 20 of 31 Need oriented subjects being correctly classified; but its misclassification represented 24 of 56 Issue and 11 of 31 Need subjects which gave it relatively little value as a discriminator.

When heterosexuality and activation were combined, they also had relatively little value as discriminators of Issue and Need subjects. There were 22 of 56 Issue and 10 of 31 Need subjects misclassified with the combined significant variables. Eight additional non-significant variables were also used in the discriminant function, where variables scores were transformed into a single discriminant score, to account for 82% of the subjects being correctly classified; however, this classification was based on a forced choice of being either Issue or Need oriented and may be of little value.

**Application of Results**

To facilitate the suggestion for application of results, this section will look at the limitations of the study which were the nature of: the population, instruments and judges, type of study and the training program.
The Population

This study dealt with a college population sample. Two significant variables were of little value in discriminating between Issue and Need classified subjects. The variable of activation tended toward an assessment of how the subject responded to conflict situations in his own life with regards to the Need orientation for the resolution. This variable may have some value in helping to understand how subjects from other samples and populations would respond to the Need approach to conflict resolution in their lives. Modification of this variable is suggested before further use.

Each population, based on the environment and the primary grouping of family, kinship or neighborhood networks, must be looked at separately. There may be some carry over of results from one population to another, but each population must be seen on its own interactions. For example, Bott's (1971) work with lower class groups suggested at least two separate populations within the lower class group based on close-knit and loose-knit kinship networks. A high, medium or low score on a particular personality scale would be of less importance for a subject's interactions than the social pressure (information) from a close-knit network which placed more restraint on whom a person talked to about a problem or concern compared to the loose-knit network which had less restraint on interactions.

Before any generalization about the usefulness of activation as
an independent variable can be made, it needs to be used in another study wherein another sample is used and the independent variables are analyzed in a multiple regression analysis (Frank et al., 1972).

Instruments and Judges

Activation was a scale created to assess an aspect of the relevance of conflict resolution. It was the most economical independent variable, but it needs refinement. That is, it appeared to give information on how the subjects were responding to the Need orientation to conflict resolution and it had the highest F-value in discriminant interaction. This particular scale should prove useful after modification.

The use of the MCRI in future settings is warranted from the reliability established in its use during this exploratory study and from a preceding stability study. Three judges doing the rating seems to be adequate for use of the MCRI. The reliability between the regular and special judges, between first and second ratings and within situations for both regular and special judges, suggests that even two judges who understand the basis of judgment might be adequate for subject classification. The MCRI can be used in a clinical setting as well as a research setting to determine if patients or subjects have the necessary information for a Need oriented approach to conflict resolution.
Type of Study

This study was exploratory as has been stressed many times. The findings do, however, have a direct bearing on future studies. There were no variables found that had sufficient value as discriminators to be useful in predicting a subject's orientation to conflict resolution. It may be that the current definitions and measurements of the independent variables under study were inadequate to discriminate between Issue and Need oriented subjects. It may be that the type of information contained in the independent variables is not correlated to a change in conflict resolution orientation--a pre- and post-assessment of personality traits would help answer that question. It may be that social roles, or other kinds of interaction analyses, would offer more information for discriminating between Issue and Need orientations and changes therein.

It was concluded that the lack of information may be far more important in understanding behavioral selections (operations), i.e., Need oriented conflict resolution to third party conflict situations, than variable score differences.

Some subjects did not select the Need orientation to conflict resolution--even with the possible bias of training. It would be important to understand how these subject's purposes and goals are set up for their particular selection. From a general systems perspective, looking for substantive differences between subjects which is
concerned with the prediction of behaviors is a use of unprofitable
time. Cause and effect are phenomena of systems of a lower order
than human systems and sociocultural systems. Causality is based
on the idea of transfer of energy rather than processing of information
to make decisions at the human level. Therefore, future research
which is concerned with behavioral selections (operations) might look
for relationships between information processed and the subjects' 
purposes and goals within the environmental context.

The Training Program

The training program (intervening variable) in this study was
not assessed and was taken as a "given." There were, however,
definite limitations in the training program. How much these limita-
tions interacted in the overall efficiency of training in the Need orien-
tation is not known. With more efficient training, more of the sub-
jects in this study might have developed facility and/or interest in
using the Need orientation for conflict resolution as assessed by the
MCRI. Training was essential as an intervening variable for this
study in that no subjects had sufficient facility and/or interest in us-
ing this approach on the pre-MCRI assessment. This suggests the
importance of using intervening variables to assure an understanding
of a process to be selected when looking at behavioral responses.

The significance of the independent variables may have shifted
considerably had the subjects had a complete understanding, in a conceptualized way rather than a memorized way, of the Need approach.

Future Research

This study has given rise to several areas for future research. Four areas will be reviewed at this time: populations, instruments, training programs and conflict resolution approaches. These are not in order of importance and/or ease of assessment.

The Population

Wherein the selection of a particular behavior is based on all the information a subject processes, it is essential to look at different populations which furnish information concerning behavior which exists primarily within the given population, e.g., social roles and interaction networks. The prerequisite information is needed for an operation, but this information is also processed within the environmental milieu. The two following suggestions for future research have the population perspective as their focus:

(a) The use of the CRM approach to training individuals or couples or living units, following an assessment of the specific training program, should be tried in a multitude of populations. The number and variety of populations is limited to one's imagination and
ability to involve those populations in the approach. (This would allow for some direct and indirect assessment of Glasser's (1967) basic needs which are to apply to every person.)

(b) Another study that would help establish validity for the CRM as assessed by the MCRI would be follow-up studies on the subjects of the current study. Data received in these follow-up studies would be without a control group; however, if the exposure to the CRM approach was pragmatically valid to the subjects, it would be retained and used in future settings. A directional comparison would be between those who selected to use the Need approach during the study and those who selected the Issue approach. From the follow-up studies information could be gathered as to what effect the training, as given, had and directions for change may result from the information.

Instruments

In further development of the MCRI, the following projects could be considered:

(a) Give more description of the third party conflict situation which would require less personal projection into the situation. Some subjects find they can't (don't want to) relate to the given situations as stated.

(b) Add the most recent personal conflict situation for the
individual, couple, family or living unit and assess how it was handled and how it could (should) be handled. Change in subject's organization could be assessed with pre- and post-measurement of personal conflicts.

(c) Create a Conflict Resolution Inventory to meet the particular relationship commitments of the subjects, such as, "single" conflict situations for "single" subjects, "engagement" conflict situations for engaged subjects. Perhaps the individual or couple (working unit) could select some categories of conflict interaction that they face and/or are concerned about. Then a selected third party conflict situation could be drawn from the category storage bank for them to respond to—a personalized MCRI. (These could be compared within groups or between groups by having the subjects respond to their own type and those of another type of relationship development.)

Further development of the RCR is needed. Suggested research projects would include:

(a) Have subjects rate the situations they respond to on any form of the MCRI in terms of the level of difficulty perceived, their involvement in this type of conflict in the past, knowledge about some known individuals having this type of conflict, and their foreseen chance of being involved in this type of conflict. This would give the subjects' relevance rating of the MCRI task.

(b) Use pre- and post-RCR scores of Value to Self and Value to
Others and a change score between these two subscales as independent variables.

(c) Have the subjects respond in narrative form to the questions of "Activation" and then respond on a scale as to the value it has for them. The description could then be judged by two or three judges and compared to the personal ratings. Modify this subscale by specific situation data as to how and why a particular approach is selected for a given situation. This should help refine the variable of "Activation."

(d) Relationship Interaction could be added to the RCR. More specification about interactions under varying circumstances could be used to gain a better understanding of the subjects in relation to his purposes or goals in relationship with other people and to conflict situations.

(e) The variable of "Use" should be modified. More specification as to how and when the model was used in interaction would allow for a continuous score suggesting more or less relevance for conflict resolution.

Training Programs

Some assessment of the effectiveness of the training program is essential. If subjects have not received the prerequisite information, they cannot make that particular selection. Assessment of various
training procedures could include some of the following:

(a) Have couples or families or living units work as a system and assess their interaction as compared to one another and a control group of separate subjects of like relationship commitment.

(b) Select specific skills such as Deciphering Basic Needs, Listening or Speaking and assess the importance of these skills in supporting the Sequential Steps Procedural skill. Experimental groups could be trained in one or more of these skills and compared to control subjects who have joint training in the Sequential Steps Procedures.

(c) Experiment with the use of audio and/or audio-visual equipment in the training. One comparison could be audio versus audio-visual equipment effects; another comparison could be its use versus no explicit system feedback equipment. One research project may have judges rate MCRI data taken from recordings rather than the written reaction.

(d) Subjects could be used to respond to their own interaction on the post-MCRI assessments. They could be asked to rate themselves, following the recording of the solution to the problem, as to whether they used the Need or Issue approach and respond as to how or why they responded in that manner. This may be an exploratory study to see if particular patterns of interaction exist such as, "It is better to smooth over hurt feelings than to push for understanding" or
"It's better to obtain peace by giving in than to rock the boat."

Conflict Resolution Approaches

One important research project would be to present subjects with several approaches to conflict resolution and have them rate the similarities and differences between the approaches. Subjects could also make a preference as to the approach they would choose and under what variety of circumstances. This would allow for some definition of what is called "product space" in Market Segmentation research. It allows for a visual perception as to how the product (conflict resolution approach) is related to others. The preference gives a rating of its desirability.

Conclusions

The data from this study can be used to draw the following conclusions:

1. There were no personal attributes or characteristics which had substantive differences to give good discrimination between Issue and Need orientation to the resolution conflict situations by the subjects. A different way of measuring these variables and adding others may help produce greater discrimination; however, human change from a general systems perspective is based on information processed and there must be some measurement of that operation.
2. A behavioral selection (operation) can only be made when the necessary information has been conceptualized. If the necessary information is present, the selection is a possibility. Prediction of particular behaviors is unimportant from the General Systems perspective. What is important is the understanding of how the subject, in addition to their scores on personality traits, are organized in terms of their goals and purposes within their environment.

3. There is need for further development of the Modified Conflict Resolution Inventory (MCRI) and the Relevance of Conflict Resolution (RCR) instrument. The MCRI has reliability but can be modified for more inclusive types of conflict situations. One scale of the RCR, activation, was the most valuable independent variable under study. Refinement of the RCR would help make it more useful in research.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF THE
CONFLICT RESOLUTION MODEL

This conceptual framework is built on the premise that interaction among human beings lies somewhere on a continuum between being very positive to very negative. Some examples of very negative interaction would be the individuals who carry hate, resentment or anger for one another but never speak or the individuals who resort to physical violence without speaking, non-verbal interaction. There may be combinations of verbal and non-verbal interaction wherein the transactions are unpleasant. Examples of positive interaction are the individuals who convey love and care for one another verbally, the couple who quietly watches the sun rise or set holding hands with a gratitude for each other or the individuals who share an experience of achieving some goal together.

The positive interactions are any of those satisfactions/attractions which draw people together; the negative interactions are any of the dissatisfaction/conflicts that separate people from each other. Positive feelings verify the worthwhileness of the individuals and the interaction. People have learned, for the most part, how to take in and manage (consume, spend, utilize) the positive feelings. It is the lack of ability to take in and manage (consume, spend, utilize) the negative feelings that cause individuals to back off or deter full interaction with others. Negative interactions that are inappropriately handled--or not handled at all--create barriers to individual and relationship growth. The concern of this Conflict Resolution Model is with the negative interactions which are inefficiently or incompletely processed.

Before looking directly at the conceptual framework, a diagram and description of human interaction will help locate the focal point of the Conflict Resolution Model. The hypothetical example will involve a couple who, over time, move from initial contact to marriage, in a "primary relationship" mode. (Secondary relationships, i.e. clerk-customer, employer-employee, etc., are held together by different rules and regulations.)

When Joe and Helen meet in a beginning relationship, *Figure 1, Figure 1 is located on page 120.
RELATIONSHIP DEVELOPMENT OVER TIME

Beginning Casual Relationship

Satisfaction (S)
Attraction (A)
Dissatisfaction (D)
Conflicts (C)

Figure 1

Dating

Solid line, ---, represents openly processed interaction.
Broken line, ---, represents lack of open processing: purposeful ignoring or control to keep from open interaction; however, it does represent unopen interaction.
Widening lines, ---, represent intensifying of interaction: quantity and/or quality.
Distance between persons represents psychological distance in the relationship.
Moving Toward Total Encounter, ---, keep out hurt.
Conflicts and dissatisfactions may be openly processed before the engagement period, and the termination of a relationship may come before marriage.
Figures 6 to 9, give two alternative ways of relationship development, others also exist.

Marriage

Separated

Married

Figure 5

SYMBOL KEY
there are satisfactions/attractions that draw them toward each other. What is satisfying/attractive to one may be a different satisfaction/attraction than for the other person. Interactions for dissatisfactions/conflicts are also present, but may not be processed openly, hence the broken line, ( - - - ) relationship. If the magnitude of the positive interaction is greater than the negative interaction, whether openly processed or not, the relationship draws closer together over time for deeper, more intense interaction, Figures 2 and 3, which represent dating and Going Steady. Often during the engagement period (p. 120), Figure 4, Joe and Helen find that conflict-dissatisfaction interaction becomes intense enough that it can't be ignored. (Some couples have tried to openly process conflict/dissatisfaction interaction before this--with varying degrees of efficiency. Some couples choose to terminate their relationship because they haven't been able to resolve or manage the conflict issues.) Joe and Helen, as well as other couples, go on into marriage, Figure 5 (p. 120), with the hope that marriage will help them work through the conflict/dissatisfaction interactions. Depending upon the couple's ability and willingness to work through the conflict situations, they may fit within the continuum of fuller encounter and total relationship commitment and meaning, Figures 6B-9B, or move defensively apart from one another, Figures 6A-9A, until the union is dissolved. Those couples who have been able to work through the conflict issues, Figures 6B-9B, continue to grow through the processing of alternative choices--the definition of conflict in the Conflict Resolution Model is alternative choices--present in the ongoing conflict situations; they have developed skills which work in their interest.

On the other hand, if Joe and Helen, or other couples, can't or don't face the conflict in efficient ways, or haven't developed needed skills, then they must place barriers between themselves to keep from getting hurt ( J ( H ), Figures 6A-9A. The barrier of psychological distance, one of several barriers, keeps the satisfaction/attraction interaction from being as fulfilling and meaningful as it lessens the pain and hurt of conflict. Depending upon other constraints which work to keep the relationship together, Joe and Helen may choose separate residence, ( J ) ( H ), Figure 8, but are legally/socially married, or they may continue on to divorce, Figure 9A, ( J ); ( H ).

The concern of the Conflict Resolution Model focuses on the conflict/dissatisfaction interaction portion of the total interaction of the couple. It's purpose is to help couples, in the early stages of relationship development, overcome the magnitude of inefficient processing of the conflict situations that later prove disruptive to the
relationship. It is also to help in relationships where conflict is emerging openly and the couple is wanting to utilize this kind of information in constructive relationship development. Attention is now directed to the conceptual framework of the Conflict Resolution Model. The purpose of a conceptual framework is to tie together the dimensions, assumptions, principles, skills and procedures that are involved within the particular model. It is to show the relationship among the concepts, give advance organization to principles, skills, and procedures and be a means for locating interactions for self/couple improvement and evaluation.

Dimensions

The dimensions of the Conflict Resolution Model give the general purposes of and limits to the program. There are eight important dimensions of this model. (The first six dimensions follow the Miller, Nunnally and Wachman (1973) paradigm).

1) An educational-developmental orientation. The major premise of this model is one of learning rather than repairing. Principles and procedures that affect communication need to be understood and similar approaches to communication is important, especially with regard to conflict. Within an understood set of communication procedures, false assumptions and misunderstandings can be reduced and couples can learn how to learn together.

2) Focus on the Couple. The central concern in this model is that the couple be seen as a unit. The engaged couple is a dyad and not two individuals or group members in a class or course. All training is centered on the development of the couple (system). Individual training is possible within an ad hoc pair, but this special group has some limitations: lack of continuity over time, dissimilar life perspectives from a spouse or semi-permanent partner, expectations that may not be understood or mutually determined, and so on.

3) Skill orientation. The purpose of this model is to provide training to develop skills in communication as well as knowledge of the principles. Skills provide a heightened awareness of self, others, situations and couple interactions which lead to a greater variety of interactions. With the added awareness, especially of conflicts, additional skills in procedures for resolution of the conflicts are used to handle the new interactions.
4) Conceptual framework presentation. The conceptual framework of this model calls for the understanding, by the participants, of the various concepts so as to remove any mystery, give advance notification of activities and be a format for self/couple development and evaluation.

5) Voluntary participation. Central motivation for changes within a couple's interaction should lie within the couple. This model calls for voluntary participation that will help couples find meaningful types of interaction that are mutually beneficial. Information supplied through the model and class is for the couple's consideration.

6) Group interaction as an expanded learning environment. Couples participating with other couples gain insights about their interactions and opportunities for discovering other ways to interact.

7) Mutual adjustment versus compromise. This model is concerned with information processing that results in more complete understanding of basic psycho-social needs and values of each one of the members and how these relate to the conflict symptoms--specific issues. Compromise, for the purpose of this model, is defined as "interaction which results in agreement by concession." Settlement through "giving up something, so as to not give up everything," at an issue (symptom) level, (Webster Dictionary, 1964). Mutual adjustment is defined, for this model, as: The selection of an alternative choice that meets the basic need/value structure of each individual through the process of gaining an understanding and appreciation of one another and their needs/values. The basic psycho-social needs are those defined by Wm. Glasser (1965) as: a) the need to love and be loved, and b) the need to feel worthwhile to oneself and others. These are interrelated, but the need of loving and being loved involves feelings in interaction, while feeling worthwhile implies meeting standards of behavior. Mutual adjustment would create an atmosphere wherein each member would feel more complete satisfaction of these basic needs.

8) Conflict as a neutral phenomenon. This model approaches conflict as alternative choices for inter-personal interaction. The manner in which the choices (alternatives) are explored and/or decided results in a positive or negative feeling for
the relationship. If there were no choices there would be no conflict. Conflict resolution is a special case of decision-making/problem solving. Conflicts are attached to deep seated and important values and needs and the alternative choices come from within the needs and values of the individuals. Outside sources may offer ideas that could be used by the couple as additional alternative choices.

To summarize the dimensions of the Conflict Resolution Model, man is seen as being well rather than sick, as having the ability to learn about himself and make changes suitable to his and others' needs rather than a mere reactor to stimuli and as being capable of learning from others rather than just trial and error learning.

Assumptions

There are seven assumptions about conflict and its interaction in couple's lives inherent in the Conflict Resolution Model. An understanding of each of these assumptions will help give greater perspective to the principles, skills and procedures of the model.

1) Conflict is an opportunity for growth. The emphasis of the model is that conflict is a point that is indicative of a chance to change—it is a growth opportunity. Contrary to the experience of many individuals, for this model conflicts are viewed as points for positive interaction. They are not seen as negative experiences that are to be dealt with only to prevent them from getting worse. From the positive point of view, conflicts represent choices to be made. These choices allow for deeper understanding and appreciation of oneself and one's partner, when they are processed via the procedures of the model.

2) Conflicts come from incongruent (dissimilar) ideas about values, needs, goals and desires. The background of each person has led to the perception that person has about the "whys" and "hows" of life. No two individuals perceive the same situation from the same vantage point. It is the dissimilarity in perceptions about life that help give rise to alternative choices. The background of each person helps him to see his own choice over his partner's choice. This model looks for additional choices that may fit the needs of each person and the relationship to a greater extent than either of the previous individual choices.
3) Conflicts manifest themselves at an issue (symptom) level. Another way of stating this would be to say that alternative choices come at an issue (symptom) level. There are many factors that go into each decision that lie beyond the issue. An inter-personal and intra-personal example will show the issue level of alternative choice. A husband wants to go to a ball game and the wife wants to go to a concert. The issue is where to go--an interpersonal conflict. An intra-personal conflict could involve the choice of two specific colors for the new car. The issue: what color. Behind each choice at the issue level (ball game or concert and car colors) there are a number of factors to be considered. The importance of this assumption is to show that a specific issue is not the end per se, but it is a symptom of interactions to be discovered at other levels.

4) Conflicts involve personal values and basic psycho-social needs. To shift the resolution from a symptom to a value/need basis requires understanding of oneself and one's partner. Understanding has as its main purpose establishing a basis for fulfillment of the value/needs and a by-product of greater appreciation and enjoyment. Everyone has the same basic psycho-social needs but these are fulfilled or satisfied in different ways via the values one holds. The degree of divergence in the value structure will function as a governor as to the difficulty in finding mutually satisfying activities and interaction that meet the individuals' needs as well as relationship needs.

An example of the conflict of Joe and Helen will help to show how conflicts are manifest at an issue (symptom) level but the more satisfying resolution comes at the basic need/value level.

Joe met Helen while he served in the Armed Forces overseas. They were married there and returned to America following his service obligation. Helen was working full time and Joe was working part-time and going to school. They were living in an apartment but Helen kept pushing for buying a house. This conflict of "house or apartment" was driving them apart.

The issue (symptom--because it is only a signal of something else) is: to buy a house or continue living in an apartment. The basic need--which is involved in the conflict--revolves
around the ideas and understandings of: how does buying a house represent the needs of Helen to love and/or be loved or feel worthwhile to herself and/or others; how does renting the apartment represent the needs of Joe to love and/or be loved or feel worthwhile to himself and/or others. The basic values of Joe and Helen also interact to indicate the what or how of need fulfillment. Each couple must work out their own resolution, but some suggested needs to issue relationships can be given. Helen is living in a foreign country. Does home ownership represent security—a part of being loved? Does apartment living interfere with her housing arrangement—furniture, remodeling—feeling worthwhile? And so on as these needs apply to Helen. Does home ownership mean extra work for Joe which would involve his feelings (need) of being worthwhile? Does it mean extra payment which involves his feelings (need) of security—a part of loving or being loved? And so on for Joe's needs. The important aspect of this particular conflict which is manifest at an issue—symptom of underlying needs—of "house or apartment" is how each see needs and their fulfillment associated with their choice of: to buy for Helen, to rent for Jim.

An analogy to the foregoing would be: issue versus need level modus operandi to conflict resolution would be like tree surgery in the branches when the problem lies in the roots. The Conflict Resolution Model is to help each couple understand the relationship between issues and basic needs and find alternative choices that better fulfill each person's needs—mutual adjustment.

5) Conflict resolution is specific to a couple. Though the processing of the conflict towards resolution involves the same principles, skills and procedures, each specific couple has a unique adjustment to themselves. The same behavioral alternative that is used by some other couple, is used by and built on the unique values, perceptions, interaction and lack of particular psycho-social need fulfillment of that specific couple.

6) Conflicts, for most people, are hard to handle and carry a negative sentiment; they are purposely disregarded or ignored unless they carry extraordinary consequences. Minor conflicts are generally ignored because a member of the couple (system) doesn't want to bother the other person or
risk the relationship. The minor conflicts involve some level of misunderstanding that may develop into greater magnitude in the relationship. The Conflict Resolution Model gives a sequential method for handling conflicts of any nature in a manner to give greater clarity to both members of anyone’s conflicts. This model is also helpful in working through what may be considered a problem or desire of one person that isn’t a conflict, per se. Some problems or desires are not openly discussed because they are perceived as being a potential conflict stimulus.

7) Conflicts that are not resolved efficiently create barriers that interfere with satisfying interactions. The negative emotions and feelings of being misunderstood that are inherent in conflict situations, regardless of the magnitude, result in one or both of the members withdrawing from the given intensity of the relationship. Minor conflicts are first treated lightly to save the good times in the relationship, but they are stockpiled and compound on one another. A defensive distance to keep from being hurt by conflict is a psychological distance which also affects the satisfying interactions. The Conflict Resolution Model is designed to not only remove the defensive distance, but to utilize the situation for a couple to gain a greater understanding of each other and oneself. This is an opportunity to develop greater intensity and less distance in the relationship.

Principles

The principles used in the Conflict Resolution Model are supportive of the assumptions and give meaning and direction to the skills and procedures. Many of the principles apply to general human relationship interaction, but are given special emphasis here in the conflict resolution process. (Many of these principles follow the Covey (1970) paradigm.)

1) Until people feel understood, they are not open to be influenced. The suggestion of "alternative choices" implies a degree of influence. With alternative choices coming from each member of the system (couple), the other member is being influenced by the source of the alternative. The crux of this principle is that there must be mutual understanding of one another before any attempt is made at choosing among the alternatives. It also implies understanding at the value/need level rather than at the issue (symptom) level.
2) The key to human influence is to be an example, not a judge. Examples in human relationships do two things: They provide a model to follow and create a climate for growth and exploration. As one person uses a particular skill in the interaction, it gives an invitation to the other person to follow in like manner which increases the desire and courage to try for mutual understanding and this leads to mutual adjustment.

3) The greatest deterrent to relationship development lies within the one's unwillingness to forgive rather than in the other's transgression. Transgressions within the relationship, even when they lie within a single person's transgression of self standards, puts a strain on the relationship interaction of all the members of the system (couple). Transgression against members within the system places a greater strain on the couple's interaction than transgression against oneself. In a growing developing relationship there are transgressions that come about, many times they are very unintentional. These need to be removed through gaining an understanding of one another and a willingness to forgive one another. (The act of forgiving the other person is often essential before he can forgive himself. Estranged or restrained individuals limit relationship interaction.) Forgiving implies forgetting --conscious remembering implies lack of forgiveness.

This principle is not suggesting blanket forgiveness of habitual, wanton transgression. Wanton, havitual transgression would be a symptom of relationship boundaries that need to be changed--through understanding and re-commitment, or perhaps, through dissolution of the relationship. When a transgressor is aware of the transgression, either toward self or the other member, he needs to seek the reconciliation and support of the other member for developmental change.

4) When someone has offended you, go to them, they may not be aware of the offense. This principle differs from the preceding one in that the offense may only be recognized by one of the members. Many individuals hesitate to confront others with negative feelings because they don't want to hurt the other person. The person may hope the offense was unintentional. The estrangement that develops doesn't bring relief to the relationship. The offender may or may not be able to tell what he did to offend. Talk about the feelings of not wanting to hurt the other person and about the importance
of the relationship first, then talk about the offense and reconciliation.

5) To rebuild a relationship, one must be released from the other person's prison. When offenses come, intentionally or unintentionally, the person offended takes the position of the plaintiff, the prosecutor, the judge and jury, and the jailer. He places the offender in a prison and keeps him there until he has made restitution, as seen by the offended. Often in conflict situations, both people place one another within their separate prisons.

There may be partial release at times, but an over-riding feeling of being on guard--not wanting to be hurt again--keeps the relationship from growing. The partial release is often a time element, where after a while we forget (or partially forgive) without any effort expended towards the reconciliation or resolution of the initial offense, which is similar, in some respects, to our treatment of civil law offenders--they pay "time as punishment" without much regard for their reconciliation or rehabilitation.

Each person needs to accept his own responsibility and be willing to forgive and to rebuild the relationship. The person who may be least in error may need to be the one to ask the other person's forgiveness (a chance for reconciliation) to enable the other person to gain courage to reciprocate in relationship rebuilding and growth--re-commitment. The Conflict Resolution Model is designed to help keep relationships from deteriorating with conflict per se; it also gives support and momentum to the reconciliation process when followed.

6) Fixing label on others, e.g. name calling, grants external security when internal security is lacking--but this erodes relationship. Name calling is a type of judgment that destroys the person and the relationship. The persons who do the name calling are expecting others to change and are not willing, or able, to look at their own interaction. Sarcasm and ridicule are other ways of sitting in judgment and have the same negative effect on the relationship. These are attacks on the dignity and worthwhileness of the individual and call forth a self defense--even when they are given in jest.
The opposite of name calling is to magnify one's own position. The Conflict Resolution Model helps each person do this. In the process of magnification, one focuses on his own actions, feelings and needs and the peripheral area of relationship—the other person's actions—goes out of focus. Responsibility is taken for one's own actions and for understanding the other person's needs and meanings. When a person takes responsibility for his own actions he has far less need to sit in judgment of the other person. He is able to help the other person find support for personal growth.

7) An imagined experience is as real in the circuitry of the individual as is the actual experience. This principle applied to conflict resolution suggests that to go through the mental process of working out alternative choices, deciphering basic needs and values from symptoms, seeking forgiveness and mutual understanding, and making reconciliation wherein necessary, makes that experience as real as the actual experience in a person's life. For each person to work through the mental steps of the interactions would give them self understanding and courage to work on relationship understanding and growth. The principle implies the idea of going through the entire process necessary for conflict resolution until the person has gained the victory of processing the conflict situation.

8) Talk about the feelings of the importance of the relationship before confronting the person with negative feelings about the conflict issue. Less hurt comes to the total relationship by working through the feelings about the conflict than to just let them ride. For Helen to say to Jim, "I have something that will be difficult for me to talk to you about, but our relationship is very important to me; therefore, I feel like I need to talk to you," sets the tone of wanting to gain an understanding about the conflict. Jim is much more prepared to receive Helen's comments than if Helen were to start talking about the conflict situation. For instance, Helen could start out, "This really bugs me!" or "You make me so . . .," without talking about the importance of their relationship, which places Jim in a very defensive position. For Helen to take responsibility for her feelings, i.e. I was hurt (her position in the relationship), is much easier for Jim than in the situation where she placed the responsibility on him, i.e. you make me . . . Neither of these two ways invites his attention and concern, as compared to the prefacing of the relationship importance and purpose for
confrontation, for self and relationship understanding.

9) If there were no choices there would be no conflicts. This principle, as well as being a dimension of the Conflict Resolution Model, lies at the center of the resolution process. There are opportunities to grow and develop and these come through choices available to individuals on an interpersonal level. The seeking for and choosing among the alternatives available to the individual and relationship is what determines the amount and direction of growth and development.

10) Individuals seek meaning which comes in relationship with others. To be able to communicate the thoughts, feelings and ideas and to work through alternative choices with one's partner adds verification of the worth and dignity of each person. The Conflict Resolution Model is to help the individuals work through alternative choices that may be "charged" with emotion so that each individual and the relationship may grow in satisfaction, direction and meaning.

11) Involve the person in the problem, not in your solution to the problem. Seek for an understanding of one another's points of view about a problem area. It may only be a problem to you, if so, seek their understanding and help in finding a solution to your problem. Do not try to engage them in your solution to your problem--this may only create additional problems. To illustrate, Mary felt that her husband, Steve, should help her with the housework since they were both attending school and worked about equal time. Presenting "her problem" of wanting his help and not "her solution" of his doing housework gives Steve an opportunity to become involved in understanding and meeting Mary's needs rather than needing to defend his use of time. (Even if she could mandate, in one form or another, her solution, and Steve did housework, without understanding each other's feelings or with resentment, the relationship and each individual suffers.)

12) Wherein possible, touch the other person physically when expressing your concerns. If you, or they, don't feel comfortable in a physical contact situation, then don't become involved in physical contact; however, if you do feel comfortable, the physical contact will support one another as you work through the conflict situation.
Skills

The skills involved in the Conflict Resolution Model are those needed to gain an understanding of oneself and one's partner in the interaction of conflict situations. The understanding of one another then allows for choices to be made that will help each person grow and develop as a person and at the same time it will help the relationship grow and develop.

1) **LISTENING** is one very important skill needed to gain an understanding of the other person (After Winans', 1959, paradigm). This skill is divided into two aspects: a) positive attitudes and actions and b) negative attitudes and actions. The positive attitudes and actions are the ones that facilitate an understanding and encouragement of the other person to interact at a deeper level. A rapport is developed through positive listening attitudes and actions that gives greater meaning and appreciation for one another. In the disclosures offered by the speaker to the good listener, the speaker gains self understanding also. The negative aspects of listening have the opposite effect. Negative attitudes and actions include: defending your position, giving advice, seeking entrance into the conversation, not having time, taking a dogmatic position, and assuming an understanding. The positive attitudes and actions include: empathy, acceptance, verification feedback, response, and silence.

**LISTENING** is equated with gaining an understanding in contrast to hearing which is recognition of sound. Listening is a skill that can be learned; it does not come naturally--hearing comes naturally for those who are not deaf.

2) **SPEAKING** is an analogous skill to listening--it must be learned and it has both positive and negative aspects. This skill enables the person to convey his intent of feelings, needs, meanings and ideas so that the listener may gain the understanding. Speaking is contrasted with talking in that talking is making sounds that do not necessarily carry a congruent message, whereas speaking is a congruent message wherein the person is expressing as clearly as possible what is in his awareness. The positive aspects of speaking include: prefacing threatening remarks, taking responsibility for statements, inviting participation of a listener, and the right and requirement to be understood. The negative aspects of the speaking skill are: attitudes of being better or
not equal to the listener or not being qualified to speak, speaking too slow or fast or loud or soft, talking to fill a void, inappropriate assumptions about the listener's knowledge or understanding, and placing the responsibility on someone else.

Reul Howe (1963) has stated that: interaction of good speaking and good listening is dialogue. He suggests:

Dialogue is to love what blood is to the body. When the flow of blood stops, the body dies. When dialogue stops, love dies and resentment and hate are born. But dialogue can restore a dead relationship. Indeed, this is the miracle of dialogue: it can bring relationship into being, and it can bring into being once again a relationship that has died. (p. 3)

If one or more of the individuals in a relationship does not learn the skills of listening and/or speaking, then communication inter-change becomes that of one way or two way monologue--messages without understanding. These two skills are especially needed in the interaction involving conflicts. The misunderstandings (monologues) that develop during conflict situations keep the individuals and the relationship on edge. Misunderstandings allow for inappropriate behavior which further aggravate the interactions.

3) The ability to DECIPHER BASIC NEEDS and values out of the conflict issues (symptoms) is another skill that is very important in conflict resolution. With mutual adjustment being the interaction that sustains both individuals and relationship growth, it is necessary to be able to find the basic needs and values involved in interaction so they may be fulfilled.

The basic psycho-social needs have been previously defined as: The need to love and be loved and the need to feel worthwhile to oneself and others. Mutual adjustment in the conflict situation would work at fulfilling these basic needs and values for the individuals involved. It is, therefore, necessary to be able to determine how these needs and values underlie the symptoms (issues) of conflict. Reflect back on the example of Joe and Helen and the conflict of buying a house or renting an apartment, (See page 125).

Each person can develop the skill of finding the relationship between a specific issue and how it relates to his (her) need
of loving and/or being loved or feeling worthwhile to oneself and/or others. For Joe it was: how did the apartment versus buying the house meet his needs. For Helen it was: how did buying the house versus renting the apartment meet her needs.

When the individuals learn to decipher basic needs, they are then ready to utilize the next skill.

4) The ability to UNLOCK ALTERNATIVE CHOICES. Joe and Helen need to be able to see as many choices as possible for their mutual decisions. Which choice would help each of them fulfill their basic needs and have greater understanding and appreciation for one another. Once a choice is made, it is important for a period of evaluation to see that it is best fitting the needs of both the individuals and the relationship. There may have been other choices available at later times that would better serve their needs. Talking with family or friends and other resource personnel could help them expand the choices available and see implications of particular alternatives that they might not have seen before. The two alternatives that formed the symptom (the issue of whether to buy or rent) are now processed in terms of other considerations. To buy or rent are still alternative choices, but they are processed at a need/value level of interaction.

5) Another skill involved in conflict resolution is that of INTROSPECION OF THE PROCESS. When individuals in the relationship can step back and ask themselves what is happening in terms of their listening and speaking to one another, their deciphering basic needs and values, their unlocking alternative choices and their utilizing principles and procedures for relationship growth, then they have learned how to learn together. They can now proceed to put these skills and principles, along with the procedures that follow, together within the Conflict Resolution Model dimensions for their individual and relationship well being.

Conflict Resolution Procedures

The CONFLICT RESOLUTION PROCEDURAL SKILL, taking the seven procedures, collectively, form a skill which has been delineated and separated out of the other skills for the major focal point of this model. All the other skills, principles, assumptions and dimensions of the model are seen as supportive of this particular skill--
the heart of the model. (Special training and experimental interaction may be needed to develop other skill and principle utility, but in this model they serve to support the procedural skill.)

The procedures for working on any conflict situation are the same. The outcome of following the steps will follow the particular needs of the individuals and the relationship at the given time. The steps are a follow AND SHOULD BE MEMORIZED IN ESSENCE:

1) Recognize conflict issues. It isn't essential to look for conflict, but when it arises, accept it as an opportunity to gain self understanding and understanding of the other person. Accept conflict as a natural part of growth--alternative choice. Select a specific issue, if there is more than one, to work on. Define the issue so there is agreement on what is under consideration. List the immediate alternatives--the choice of each partner.

2) Select a time that will allow for the greatest understanding and cooperative effort, if the present time is not appropriate. The time selected should not be set too far into the future. When one, or more, of the individuals are physically imbalanced, e.g., fatigue, hunger, ill (Popenoe, 1950) or emotionally charged (Strauss, 1974), are not appropriate times for continuing the procedures. Take care of these needs first. Just be sure the issue is defined well enough to be able to come back to it--this may mean writing it down. A future setting also gives each person time to reflect on his feelings and basic needs before trying to resolve them (Ard, 1971). They can work through thoughts and feelings that may be somewhat confused. Finding a good listener, who may be your partner or someone else, can also help each person sort out feelings and needs. To force an issue to completion results in wasted time and dignity--choose an appropriate time for conflict resolution.

3) Look for the relationship between the issue defined and the basic psycho-social needs and values. Put your feelings down in writing, this may require some dialogue with someone else before the feelings are clear enough to be written out. Writing out the feelings takes more time and energy, but it produces a much clearer understanding of how the issue relates to the basic needs and values. Write out the seen relationship between the issue and basic needs and values. THIS IS AN INDIVIDUAL STEP--each person looks
for his own need/values as they relate to the conflict issue.

4) Convey your feelings about the issue and their relationship to your basic needs/value to one another through verification feedback. In early experiences of processing conflict situations the verification feedback should be written out--this assures understanding.

5) Look for alternatives that meet the need level interactions. The more alternatives that can be found and considered, within limits, before one is chosen, the greater the opportunity to experience mutual care and concern for one another.

6) Choose one alternative that best fits the mutual good of the partners and specify how it is to be carried out.

7) Specify a particular period of time for evaluation of the new interaction. Look for additional alternatives that may better fit your needs as growing individuals in a deepening relationship. Make changes as the nature of your relationship changes. Positive evaluations compound satisfaction in the relationship.

In Conclusion

The Conflict Resolution Model is designed to develop a processing skill for conflict situations that would lead a couple, Joe and Helen for our example, to total encounter. What may have been the negative feelings or experiences they had with conflict situations in their early relationship interactions have now become manageable (consumed, spent, utilized). By using the skills of: listening, speaking, introspection, deciphering basic needs and unlocking alternative choices, along with the conflict resolution procedural skill, Joe and Helen no longer need to try to hide or minimize the alternate choices (conflicts) which they have. They use what had been negative interaction to understand one another and themselves in a total way. Any feeling or idea that either one has is open to be shared with the other in a growth promoting way--this is total encounter.

Joe and Helen, or any couple, have not developed a skill to remove conflict from their lives. There will always be pressures and decisions to make alternative choices possible and necessary. What they have accomplished in learning the conflict resolution procedural skill is to be able to put the available choices into perspective. They are committed to one another and any resolution of the alternatives
serves the relationship as it serves the individuals. The magnitude
of the negative interaction diminishes as they work together, in a
cooperative way rather than work against each other, in continuing
the relationship and self growth process. (They would be very frus-
trated if their choices for alternatives were taken away.)

The Conflict Resolution Model is concerned about the process of
resolution, not the product of resolution. The idea of a product to
conflict resolution suggests the result of: once you have concluded a
decision it is over. This idea robs the potential of each human being
to grow and develop the capacity of self and relationship. Processing
suggests the idea that as people and events change, so decisions
change to meet new circumstances. What may have been the best
alternative at one point in time may need to be altered to better fit
the current status of personal and relationship needs. Positive inter-
actions are processed--molded and changed--for changes of oneself
and relationship; the Conflict Resolution Model will now allow the once
negative interactions to be processed.

The processing skill is not easy--at least at first, through prac-
tice it becomes easier to use and understand. It will be found, how-
ever, to be similar to the listening and speaking skill. It is harder to
use with someone close and important to you, than to a stranger--
there is more at stake! Practice and effort will result in success.

Addendum

USING THE CONFLICT RESOLUTION MODEL IN A NON-CONFLICT
SITUATION

A use for the seven sequential steps to conflict resolution may
lie outside a "conflict type" of interaction. One or more individuals
in interaction could use the format to assure an understanding of a
particular idea, feeling or personal problem. For example, if Joe
was concerned about a particular value he had and wanted Helen to
understand him, he could say to Helen, "I have an idea (feeling) that
I would like you to understand. It is___________(and he may name;
membership in or desire to join a social group, religion, children,
finances, in-laws, as the idea or feeling he would like Helen to under-
stand about him)." This is step one.

Step two is to set an appropriate time.

In step three, Joe looks at his basic needs (need to love and be
loved and need to feel worthwhile to himself and others) and how they
relate to his idea or feeling he wants to share. Helen may also want
to be understood in terms of her basic needs on the same idea or feeling.

Step four is where each share how they think or feel and allow the verification feedback process to assure understanding.

Step five may not be used if being understood is all that is desired. (Alternative choices may be appropriate for situations where Joe or Helen are problem solving, such as: looking for a new job, deciding on an occupational goal, or selecting a major purchase such as an automobile).

Step six fulfills step five if used in looking at alternative choices and then step seven follows, if appropriate.

Helen or Joe may initiate the idea, feeling or personal problem or decision-making concern. One or both may want to discuss the feeling or situation as it relates to their basic psycho-social needs of loving or being loved and feeling worthwhile to oneself or others.

(Any who are interested in using these ideas, or their revised form when that time comes, or other related materials, may contact me and I will be happy to share what has happened and where things seem to be going. I can be located through: The National Council on Family Relations, 1219 University Avenue, Southeast, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 55414).
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APPENDIX B

MODIFIED CONFLICT RESOLUTION INVENTORY
FORMS A and B

The following information was on a cover letter for each copy of the Modified Conflict Resolution Inventory:

PLEASE READ CAREFULLY

This questionnaire, which you are asked to fill out, is being used for a doctoral dissertation. The purpose of the research is to collect and analyze information on ways individuals have for dealing with conflict situations.

There are no right or wrong answers to the situations in the questionnaire. Please respond in the manner that you feel would best accomplish the task via the instructions.

The questionnaires will be coded before being analyzed to insure that every respondent's answers will be kept confidential. The analysis of data will be available for your information, near the end of the term, if you would like to know the results. You may contact me at my office: HE 307 or 754-1765.

Thank you very much for your help on this project.

John Strong
Doctoral Candidate
Family Life Department

The following instructions were given on both Form A and B of the MCRI:

INSTRUCTIONS

All couples, or families, have conflict of one form or another. On the following three pages are listed three conflict situations which you are to respond to. You are asked by each couple to offer them a solution to their problem and to give them some rationale (reasons) for your choice.

The following items comprise Form A and are each placed at the top of a separate page:
Betty and Earl have been married less than a year. Their dating and engagement took place on a college campus. Each had more schooling to finish, but they choose to be married while finishing their degrees. Finances are tight, but they seem sufficient to "get by." The conflict seems to be in Betty's mind only: "She goes to school full-time and has 'housework' to do also--she doesn't know how to get Earl to help."

Sherri and Jerry find their problems with in-laws. They live in the same town as Jerry's parents and brothers and sisters. Jerry's family is close to one another emotionally and socially. They are constantly planning things that involve Sherri and Jerry. Jerry often expresses how happy he is to have such good family relationships. Sherri keeps finding more and more things that disengage them from Jerry's family activities. Sherri says she really likes Jerry's family.

Harriet's and Wendel's conflict revolves around the problem of having children. Wendel says that he doesn't want children for about four years while he is getting established in his occupation. Harriet says that she has worked two years helping Wendel get his education and now she wants to have some children and stop working.

The following items comprise Form B and are each placed at the top of a separate page:

Richard and Janice have been married for about a year. Before their marriage they were involved in a number of activities and seemed to enjoy themselves very much. They don't have a lot of money for this anniversary celebration, so each wants it to count the most. Richard wants them to attend a sport activity, Janice wants them to attend a dance.

Henry and Margo live in suburbia with a large house and a good income. Henry works hard and is gone quite frequently on business trips. Margo has been active in civic groups and a church club. Their conflict revolves around the issue of: Henry wants them to spend time with other couples, Margo wants them to spend time by themselves.

Bill, who is 28 years old, was married 3 1/2 years and then divorced. Kathy, who is 22 years old, and Bill dated for 9 months before they were married. They have been married 3 1/2 years and have two children. Bill works for an engineering firm in a semi-skilled position, Kathy has worked at a bank and has recently started to attend college. She says she no longer loves Bill and wants a divorce.
Fourteen individuals, seven males and seven females, were given the following instructions to rate 12 conflict situations:

Would you please rate the following conflict situations, separately, on the following scale: very easy (1) to very difficult (10).

#1 Mary Waldron has been busy taking care of the two children, ages 3 and 5, and greets her husband as he comes home from work with the request, "Let's get a baby sitter and go out to a movie." Walter Waldron, whose boss has been on him all day, wants to stay home and unwind, replied, "Is that the only thing you can think about--spending money on a movie?" Walter's voice was somewhat harsh, a few minutes later he finds Mary in the kitchen crying.

#2 Rebecca has been trained in home management and is very efficient in her work. Bob has what he describes as "creative urges" in preparation of food. At least half the time when they work in the kitchen together, they end up being upset with each other.

#3 Bill who is 28 years old, was married 3 1/2 years and then divorced. Kathy, who is 22 years old, and Bill dated for 9 months before they were married. They have been married 3 1/2 years and have two children. Bill works for an engineering firm in a semi-skilled position, Kathy has worked at a bank and has recently started to attend college. She says she no longer loves Bill and wants a divorce.

#4 Mark and Rita both came from large families. Rita's home life could be characterized as "the lived in look" about the home, while Mark's home life could be characterized as "a neat, well ordered home" look. Mark is always "picking things up" which annoys him. Rita doesn't mind his "picking-up" but thinks he has hid a particular blouse that she wanted to wear.

#5 Steve and Chris were both active in their social groups during their dating and engagement period. Both were semi-active in their separate church affiliations. During the first 2 1/2 years of their marriage, while they were getting to know each other, they attended church occasionally, but not together. Jennifer was born 6 months
ago and now each feel that Jennifer should be trained in their own belief—each have shown considerable more interest in their church.

#6 Henry and Margo live in suburbia with a large house and a good income. Henry works hard and is gone quite frequently on business trips. Margo has been active in civic groups and a church club. Their conflict revolves around the issue of: Henry wants them to spend time with other couples, Margo wants to spend time by themselves.

#7 Richard and Janis have been married about a year. Before their marriage they were involved in a number of activities and seemed to enjoy themselves very much. They don't have a lot of money for this anniversary celebration, so each wants it to count the most. Richard wants them to attend a sports activity, Janice wants them to attend a dance.

#8 The Peter Quimbly's have planned an evening out. Peter invited some casual friends, the Bakers, who are the life of the party, to join with them. Maxine Quimbly was upset, she had told her parents they would drop over later. Peter retorted to Maxine's plans, "you call the Bakers and tell them why we don't want to keep our social engagement." Maxine said, "you never talk about what's on your mind."

#9 Sherri and Jerry find their problems with in-laws. They live in the same town as Jerry's parents and brothers and sisters. Jerry's family is close to one another emotionally, and socially. They are constantly planning things that involve Sherri and Jerry. Jerry often expresses how happy he is to have such good family relationships. Sherri keeps finding more and more things that disengage them from Jerry's family activities. Sherri says she really likes Jerry's family.

#10 Harriet's and Wendel's conflict revolves around the problem of having children. Wendel says that he doesn't want children for about four years while he is getting established in his occupation. Harriet says that she has worked two years helping Wendel get his education and now she wants to have some children and stop working.

#11 Dan and Melba don't have many conflicts at home, but recently they have been arguing about little things when they are in company. The latest conflict came when Dan splurged on some souvenirs. Melba's point of view, which was expressed in a sarcastic way, was: "Dan wants some trinkets to play with, even if he can't pay the bills." Dan then accused Melba of always being a "tight-wad, saving junk
because she can't throw it away." Neither of them, nor the company, seemed to enjoy the remainder of the evening.

#12 Betty and Earl have been married less than a year. Their dating and engagement took place on a college campus. Each had more schooling to finish, but they chose to be married while finishing their degrees. Finances are tight, but they seem sufficient to "get by." The conflict seems to be in Betty's mind only: "She goes to school full time and has housework to do also--she doesn't know how to get Earl to help."

Table 10 gives the individual scores for each conflict situation, per rater, with the mean and standard deviation for each conflict situation.

Table 10. Rankings of Conflict Situations for Use in the Modified Conflict Resolution Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Male Judges</th>
<th>Female Judges</th>
<th>Mean (X)</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7 2 2 5 8 3 4</td>
<td>5 5 7 3 2 5 3</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4 2 3 3 6 2 4</td>
<td>7 2 4 3 3 5 3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5 7 9 8 9 5 7</td>
<td>5 9 9 8 8 8 9</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 3 4 10 4 2 3</td>
<td>4 3 3 3 7 8 5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 9 9 8 7 4 6</td>
<td>10 8 9 3 6 9 9</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 5 7 2 8 2 3</td>
<td>10 3 6 3 3 9 5</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3 2 3 4 7 2 2</td>
<td>10 3 4 2 2 5 7</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7 4 5 6 9 3 4</td>
<td>10 5 6 5 3 8 9</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7 4 2 7 4 3 6</td>
<td>10 3 7 5 4 6 5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6 9 10 8 9 4 6</td>
<td>10 8 9 5 7 7 8</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6 4 5 10 3 4 4</td>
<td>9 8 6 5 3 9 6</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5 2 3 3 8 3 2</td>
<td>5 2 7 2 4 8 2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Items 3 and 10; 7 and 12; and 6 and 9 were considered matched in level of difficulty for Form A and B of the MCRI. Items 3, 6 and 7 were selected for Form A and items 9, 10 and 12 for Form B.
APPENDIX D

EXAMPLES OF JUDGES' RATINGS OF NEED AND ISSUE RESPONSES TO CONFLICT SITUATIONS ON THE MODIFIED CONFLICT RESOLUTION INVENTORY

The following rates were randomly drawn from a list of responses where judges had unanimous agreement as to the orientation toward conflict resolution by the subject. The situation is given first, followed by the Need response and Issue response, respectively. Each response came from a different subject.

Situation: Sherri and Jerry find their problems with in-laws. They live in the town as Jerry's parents and brothers and sisters. Jerry's family is close to one another emotionally, socially, etc., and they constantly plan things that involve Sherri and Jerry. Jerry often expresses how happy he is to have such good family relationships. Sherri keeps finding more and more things that disengage them from Jerry's family activities. Sherri says she really likes Jerry's family.

Need response: Sherri and Jerry ought to use the conflict resolution process. They should identify the issue which is: Jerry wants to spend time with his family and Sherri doesn't. They should set a time to discuss it when neither person is tired, sick or hungry. They then should find the relationship between issue and their basic needs. Sherri's need to feel love is threatened when Jerry always wants to spend time with his family. She feels that she and Jerry have formed their own family now and ought to be more independent of his family. She feels that if he really loves her he should want to spend almost all his time with her. Jerry's need to feel loved is threatened when Sherri keeps finding more and more things to disengage them in Jerry's family. Jerry is very happy to have such strong family ties and feels that Sherri is not being loving when she pulls in the other direction. They need to convey an understanding to each other of their basic needs. Now they must look for alternative choices. A good alternative would be to spend less time with Jerry's family as they did before. This is probably the alternative they should choose. Jerry would still keep close family ties, but Sherri would be able to spend time with Jerry away from his family. They should set an evaluation time, probably
a week or so off. Reason: This is a mutually satisfying agreement. (Because they understand each other now.)

**Issue response:** Sherri and Jerry need to talk about this together. Sherri says she really likes Jerry's family yet she tries to find reasons to disengage from Jerry's family activities, which means that she is not being truthful with Jerry or herself. Family relationships are very important, and should be continued if at all possible. So Jerry and Sherry should talk and find out where the problem really lies.

Situation: Henry and Margo live in suburbia with a large house and a good income. Henry works very hard and is gone quite frequently on business trips. Margo has been active in civic groups and a church club. Their conflict revolves around the issue of: Henry wants to spend time with other couples, Margo wants them to spend time by themselves.

**Need response:** The conflict revolves around the way Margo and Henry want to spend time together. They should definitely talk to each other and listen to each others' viewpoint and try to understand the needs in respect to the conflict then after communication and understanding, choose a good solution. It seems Margo needs time alone with her husband, possibly to feel loved on a more one to one basis. Possibly she feels taken for granted and needs to be reassured. It seems Henry is a bit insensitive to her need for reassurance and individual attention. He possibly feels she is a bit possessive and he enjoys "doing," on the go, etc. Possible alternatives could be spending time alone together sometimes and also going out with others at times. Most important is to sit down and talk it out and understand, then to satisfy needs in each other of being loved and feeling worthwhile. When the two of them are out with others maybe each could make a special effort to remain united in spirit either with a glance, a touch, that way togetherness can be there with or without others around.

**Issue response:** My solution to this problem is for Henry and Margo to compromise and see friends once in a while and be together at other times. I would suggest them being to themselves more often than to spend time with friends. Reasons: Since Henry is frequently gone they should spend more time to themselves than other couples because they need time to communicate on a one
to one basis. Whereas a visit with another couple(s) once in a while keeps them from privately expressing themselves.

Situation: Betty and Earl have been married less than a year. Their dating and engagement took place on a college campus. Each had more schooling to finish, but they choose to be married while finishing their degrees. Finances are tight, but they seem sufficient to "get by." The conflict seems to be in Betty's mind only: "She goes to school full-time and has 'housework' to do also—she doesn't know how to get Earl to help her."

Need response: Betty and Earl ought to use the conflict resolution model to solve this problem. First they should identify the issue. Betty is unhappy because she is going to school full-time and doing all of the housework as well. They should set a time to discuss the problem when neither of them are sick, tired or hungry. During this time they need to find the relationship between the issue and their basic needs. Betty's need to feel loved is threatened when she has to do all of the housework. This feeling needs to be communicated to Earl and he should convey an understanding. They need to look for alternative choices. One alternative is that Earl share part of the housework. Another alternative is that they take turns doing all of the housework. They need to select an alternative choice. Probably the best choice would be an equal division of labor. Each of them will have their own specific chores. Of course this doesn't mean it is a completely rigid division. If Betty has a test one evening, Earl should do the dishes that night, for example even if dishes are part of Betty's housework. Next they need to set a time to evaluate their decision. Probably Thursday of next week would be a good day because that is exactly one week off and neither of them has a test or assignment due the following day and they planned to be at home that night so it would be a good time to discuss it. Reason: This is a mutually satisfying solution because they understand each other now.

Issue response: Try to explain to Earl that you have just as much to do as he does and that you need help doing the housework. You need to see what his feelings are about housework. Is he against it, or does he think it is a woman's work, or perhaps he feels that you want to do that work. There seems to be a lack of communication, it seems that it is something that needs to be worked out between the two of you. You can't make Earl help unless you threaten to leave him. He must want to help.
Situation: Bill who is 28 years old, was married 3 1/2 years and then divorced. Kathy who is 22 years old, and Bill dated for 9 months before they were married. They have been married 3 1/2 years and have two children. Bill works for an engineering firm in a semi-skilled position, Kathy has worked at a bank and has recently started to attend college. She says she no longer loves Bill and wants a divorce.

Need response: I think the conflict lies in Kathy's feelings of not being loved or feeling worthwhile. Sometimes college gives a person fantastic goals to aim for—goals that possibly Kathy realizes that she and her husband and family can't reach. She then does not feel worthwhile and because she feels Bill is holding her back she does not love him as much as she once did. I suggest that they sit down together when both are emotionally calm and discuss what each wants and expects for and from life. Together, possibly they can plan for new horizons and so fulfill both Kathy and Bill's psychological needs.

Issue response: First they should talk over the reason why Kathy no longer loves Bill. There has to be more to it than just not loving him anymore. It might be something that she has not said to him or even talked to him about. Things might be able to be worked out if they could only talk them over. Sometimes the smallest little things can turn into the biggest fights. If you could learn to talk about them when they are still small problems you might save a large fight from even being thought of.
APPENDIX E

RELEVANCE OF CONFLICT RESOLUTION

(This form of the instrument has the numerical weights inserted on the continuum scales. These weights were not present when the subjects responded. Those items that are not weighted are not included on a subject's score. The "Value to Others" (Part I) score may range from 0 to 114. The "Value to Self" (Part II) score may range from 0 to 60.)

Please mark the following statements according to your present feelings about each.

PART I
(Others)

1. Conflicts of engaged couples I know are generally:
   - Minor: 0 : 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6
   - Frequent: 6 : 5 : 4 : 3 : 2 : 1 : 0
   - Disruptive: 6 : 5 : 4 : 3 : 2 : 1 : 0
   - Based on Misunderstanding: 0 : 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6
   - Beneficial: 6 : 5 : 4 : 3 : 2 : 1 : 0

2. Conflicts of married couples I know are generally:
   - Beneficial: 0 : 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6
   - Major: 6 : 5 : 4 : 3 : 2 : 1 : 0
   - Differences in Outlook on Life: 0 : 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6
   - Because of Misunderstanding: 6 : 5 : 4 : 3 : 2 : 1 : 0

3. When a person has a conflict, he (she) generally makes it bigger than what it is:
   - Yes: 0 : 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6
   - No

4. Some "common sense" would help most people resolve their conflicts:
   - Yes: 6 : 5 : 4 : 3 : 2 : 1 : 0
   - No
5. Special training on how to handle (or manage) conflicts would be:

Helpful to: of little value to:
Engaged couples 6:6:4:3:2:1:0
Married couples 6:5:4:3:2:1:0
Everyone 6:5:4:3:2:1:0

6. Generally speaking, people should be concerned about conflicts:

Less than More than
they are 0:1:2:3:4:5:6 they are

7. My parents' way of handling conflict is (was):

Constructive 0:1:2:3:4:5:6 Destructive
Noisy ______ ______ ______ ______
What I want to follow 0:1:2:3:4:5:6 Not what I want to follow

8. My friends' ways of handling conflicts are:

Quiet ______ ______ ______ ______ Noisy
Destructive 6:5:4:3:2:1:0 Constructive
Not what I want to follow 6:5:4:3:2:1:0 What I want to follow

9. Conflicts remain unresolved because people don't:

A - Look at their problems:
High Percent 6:5:4:3:2:1:0 Low Percent

B - Express themselves:
Low Percent 0:1:2:3:4:5:6 High Percent

C - Know how:
High Percent 6:5:4:3:2:1:0 Low Percent
PART II
(Self)

10. Conflicts I have, that are of major concern to me are:

Resolved immediately 0 : 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6 Still pending
Poorly Resolved 6 : 5 : 4 : 3 : 2 : 1 : 0 Satisfactorily handled

11. Conflicts I have with other people are:

Easy to bring up 0 : 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6 Very touchy
Based on our frequent misunderstandings Because of basic differences we have
Frequent 6 : 5 : 4 : 3 : 2 : 1 : 0 Few
Minor 0 : 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6 Major

12. Special training on how to handle (or manage) conflicts would be:

Helpful to me 6 : 5 : 4 : 3 : 2 : 1 : 0 Of little value to me

13. My concern about conflicts and their resolution is:

Greater than Less than it should be 0 : 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6 it should be

14. My conflicts which remain unresolved, are mainly because I don't:

A - Express myself:
High Percent 6 : 5 : 4 : 3 : 2 : 1 : 0 Low Percent

B - Look at the problem:
Low Percent 0 : 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6 High Percent

C - Know how:
Low Percent 0 : 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6 High Percent
PART III
(Response to the Program)

Please answer each question fully.

1. What has this training program meant to you? Did it help you move toward your goal of communication in marriage?

2. Do you think that the kind of experience we had in class would be important for other people? Who (What groups) and how would it serve their needs?

3. Have you used, or do you see use for, the Conflict Resolution Model in your personal interactions:
   a) Currently: Yes or no, with whom and how often?
   b) Immediate future?
   c) Ultimate future?

4. Do you think the program would have been more effective with couples, engaged or married, rather than group member pairs? Why or how?

5. What changes would you recommend in the program when it is offered to another group?

(A judge rates the narrative of items 1, 2, and 3 b and c on a five-point scale of: 0 = none or no, 1 = a little, 2 = average, 3 = a lot and 4 = very much. Item #1 is doubled in weight and added to the scores of items 2 and 3 b and c for the "activation" total score. This score is continuous and may range from 0 to 21. Item 3a is scored: yes = 1, no = 0. The "use" score is obtained from the number of times used in item 3a and is a discrete variable with two categories: 0 to 2 uses or 3 or more uses. Items 4 and 5 are not used as independent variable data. On the form used by the subjects there was ample room for each response.)
APPENDIX F

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA QUESTIONNAIRE

5. Father's occupation________, Father's approx. income______,
   Father's education, circle the correct answer: a. less than seven years; b. junior high (7-9); c. partial high school (10-11); d. high school graduate; e. partial college (1-3 years) was a vocational trade learned, f. if so, what?_________; g. college graduate (B.A. degree); h. training beyond B.A. degree; i. Master's degree; j. Doctoral degree; k. Other______________________.
6. What is your current College Grade-Point Average:____ Have you received any academic honors? What:________ How many credit hours are you taking this term____, How much time do you spend in an average week on all your course work____, How much time do you spend on this course in an average week_____.
7. If you are presently going steady, pinned, engaged or married,
   how long have you known this partner: Years____ Months____. In past relationships where you went steady or were pinned, engaged or married, how long did you know that partner and what type of relationship did you have? Person A - Years____, Months____, Type____; Person B - Years____, Months____, Type____. Others:_____________________________________________________.
   How many individuals have you dated, including your present partner, for a period of two months or longer?____. For those who are not married or living in a permanent living arrangement, how many individuals are you living with in your present living arrangement?____ What is the longest period of time you have lived with any one of them?____ How much do you interact with the one(s) you live with at the present time: Very little____:____:____:____:____ Very much
8. Occupational goal and/or major selected_____. Have you changed your goals in the last two years?_____

9. Do you have a religious affiliation: Yes  No. If so, are you: Active, semi-active or inactive.

10. What social groups do you belong to and how active: High, Medium, or low for each: a)_______, b)_______, c)_______, d)_______, etc._______

11. Circle the attendance that best fits you in this class: (Day Section) 0-1 day absent, 2-3 days absent, 4-6 days absent, 7 or more days absent; (Night Section) No absence, 1 night absent, 2 nights absent, 3 or more nights absent.

SCORING DATA--NOT ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE SUBJECTS

Items numbered 4, 8, 9, 10, and 11 were not used as independent variables in this study.

Item 1 is viewed in two discrete categories for this study: 21 years of age and younger and 22 years of age and older.

Item 2 is male or female.

Item 3 is viewed in six discrete categories for this study: single, going steady, pinned, engaged, engaged with partner present in training, and married.

Item 5 is viewed as a composite, continuous variable of: occupation, education and income of subject's Father.

Occupational ratings are the reverse weight given to the Hollingshead (1958) scale--the higher occupations carried the greater numerical weight, from 1 to 7.

Educational ratings were for item (a) a score of 1, (b) a score of 2, on to item (i) a score of 10. A vocational trade, item f, was scored 6.

Income ratings: $5000 or below = 1; 5000 to 6000 = 2; 6000-7500 = 3; 7500-9000 = 4; 9000-11000 = 5; 11000-13000 = 6; 13000-15000 = 7; 15000-17500 = 8; 17500-20000 = 9; 20000-25000 = 10; 25000-37500 = 11; 37500-50000 = 12; 50000-100,000 = 13; and 100,000 or more = 14.

These three parts were added for the socioeconomic status score.
Item 6 is viewed as a composite, continuous variable composed of GPA, academic honors, number of hours spent on studies, number of hours spent on the training procedures and number of hours at work per week.

GPA Freshmen: 0.0 to 1.0 = 1; 1.0 to 2.0 = 2; 2.0 to 2.5 = 3; 2.5 to 3.0 = 4; 3.0 to 3.5 = 5; and 3.5 to 4.0 = 6.

Sophomores: 0.0 to 1.0 = 1; 1.0 to 1.5 = 2; 1.5 to 2.0 = 3; 2.0 to 2.5 = 4; 2.5 to 3.0 = 5; 3.0 to 3.5 = 6; and 3.5 to 4.0 = 7.

Juniors and Seniors: 0.0 to 1.5 = 2; 1.5 to 2.5 = 4; 2.5 to 3.0 = 6; 3.0 to 3.5 = 8 and 3.5 to 4.0 = 10.

Academic Honors: each honor, i.e., high honor roll, scholastic group membership = 6

Hours on all school work: Number of hours spent divided by number of credit hours; plus: 5 points for 2 to 9 credit hours, 7 points for 10 to 14 credit hours, 9 points for 15 to 18 credit hours, and 11 points for 19 or more credit hours carried. Score rounded to nearest whole number.

Hours on training procedures divided by 2 and rounded to nearest whole number.

Hours of work per week divided by 6 and rounded to nearest whole number.

These five scores were summed for the academic achievement score.

Item 7 is viewed as a composite, continuous variable composed of:

Present relationship: Steady dating = 1/2 point per month; engaged or pinned = 1 point per month; and married = 2 points per month.

Past partner relationships: same as present relationship for each separate relationship.

Number of persons dated for 2 months or more = 1 point per person.

Number in present living arrangement: 1 to 2 persons = 4 points; 3 to 4 persons = 5 points; 5 to 8 persons = 6 points; 9 or more persons = 7 points; and married = 10 points.

Period of living with one person: 3 months = 2 points; 4 to 6 months = 3 points; 7 to 12 months = 4 points; 1 to 2 years = 5 points; and 2 or more years = 7 points.
Interaction in present living arrangements: Married - 2 times scale value (1 = very little to 7 = very much); 1 to 3 persons = 1 time the scale value, and 4 or more persons = 2 times the scale value.

All the above sections of item 7 were summed for the Relationship Interaction variable.