Journal QR Code:

Article:	**Authority, Personality, and its Effects on Conflict Resolution Behaviour among Students of Istanbul Bilgi University**
Author(s):	Ayesha Gul Arif[1], Gergely Czukor[2]
Affiliation:	[1]University of Management and Technology, Lahore, Pakistan [2]Istanbul Bilgi University, Istanbul, Turkey
Online Published:	Fall 2020
Article DOI:	https://doi.org/10.32350/uer.32.01

Article QR Code:

Ayesha Gul Arif

NUMBER OF REFERENCES	NUMBER OF FIGURES	NUMBER OF TABLES
32	00	05

Estd. 1990

Authority, Personality, and its Effects on Conflict Resolution Behaviour among Students of Istanbul Bilgi University

Ayesha Gul Arif[1*] and Dr. Gergely Czukor[2]

[1]University of Management and Technology, Lahore, Pakistan
[2]Istanbul Bilgi University, Istanbul, Turkey

Abstract

The aim of this experimental study was to examine how undergraduate students as participants resolve a conflict in response to authority status manipulation of the opponent person (low: a fellow student; high: a university professor), considering the moderating role of participants' personality traits. 320 Psychology undergraduate students from Istanbul Bilgi University, aged 19-23 participated in an online survey. The participants first completed the Turkish version of the NEO-FFI and then they completed the modified Turkish version of the Thomas-Kilmann Mode Instrument (TKI). It was hypothesised that highly agreeable participants who were faced with a professor in a conflict would show a accommodating resolution style. Whereas extroverted participants who faced a fellow student in were predicted to display competitiveness in the conflict. A moderated regression analysis was applied. The results showed the opposite effects, students who were in conflict with the professor were more competitive and students who were in conflict with fellow students showed more accommodation. Limitations and future research possibilities are also discussed.

Keywords: conflict resolution, authority, personality, NEO-FFI, TKI

Introduction

In everyday life, conflicts are inevitable. In any particular situation, nobody truly has full control over a situation. How a person handles these conflicts is of particular importance because sometimes conflicts are handled very smoothly, and the two parties may end up cooperating or collaborating; however, at other times, conflict situations are ignored and are worsened as time goes by, which makes it even more difficult for the parties to negotiate and resolve the conflict (Rahim & Jaffery, 2019). There are several different ways to solve conflicts, and these may be dependent on the situation, for example, with whom the person has a conflict. If the other party has a higher authority status than the person, they may choose a more obligating style, whereas they might choose a more dominating style if the other party was from a lower authority status (Mukherjee & Upadhyay, 2019).

---

*Corresponding author: ayeshagul96@gmail.com

Conflict Resolution style may also be affected by personality. Personality has been known to explain certain behaviors and attitudes; it can impact our motivation to do something (Aliakbari & Amiri, 2016). Ayub et al. (2017) contend that people are sensitive towards conflicts, and they do not want to manage it poorly; personality traits affect conflict handling; therefore, the relationship between the two must be seriously approached.

Conflicts are misunderstood; they are thought of as problems; however, conflicts can add to a healthy working relationship. Most of the previous research focuses on how either personality or a situational factor determines to come to a resolution. It is paramount to understand that behavior is not affected by one aspect but several aspects, including personality and situational factors. The present study examines the authority level as a situational factor and personality to see what relationship it has with conflict resolution strategies.

Authority Level

There are several reasons why conflicts may occur, and if we take the example of a classroom, conflicts may occur between students or between a student and a teacher. This could be because of a lack of communication, expressing emotions improperly, or even the misuse of authority. Authority level is the actual or perceived status of the person. It can be noted that generally if a person is talking to someone who has a higher status level in terms of authority, like a teacher and a student, the student would be more respectful, less aggressive, and may even be more obliging than usual. However, when talking to a fellow student, the individual may be more competitive and dominating; this could also be affected by the type of personality the individual has and the criticalness of the situation.

Obedience to authority can be seen from research as early as Milgram's study on obedience (Milgram, 1963). The experiment showed that people were capable of inflicting harm to others as obedience to authority; Hofling et al. (1966) further conducted an experiment on nurses and found out that they would not question the doctors as they have higher authority (Gibson, 2020). Lee (2002) found out that participants in a conflict with their superior would either choose a more obliging conflict resolution style or avoid it. Brockman et al. (2010) showed that students tend to be more obliging towards authority or tend to be avoided when in conflict with a faculty advisor. Through these examples, it is seen that authority can play a decisive role in what conflict resolution strategy a person might choose.

Personality Type and Assessment

Recent researchers have started to take personality into account as affecting conflict resolution behavior (Godse & Thingujam, 2010; Broukhim et al., 2019). Since daily interactions take place in a social situation, and conflicts are bound to occur. Some people try to understand others' emotions and are more compassionate and cooperating when resolving a conflict, which helps maintain a positive relationship. These are the people who generally have high emotional intelligence and are good listeners, which leads to becoming right partners, friends, or eventually, better leaders (van der Linden et al., 2017). Other people, however, may not be that concerned with listening to the other side (Ayachit & Natarajan, 2014). Earlier psychologists found Jungian personality dimensions relevant to conflict resolution behavior. Myers (1962) quantified this by dividing it into four aspects of the Jungian theory: Introversion-extraversion, thinking-feeling, sensation-intuition, judging-perceiving, called the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Researchers have recently used the Big Five Personality Inventory in various educational settings (Aliakbari, & Amiri, 2016; Canaan Messarra et al., 2016). The following ideas discuss how the Big Five traits may be predictors of conflict resolution styles.

Agreeableness. Agreeable people are seen to want positive relations with others and avoid conflicts. They are generally more trusting and cooperative. Thus, they try to avoid behavior that does not compliment their personality, such as competition (Park & Antonioni, 2007). These people are concerned with satisfying other people's needs and would sacrifice their own for them also. They are relatively more accepting (Antonioni, 1998); therefore, Agreeable people would be more likely to have an accommodating, avoiding, collaborating style of conflict resolution.

Extraversion. People with high extraversion are seen to have more social skills, which means they can work with other people; they are more assertive and confident. They may be seen as aggressive as they can be the opposite of people with a high agreeable trait because extroverts may fight for their own needs without being concerned about other people's needs (Antonioni, 1998). Because they have good social skills, they can be cooperative and come to solutions that are a win for both sides. However, they are also dominating and can be competitive (Park & Antonioni, 2007).

Neuroticism. Neuroticism is seen as emotional instability; people high in neuroticism may be depressed, more pessimistic, deal with anxiety problems. For these reasons, it is hard for them to control their impulses. Which can make them attacking or wanting to avoid conflicts at all costs (Park & Antonioni, 2007). They

may also use compromising conflict resolution styles because they would only compete till the point their anxiety level is maintained. If it rises, they are more likely to agree with other people not to feel anxious anymore.

Conscientiousness. Individuals high in conscientiousness are relatively more organized, they like to plan things and achieve things, which is why they are rendered competitive people. They are task-oriented and are more disciplined; that is why they can be more willing to listen to the other party and come to a collaborative solution (Antonioni, 1998). We can derive the word conscience from conscientiousness, which essentially indicates being moral and following social rules and norms, which is why a person with high conscientiousness may be more cooperative.

Openness. People with high scores in openness are more adventurous and imaginative. They like to experience different things, as they are open to experience; they are more likely to engage in conversation and debate on a situation (Park & Antonioni, 2007). These individuals are seen to be more competitive, but if a person hears somebody else's arguments, that will mean they are likely to engage in a cooperative and collaborating style of conflict resolution. They would not altogether avoid the situation as they are relatively more engaging, and they would be accommodating to the extent the other party is accommodating in return.

Conflict Resolution Style

Pondy (1976) divided the conflict into three categories, bargaining, bureaucratic, and systems model. Jehn (1997) categorized conflict into three types, task conflict, relationship conflict, and process conflict. There are many different types of conflicts, and how an individual manages and resolves a conflict is of great importance. Blake et al. (1964) proposed Conflict management styles by include withdrawing, smoothing, forcing, problem-solving, and compromising. Rahim and Bonoma (1979) further extended this model by adding the two dimensions of concern for one's outcomes and other's outcomes. Rahim (1983, 1986) developed an inventory for conflict resolution styles, called the Rahim Organisational Conflict Inventory, which included integrating, obliging, dominating, avoiding, and compromising conflict resolution styles (as cited in Özkalp et al., 2009).

The measure used in this research is the Thomas-Kilmann Mode Instrument (TKI), as it has been a reliable test tool. The dimensions of the TKI include the following styles of conflict resolution.

Competing. People high in competing are usually bolder, dominant, and confident. They try to achieve what they want and show less concern for the other

party's concerns. It is useful if a quick decision is required that is seen as a win-lose approach, which may displease the party who loses.

Accommodating. This is the opposite of competing; more accommodating people are usually less bold, slow in making a decision, and they depend on others. They usually are more concerned about others rather than themselves. It is useful when a person cannot develop a solution and would like to get ideas from somebody else; however, this may make the person feel overpowered or taken advantage of.

Avoiding. Avoidance is like accommodation in terms of the person is usually unassertive and does not like to make decisions, but the difference is that people who are avoiding are ignoring the conflict or postponing it. This might be useful if the conflict is unimportant, but usually ignoring the conflict and letting time pass by exacerbates the situation.

Collaborating. A person who scores high in collaboration is seen as dominant and assertive, but at the same time, they are also seen as cooperative. Collaboration is the opposite of Avoiding. People who adopt a collaborating style of conflict resolution tend to find solutions to the problem that satisfy their concerns and the other party's concerns. It is useful because it maintains a healthy relationship, and important ideas and views are not missed. It is seen as a win-win approach requiring much listening, time, and effort.

Compromising. In a compromise, the two parties come to a mutual solution; however, this is mostly temporary, and both the parties do not get what they want. This is useful for situations where collaboration cannot be achieved.

Current Study

To sum up, the current study examined the relationship between authority level and conflict resolution style, personality and conflict resolution style, and the interaction of personality, authority, and its relationship with conflict resolution style. There were two authority levels, superior and similar. To assess personality, the NEO-FFI was used, and the TKI assessed the conflict resolution styles.

Research Questions

1. What would be the difference in conflict resolution behaviors of students in high authority and low authority roles?
2. What is the effect of Big 5 personality traits on conflict resolution styles?
3. What is the interactive effect of personality and authority on the conflict resolution styles of students?

Method

Participants

Convenience sampling was used to gather participants. The survey was conducted with 320 Istanbul Bilgi University students between the ages of 19 and 23. They were Psychology department students and were given extra credit to participate in the research. There were 158 students in the professor condition and 162 participants in the student condition.

Materials

Personality Inventory

NEO-FFI, developed by Costa and McCrae ([1991](#)) and translated into Turkish by Sunar ([1996](#)) was used to assess personality (Appendix B). The NEO-FFI contains 60 items. Participants were required to choose one of the five responses from the 5-point Likert scale, where 1 equal strongly disagree, and 5 equals strongly agree. The score on each trait shows how much of that trait a person has. The Cronbach's alpha reliability score for neuroticism was .76, extraversion .70, openness to experience .65, agreeableness .70, and conscientiousness was .80.

Conflict Resolution Style Test

To assess the participants' conflict resolution styles, a translated version of the Thomas and Kilmann Mode Instrument (TKI) was used (Thomas & Kilmann, [1974](#)). This was translated into Turkish by using the back-translation method. First, a bilingual expert translated the Instrument from English to Turkish, then it was translated by another bilingual from Turkish to English, and those two versions were finally given to a third bilingual to compare them and create a suitable Turkish translation. The TKI consists of 30 forced-choice items. The participants chose statements that best fit their behavior. The forced choice was used by Thomas and Kilmann to control the social desirability bias and to make sure that it includes all five dimensions of the conflict resolution styles.

A hypothetical conflict was included before the TKI either with a student (Appendix C) or a professor (Appendix D). This helped in judging the student responses to the changing authority levels. The Cronbach's alpha reliability score for the conflict resolution styles showed that the competition's coefficient was 0.69. The reliability analysis indicated that removing one item (R6) increased the coefficient alpha from 0.69 to 0.72. The collaboration was 0.02. The compromise was .36; the analysis showed that removing the item R20 increased the alpha to 0.42. The alpha for avoidance was 0.33; removing items 1 and 7 increased the alpha

to .42. The alpha for accommodation was 0.38; removing the items R1 and R15 increased the alpha to 0.50. The collaboration was removed from the analysis as it did not have a reliable result.

Procedure

Undergraduate Psychology students from different courses were asked to participate in the study. They were given extra credit to complete the surveys for their course. It was online research. Informed consent was given to the students that included the study's procedure, potential risks and benefits, researcher's contact information, and a statement explaining that it is voluntary participation, and the students may leave if they wish to (Appendix A). The whole purpose of the study was not disclosed because it could have resulted in social desirability bias. They were told that it is a study regarding their personality type. The participants then finished the NEO-FFI and the TKI. When they finished, they were debriefed about the whole purpose of the study, and they had the opportunity to ask for their results on the Personality test and the Conflict Resolution Style test.

Results

Hypotheses I–III was tested using regression analysis. The independent variables, 1) condition (student or professor) 2) five personality traits (extraversion, neuroticism, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness) were entered in the first step, and the interaction term (the product term between the condition and each of the five personality traits separately) in the second step. The participants' responses on the Thomas-Kilmann Mode Instrument (TKI) provided one score for each of the five tested conflict resolution style preferences (competition, collaboration, compromise, avoidance, accommodation). Therefore, for each of these resolution style scores, a separate regression analysis was conducted with 5 personality traits individually, along with the condition.

The descriptive statistics summarize the means of the data (Table 1).

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of Data

Variables	N	Min	Max	M	SD
Neurotiicismm	320	1.50	4.83	3.21	0.70
Extraversion	320	1.58	4.75	3.26	0.59
Openness	320	1.75	4.25	3.38	0.45
Agreeableness	320	1.92	4.67	3.36	0.49
Conscientiousness	320	1.50	4.92	3.39	0.63

Variables	N	Min	Max	M	SD
Competition	320	0.00	12.00	3.81	2.56
Compromise	320	3.00	11.00	8.25	1.59
Avoidance	320	1.00	10.00	5.60	1.82
Accomodation	320	0.00	9.00	3.54	2.00
Condition*Extraversion	320	-5.10	4.22	-0.01	1.55
Condition*Neuroticism	320	-4.89	4.64	0.02	1.57
Condition*Openness	320	-7.26	3.52	0.06	1.60
Condition*Agreeableness	320	-4.61	3.96	0.02	1.51
Condition*Conscientiousness	320	-5.98	4.03	-0.01	1.54

The analyses were performed with the condition and the five personality traits as predictors and the conflict resolution styles as the outcome variable. Results for competition showed that, in step 1, condition, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness were significant predictors, $F_{(6, 313)} = 11.70$, $p < .05$. In step 2, the interaction terms were not a significant predictor, $F_{(5, 308)} = 0.44$, $p > .05$ (See *Table 2*).

Table 2

Regression Analysis Predicting Competition (N=320)

Step	Variables	R^2	R^2 change	B1	B2
1		.18**	.18**		
	Condition			-.17**	-.17**
	Extraversion			.11	.06
	Neuroticism			.06	.27
	Openness			.11	.04
	Agreeableness			-.38**	-.43*
	Conscientiousness			.16**	.28
2		.19	.01		
	Condition x Extraversion				.05
	Condition x Neuroticism				-.22
	Condition x Openness				.07
	Condition x Agreeableness				.06
	Condition x Conscientiousness				-.12

*p<.05, **p<.01

The analysis for compromise showed that in step 1, neuroticism and agreeableness, were significant predictors, F (6, 313) = 4.38, $p<.05$. In step 2, only the interaction between condition and openness was a significant predictor, F (5, 308) =2.38, $p<.05$ (*Table 3*).

Table 3

Regression Analysis Predicting Compromise (N=320)

Step	Variables	R^2	R^2 change	B1	B2
1		.07**	.07**		
	Condition			.04	.04
	Extraversion			-.01	-.16
	Neuroticism			-.11	-.08
	Openness			-.01	.46
	Agreeableness			.19**	.32
	Conscientiousness			.08	.33
2		.11*	.03*		
	Condition x Extraversion				.16
	Condition x Neuroticism				-.04
	Condition x Openness				-.49**
	Condition x Agreeableness				-.14
	Condition x Conscientiousness				-.25

*p<.05, **p<.01

The analysis for avoidance showed that, in step 1, extraversion, openness and agreeableness were significant predictors, F (6, 313) = 5.40, $p<.05$. In step 2, the interaction terms were not a significant predictor, F (5, 308) =1.02, $p>.05$ (*Table 4*).

Table 4

Regression Analysis Predicting Avoidance (N=320)

Step	Variables	R^2	R^2 change	B1	B2
1		.09**	.09**		
	Condition			-.04	-.04
	Extraversion			-.15	-.04
	Neuroticism			.10*	-.25
	Openness			-.12*	-.11

Step	Variables	R^2	R^2 change	B1	B2
	Agreeableness			.18**	.04
	Conscientiousness			-.11	-.36
2		.10	.02		
	Condition x Extraversion				-.11
	Condition x Neuroticism				.36
	Condition x Openness				.002
	Condition x Agreeableness				.13
	Condition x Conscientiousness				.26

*p<.05, **p<.01

The analysis for accommodation showed that, in step 1, condition, agreeableness, and conscientiousness were significant predictors, F (6, 313) = 4.18, p<.05. In step 2, the interaction terms were not a significant predictor, F (5, 308) =.80, p>.05 (see table 5).

Table 5

Regression Analysis Predicting Accommodation (N=320)

Step	Variables	R^2	R^2 change	B1	B2
1		.07**	.07**		
	Condition			.15**	.15**
	Extraversion			-.03	.04
	Neuroticism			-.03	.12
	Openness			-.07	-.27
	Agreeableness			.19**	.10
	Conscientiousness			-.16*	-.29
2		.09	.01		
	Condition x Extraversion				-.08
	Condition x Neuroticism				-.15
	Condition x Openness				.20
	Condition x Agreeableness				.10
	Condition x Conscientiousness				.14

*p<.05, **p<.01

Conclusions

The present study aimed to examine the combined effect of personality and a situational factor on conflict resolution strategy. The situational factor used was authority status; it consisted of two conditions, a conflict with a professor (with higher authority status) and a conflict with a student (with similar authority status). NEO-FFI and conflict resolution styles assessed personality were predicted by the Thomas-Kilmann Mode Instrument (TKI). Regarding the singular effect of authority on conflict resolution styles, the participants were more competitive in the professor condition (high authority) as compared to the student condition (similar authority); contrarily, the participants were more accommodating in the student condition (similar authority) as compared to the professor condition (high authority).

Regarding the effect of Big5 traits on conflict resolution styles, the participants who had a higher score on agreeableness were less likely to be competing and more likely to be accommodating than those who had a low score in agreeableness. Likewise, the participants who scored high on conscientiousness were more competing and less likely to be accommodating. There were no significant interactive effects regarding the interactive effect of personality and high authority on conflict resolution. Hence, personality alone has a more significant effect on conflict resolution style; the authority has little or no role in managing conflict resolution.

Third, there will be an interaction effect between the authority status conditions and personality traits. For example, if the person were in the professor's condition and had a high agreeableness score, they would be more accommodating.

Discussion

This research was conducted to see the relationship between authority status, personality, and conflict resolution behavior to understand if the level of authority a person has, and their personality type would affect their conflict resolution style.

The results showed that the authority status condition had an unexpected effect; participants were more competitive in the professor's condition than the student condition. Further, participants were more accommodating in the student condition compared to the professor condition. These results contradict previous studies' findings (Lee, 2002; Sandhya & Rajan, 2017), who found out that participants are more obliging towards their superiors. It also contradicts Brockman et al. (2010), who concluded that students would avoid conflict with their advisors. The current study results indicate that the universality of the case of students being

compromising towards professors is questionable. Twenge ([2014](#)) concluded that the younger generation scores higher on assertiveness and have higher expectations, and it is a linear change, i.e., the upcoming generation would show even higher scores on assertiveness and would have higher expectations. These results are in sync with Rahim and Jaffery ([2019](#)); while explaining this research results, it is stressed, as students have relatively higher expectations, they feel more entitled. As the upcoming generation is comparatively more assertive, they become more competitive with a professor to make sure they get what they expect and want (Aliakbari & Amiri, [2016](#); Ciuladiene & Kairiene, [2017](#); Jassawalla & Sashittal, 2017).

The research by Deluga ([1988](#)) explains that subordinates use assertiveness to show that they were highly competent. In terms of social learning theory, the subordinate might model the manager's behavior and show more competitiveness, or they might be rebelling and showing competitiveness (Ayub et al., [2017](#)). The subordinates might have been trying to use a similar strategy as their leader. This may explain why students were more competitive with professors, seem more competent and/or because they think being in the same mindset as the professor would help solve the conflict (Broukhim et al., [2019](#); Pozdnyakova & Pozdnyakov, [2019](#)).

Agreeableness and conscientiousness supported the hypothesis in both professor and student conditions. Participants who had a higher score on agreeableness were less likely to be competitive and more likely to be accommodating than those who had a low score on agreeableness. These findings are supported by Wood and Bell ([2008](#)), in which agreeableness was positively correlated with accommodation and negatively correlated with the competition. Participants who scored high on conscientiousness were more competitive and less likely to accommodate compared to when they scored low in it. Another finding showed that if a person is high on conscientiousness, they are less likely to be avoidant. Agreeableness was positively correlated to compromise and avoidance as predicted: the more agreeable a person was, the more likely they were to compromise or avoid. Participants tended to be more avoiding when they scored low on extraversion. Park and Antonioni ([2007](#)) found a negative relationship between extraversion and avoidance, which supports the results of the current study.

The study results show that conducting a personality assessment may not be the most reliable way of concluding how a person may solve their discrepancies with different people. As there were no significant interactions between the condition

and personality with the conflict resolution style. Students were more competitive with the professor who is generally not expected. These results are beneficial for professors to understand the thinking process of students of the new generation. Previous researches showed that students were more likely to accommodate if they were in a conflict with higher authority. However, the young generation is more assertive and confident. (Twenge, 2014; Rahim & Jaffery, 2019). The current study also shows that Bilgi students are generally more competitive.

The main limitation of this research study is the reliability of the conflict resolution style measure. It would be better to revise the test so that the average alpha coefficient is at least .80. Another implication was that the research design was between subjects, resulting in individual differences being an extraneous variable. As generally more competitive people could have been in the professor condition. It would be more beneficial if the same participants were in both the conditions to draw up differences. One limitation of this study was that the order of the survey was not randomized and counterbalanced. The NEO-FFI was always shown first, followed by the TKI. Given the length of the survey, the participants may have gotten bored and filled the survey randomly. Counterbalancing the survey in this case would have yielded more robust results.

Future research may explore broader and different forms of conflict resolution styles in an educational environment. It is recommended that similar research would be conducted with a younger population to see the difference and if they are more competitive and assertive. Perhaps a different scenario, such as a domestic one, including a conflict between father and son compared to a conflict between siblings, would let us understand more about this topic. It would show us authority scenarios other than those of an educational or professional environment. Furthermore, extensive research is needed, why students are more competitive with professors. As a final point, another issue that could be researched are the cultural differences. Would there be a higher difference between an Eastern culture (assumed to be more collective) and a Western culture (assumed to be more individualistic)?

The results of this research are aimed at the comprehension of interpersonal psychology of cooperativeness and competitiveness in conflict management; In-depth understanding of conflict resolution styles and upcoming generational challenges with millennials would guide the faculty to better deal with these conflicts (Ayub et al., 2017; Pozdnyakova & Pozdnyakov, 2019). University faculty shall adopt the positive way of conflict handling and assist in social capital development of new generation by knowing more about conflict management

strategies and educate oneself with multiple interventions to minimize inter-group conflicts.

References

Aliakbari, M., & Amiri, M. (2016). Personality, face concern, and interpersonal conflict resolution styles: A case of Iranian college students. *Personality and Individual Differences, 97*, 266–271.

Antonioni, D. (1998). Relationship between the big five personality factors and conflict management styles. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, *9*(4), 336–355.

Ayachit, D., &Natarajan, N.K. (2014). Exploring the relationship between personality and conflict resolution style of future managers. *Journal of General Management Research, 1,* 65–76.

Ayub, N., Al-Qurashi, S. M., Al-Yafi, W. A., & Jehn, K. (2017). Personality traits and conflict management styles in predicting job performance and conflict. *International Journal of Conflict Management*,*28*(5), 671–694.

Blake, R. R., Mouton, J. S., Louis, B. B., & Larry, E. G. (1964). *Breakthrough in organization development*. Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University.

Brockman, J. L., Nunez, A. A., & Basu, A. (2010). Effectiveness of a conflict resolution training program in changing graduate students' style of managing conflict with their faculty advisors. *Innovative Higher Education*, *35*(4), 277–293.

Broukhim, M., Yuen, F., McDermott, H., Miller, K., Merrill, L., Kennedy, R., & Wilkes, M. (2019). Interprofessional conflict and conflict management in an educational setting. *Medical Teacher, 41*(4), 408–416.

Canaan Messarra, L., Karkoulian, S., & El-Kassar, A.-N. (2016). Conflict resolution styles and personality: The moderating effect of generation X and Y in a non-Western context. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 65*(6), 792–810.

Ciuladiene, G., & Kairiene, B. (2017). The resolution of conflict between teacher and student: Students' narratives. *Journal of Teacher Education for Sustainability, 19*(2), 107–120.

Costa, P. T. Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1991). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual*. Psychological Assessment Resources.

Deluga, R. J. (1988). The politics of leadership: The relationship between task-people leadership and subordinate influence. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *9*(4), 359–366.

Gibson, S. (2020). *History and systems of psychology, methods and approaches in psychology,social psychology*. Oxford University Press

Godse, A. S., & Thingujam, N. S. (2010). Perceived emotional intelligence and conflict resolution styles among information technology professionals: testing the mediating role of personality. *Singapore Management Review*, *32*(1), 69–83.

Hofling, C. K., Brotzman, E., Dalrymple, S., Graves, N., & Pierce, C. M. (1966). An experimental study in nurse-physician relationships. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, *143*(2), 171–180.

Jehn, K. A. (1997). A qualitative analysis of conflict types and dimensions in organizational groups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*,*42*, 530–557.

Lee, C. W. (2002). Referent role and styles of handling interpersonal conflict: Evidence from a national sample of Korean local government employees. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, *13*(2), 127–141.

Milgram, S. (1963). Behavioral study of obedience. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *67*(4), 371.

Mukherjee, K., & Upadhyay, D. (2019). Effect of mental construal's on cooperative and competitive conflict management styles. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 30*(2), 202–226.

Myers, I. B. (1962). *The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator: Manual 1962*. Consulting Psychologist Press.

Özkalp, E., Sungur, Z., & Özdemir, A. (2009). Conflict management styles of Turkish managers. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, *33*(5), 419–438.

Park, H., & Antonioni, D. (2007). Personality, reciprocity, and strength of conflict resolution strategy. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *41*(1), 110–125.

Pondy, L. R. (1967). Organizational conflict: Concepts and models. *Administrative Science Quarterly*,*13*, 296–320.

Pozdnyakova, O., & Pozdnyakov, A. (2018, October). *Conflict management in the educational process at the university* [Paper Presentation]. International Conference on Reliability and Statistics in Transportation and Communication (pp. 798-807). Springer.

Rahim, M. A. (1983). Measurement of organizational conflict. *The Journal of General Psychology, 109*(2), 189–199.

Rahim, M. A. (1986). Referent role and styles of handling interpersonal conflict. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 126*(1), 79–86.

Rahim, M. A., & Bonoma, T. V. (1979). Managing organizational conflict: A model for diagnosis and intervention. *Psychological Reports, 44*(3c), 61–66.

Rahim, M. A., & Katz, P. J. (2019). Forty years of conflict: the effects of gender and generation on conflict-management strategies. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 31*(1), 1–16.

Sandhya, M. & Rajan, S. (2017). Role of personality type and leadership style in the choice of the conflict handling style of the college principals and directors of the colleges in the state of Punjab. South Asian *Journal of Marketing & Management Research, 7*(6), 138–154.

Sunar, D. (1996). *Turkish adaptation of the NEO-FFI* [Unpublished Manuscript]. Bogazici University, Istanbul.

Thomas, K.W., & Kilmann, R.H. (1974). *Thomas-Kilmann conflict mode instrument.* Consulting Psychologists Press.

Twenge, J. M. (2014). *Generation me-revised and updated: Why today's young Americans are more confident, assertive, entitled--and more miserable than ever before*. Simon and Schuster.

van der Linden, D., Pekaar, K. A., Bakker, A. B., Schermer, J. A., Vernon, P. A., Dunkel, C. S., & Petrides, K. V. (2017). Overlap between the general factor of personality and emotional intelligence: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 143*(1), 36–52.

Wood, V. F., & Bell, P. A. (2008). Predicting interpersonal conflict resolution styles from personality characteristics. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *45*(2), 126–131.

Appendix A

Informed Consent Form

Bilgilendirilmiş Gönüllü Onam Formu

Bu araştırma Ayesha Gul Arif tarafından yürütülen lisans tezi araştırmasıdır. Araştırmanın amacı bireylerdeki değişik kişilikleri belirlemektir. Araştırma tahminen 20-30 dakika sürecektir. Çalışmanın amacına ulaşması için sizden beklenen, bütün soruları eksiksiz, kimsenin baskısı olmadan, size en uygun gelen cevapları vererek cevaplamanızdır. Ayrıca, bu araştırma sağlığınıza herhangi bir türlü zarar vermemekle, sadece kişilikler ve kişilik dinamikleri ile ilgili bilgi verecektir. Bu çalışmaya katılmak tamamen gönüllülük esasına dayanmaktadır, istediğiniz zaman araştırmayı bırakma hakkına sahipsiniz. Araştırmamının sonunda sonuçlarınızı irtibata geçerek isteyebilirsiniz. Bu formu okuyup onaylamanız, araştırmaya katılmayı kabul ettiğiniz anlamına gelecektir.

Araştırma ile ilgili sorularınızı şimdi sorabilir veya **gul.arif@bilgiedu.net** e-posta adresinden ulaştırabilirsiniz.

Lütfen yukardaki formu okuduktan sonra katılımcı olarak devam etmek istiyorsanız, "Kabul ediyorum" seçeneğini seçiniz.

☐ Kabul ediyorum

☐ Kabul etmiyorum

Appendix B

Turkish Adaptation of NEO-FFI

NEO-FFI

N1 I am not a worrier.
Herşeyi kendime dert etmem.

E2 I like to have a lot of people around me.
Etrafımda birçok insan olmasından hoşlanırım.

03 I don't like to waste my time daydreaming.
Zamanımı hayal kurarak harcamaktan hoşlanmam.

A4 I try to be courteous to everyone I meet.
Herkese karşı nazik olmaya çalışırım.

C5 I keep my belongings clean and neat.
Eşyalarımı temiz ve düzenli tutarım.

N6 I often feel to inferior to others.
Sık sık başkaları kadar iyi ya da yeterli olmadığımı hissederim.

E7 I laugh easily.
Kolay gülerim.

O8 Once I find the right way to do something, I stick to it.
Bir şeyi yapmanın doğru yolunu bulduktan sonra ondan şaşmam.

A9 I often get into arguments with my family and friends.
Ailemdekilerle ve arkadaşlarımla sık sık tartışırım.

C10 I'm pretty good about pacing myself so as to get things done on time.
İşleri zamanında yetiştirmek için kendimi oldukça iyi ayarlarım.

N11 When I am under a great deal of stress, sometimes I feel like I'm going to pieces.
Çok fazla stres altında olduğum zamanlarda bazen kendimi dağılacakmış gibi hissederim.

E12 I don't consider myself especially "light-hearted."
Kendimi pek o kadar "gamsız" biri olarak görmüyorum.

O13 I am intrigued by the patterns I find in art and nature.
Sanatta ve doğada gözlediğim biçimler bende derin bir merak uyandırır.

A14 Some people think I'm selfish and egotistical.
Bazı insanlar benim bencil ve egoist olduğumu düşünür.

C15 I am not a very methodical person.
Çok sistemli biri değilim.

N16   I rarely feel lonely or blue.
Kendimi yalnız ya da hüzünlü hissettiğim zamanlar çok azdır.

E17   I really enjoy talking to people.
İnsanlarla konuşmaktan gerçekten çok hoşlanırım.

O18   I believe letting students hear controversial speakers can only confuse and mislead them.
Öğrencilere aykırı görüşleri savunan konuşmacıları dinletmenin, sadece kafalarını karıştırıp onları yanlış yönlendireceğine inanıyorum.

A19   I would rather cooperate with others than compete with them.
Başkalarıyla yarışmaktansa, onlarla yardımlaşmayı tercih ederim.

C20   I try to perform al the tasks assigned to me conscientiously.
Bana verilen tüm işleri sorumlu bir şekilde yerine getirmeye çabalarım.

N21   I often feel tense and jittery.
Kendimi sık sık gergin ve sinirli hissederim.

E22   I like to be where the action is.
Nerede hareket varsa, orada olmak isterim.

O23   Poetry has little or no effect on me.
Şiirden pek etkilenmem.

A24   I tend to be cynical and sceptical of others' intentions.
Başkalarının davranışlarına şüpheyle bakar, art niyet ararım.

C25   I have a clear set of goals and work toward them in an orderly fashion.
Belirli hedeflerim vardır ve bunlara ulaşmak için düzenli bir biçimde çalışırım.

N26   Sometimes I feel completely worthless.
Bazen kendimi tamamen değersiz hissederim.

E27   I usually prefer to do things alone.
Genellikle yalnız başıma birşeyler yapmayı yeğlerim.

O28   I often try new and foreign foods.
Sık sık yeni ve yabancı yemekler denerim.

A29   I believe that most people will take advantage of you if you let them.
İzin verdiğiniz takdirde, çoğu insanın sizi kullanacağına inanırım.

C30   I waste a lot of time before settling down to work.
Çalışmaya başlayıncaya kadar epey zaman harcarım.

N31   I rarely feel fearful or anxious.
Korktuğum ya da endişeli olduğum zamanlar çok azdır.

E32   I often feel as if I'm bursting with energy.
Sık sık, sanki enerji ile dolup taşıyormuşum gibi hissederim.

O33 I seldom notice the moods or feelings that different environments produce.
Değişik ortamların bende uyandırdığı hislerin ve duygusal değişimlerin ender farkına varırım.

A34 Most people I know like me.
Tanıdığım insanların çoğu beni sever.

C35 I work hard to accomplish my goals.
Amaçlarıma ulaşmak için çok çalışırım.

N36 I often get angry at the way people treat me.
Başkalarının bana karşı davranış şekli beni sinirlendirir.

E37 I am a cheerful, high-spirited person.
Neşeli ve keyif dolu biriyimdir.

O38 I believe we should look to our religious authorities for moral decisions.
Ahlaki konularda karar verirken örf ve adetlerimizin göz önünde bulundurulması gerektiğine inanıyorum.

A39 Some people think of me as cold and calculating.
Bazı insanlar benim soğuk ve içten pazarlıklı biri olduğumu düşünürler.

C40 When I make a commitment, I can always be counted on to follow through.
Bir söz verdiğimde, bunu yerine getireceğime her zaman güvenilebilir.

N41 Too often, when things go wrong, I get discouraged and feel like giving up.
İşler ters gittiğinde, çoğunlukla cesaretim kırılır ve içimden vazgeçmek gelir.

E42 I am not a cheerful optimist
Çok iyimser biri değilimdir.

O43 Sometimes when I am reading poetry or looking at a work of art, I feel a chill or wave of excitement.
Bazen şiir okurken veya bir sanat eserine bakarken, bir ürperti ya da heyecan dalgasının içimde yükseldiğini hissederim.

A44 I'm hard-headed and though-minded in my attitudes.
Tutum ve tavırlarımda duygularıma yer vermem,gerçekçiyimdir.

C45 Sometimes I'm not as dependable or reliable as I should be.
Bazen, olmam gerektiği kadar güvenilir biri olmayabiliyorum.

N46 I am seldom sad and depressed.
Hüzünlü ya da kederli olduğum zamanlar çok azdır.

E47 My life is fast-paced.
Hızlı ve yoğum bir yaşantım vardır.

O48 I have little interest in speculating on the nature of the universe or the human condition.
Evrenin doğası ya da insanlığın durumu gibi konularda fikir yürütmek fazla ilgimi çekmez.

A49 I generally try to be thoughtful and considerate.
Genellikle düşünceli ve anlayışlı biri olmaya çalışırım.

C50 I am a productive person who always gets the job done.
Her zaman eline aldığı işi tamamlayan, üretken bir insanımdır.

N51 I often feel helpless and want someone else to solve my problems.
Sık sık kendimi çaresiz hisseder ve bir başkasının sorunlarımı çözüvermesini isterim.

E52 I am a very active person.
Çok hareketli bir insanımdır.

O53 I have a lot of intellectual curiosity.
Entellektüel merakı çok olan biriyimdir.

A54 If I don't like people, I let them know it.
Eğer birinden hoşlanmazsam, bunu ona belli ederim.

C55 I never seem to be able to get organised.
Kendimi bir türlü düzene sokamıyormuşum gibi gelir.

N56 At times I have been so ashamed I just wanted to hide.
Utancımdan saklanmak istediğim zamanlar olmuştur.

E57 I would rather go my own way than to be leader of others.
Başkalarına liderlik yapmak yerine, kendi yolumda ilerlemeyi tercih ederim.

O58 I often enjoy playing with theories or abstract ideas.
Teorilerle ya da soyut düşüncelerle uğraşmaktan keyif alırım.

A59 If necessary, I am willing to manipulate people to get what I want.
Gerekirse, istediğimi elde etmek için insanları kullanmaktan çekinmem.

C60 I strive for excellence in everything I do.
Yaptığım herşeyde mükemmeli yakalamaya çabalarım.

Appendix C

TKI with a student scenario

Kendinizi başkasıyla fikirlerinizin çatıştığı bir ortam düşünün. Bu tarz durumlara genellikle nasıl tepki verirsiniz?

İleriki sayfalarda olası davranış yanıtlarını açıklayan birkaç ifade bulunmaktadır. Aşağıdaki senaryoyu baz alarak her bir açıklama için "A" ya da "B" ifadesinden kendi davranışlarınızı yansıtanı işaretleyin.

Çoğu durumda, "A" ya da "B" açıklaması sizin davranışlarınızı açıklamıyor olabilir, sizin için en elverişli olanı seçin.

Sınıf arkadaşınız ile araştırma yapmanız gerekli olduğunu hayal edin. Yapmanız için iki yöntem var, A ve B. Önceden kullandığı ve tercih ettiği için arkadaşınız A yöntemini kullanmanızı istiyor. Fakat, siz B yönteminin daha fazla bilgi toplayacağını düşündüğünüz için onu daha avantajlı olarak görüyorsunuz.

1. A. Öğrencinin problemi çözmek için sorumluluk almasına izin verirdim.
    B. Anlaşamadığımız konularda anlaşmak yerine, anlaştığımız konuların üstüne düşmeye çalışırım.
2. A. Orta yol bir çözüm aramayı denerdim.
    B. Hem kendimin hem de öğrencinin sorunları ile baş etmeye çalışırım.
3. A. Kendi hedeflerinin peşinde koşarım.
B. Öğrencimin duygularını ilişkiyi korumak için yumuşatırdım.
4. A. Orta yol bir çözüm aramayı denerdim.
    B. Kendi isteklerimi başka birisinin istekleri için feda edebilirim.
5. A. Problemi çözmek için devamlı olarak öğrencinin yardımını arardım.
    B. Gereksiz gerginlikten kaçınmak için ne gerekiyorsa yapardım
6. A. Kendim için tatsızlık yaratmaktan kaçınırım.
    B. Pozisyonumu kazanmayı denerdim.
7. A. Sorunu düşünecek vaktimin olduğu bir zamana ertelemeyi denerdim.
    B. Öğrenci için birkaç puandan feragat ederim.
8. A. Kendi hedeflerinin peşinde koşarım.
    B. Endişelerimi ve sorunlarımı ortaya koymayı denerim.
9. A. Farklılıkların derde değer olduğunu sanmıyorum.
    B. Kendi yolumu çizmek için efor sarf ederim.
10. A. Kendi hedeflerinin peşinde koşarım.
    B. Orta yol bir çözüm aramayı denerdim.
11. A. Endişelerimi ve sorunlarımı ortaya koymayı denerim.

B. Öğrencinin duygularını ilişkiyi korumak için yumuşatırdım.

12. A. Tartışma yaratacak konumlardan kaçınabilirim.

B. Eğer öğrenci benim duruşumu sergilememe izin verirse, onunda kendi duruşunu sergilemesine izin veririm.

13. A. Ortak anlaşma zemini sağlardım

B. Kendi amacı için baskı kurardım.

14. A. Kendi fikirlerimi profesöre söyler onların fikirlerini sorardım.

B. Kendi durumumun mantığını ve yararlarını gösterirdim.

15. A. Öğrencinin duygularını ilişkiyi korumak için yumuşatırdım.

B. Gereksiz gerginlikten kaçınmak için ne gerekiyorsa yapardım

16. A. Öğrencinin duygularını incitmemeye çalışırım.

B. Öğrenciyi kendi pozisyonumun faydalarına inandırırdım.

17. A. Kendi hedeflerinin peşinde koşarım.

B Gereksiz gerginlikten kaçınmak için ne gerekiyorsa yapardım

18. A. Öğrenciyi mutlu ediyorsa görüşlerini devam ettirmelerine izin verebilirim.

B. Eğer öğrenci benim duruşumu sergilememe izin verirse, onunda kendi duruşunu sergilemesine izin veririm.

19. A. Endişelerimi ve sorunlarımı ortaya koymayı denerim.

B. Sorunu düşünecek vaktimin olduğu bir zamana ertelemeyi denerdim.

20. A. Farklılıklarımız üzerine hemen bir çalışmaya başlarım.

B. Kayıplar ve edinimler üzerine ortak çıkarlarımı göz ardı ederim

21. A. Anlaşmaya varırken, diğerlerinin duygularını göz ardı ederim.

B. Problem üzerine münakaşaya yoğunlaşırım.

22. A. Kendim ve öğrenci için ortak yol bulmayı denerim.

B. İsteklerimi bildiririm.

23. A. Büyük ihtimalle kendi isteklerimi yerine getirmekle meşgul olurum.

B. Öğrencinin problemi çözmesi için sorumluluk almasına izin verirdim.

24. A. Öğrencinin durumu onlar için önemliyse, isteklerini yetirene getirmeye çalışırım.

B. Öğrenciyi uzlaştırmaya çalışırım.

25. A. Öğrenciye benim düşüncemin mantığını ve faydalarını göstermeye çalışırım.

B. Anlaşmaya varırken, öğrencinin isteklerini değerlendirmeyi denerim

26. A Ortak anlaşma zemini sağlardım

B. Büyük ihtimalle kendi isteklerimi yerine getirmekle meşgul olurum.

27. A. Tartışma yaratacak konumlardan kaçınabilirim.

B. Eğer diğer kişiyi mutlu ediyorsa, görüşlerini sürdürmelerine izin verebilirim.

28. A. Büyük ihtimalle kendi hedeflerinin peşinde koşarım.
    B. Farklılıkların derde değer olduğunu sanmıyorum.
29. A. Ortak anlaşma zemini sağlardım
    B. Farklılıkların derde değer olduğunu sanmıyorum.
30. A. Diğerlerinin duygularını incitmemeye çalışırım.
    B. Problemi çözebilmek adına diğer kişiyle paylaşırdım

Appendix D

TKI with the Professor Scenario

Kendinizi başkasıyla fikirlerinizin çatıştığı bir ortam düşünün. Bu tarz durumlara genellikle nasıl tepki verirsiniz?

İleriki sayfalarda olası davranış yanıtlarını açıklayan birkaç ifade bulunmaktadır. Aşağıdaki senaryoyu baz alarak her bir açıklama için "A" ya da "B" ifadesinden kendi davranışlarınızı yansıtanı işaretleyin.

Çoğu durumda, "A" ya da "B" açıklaması sizin davranışlarınızı açıklamıyor olabilir, sizin için en elverişli olanı seçin.

Profesör Z'nin sınıfında olan bir öğrenci olduğunuzu hayal edin. Bir araştırma yapmanız gerekli. Yapmanız için iki yöntem var, A ve B. Önceden kullandığı ve tercih ettiği için Profesör Z A yöntemini kullanmanızı istiyor. Fakat, siz B yönteminin daha fazla bilgi toplayacağını düşündüğünüz için onu daha avantajlı olarak görüyorsunuz.

1. A. Profesörün problemi çözmek için sorumluluk almasına izin verirdim.
   B. Anlaşamadığımız konularda anlaşmak yerine, anlaştığımız konuların üstüne düşmeye çalışırım.
2. A. Orta yol bir çözüm aramayı denerdim.
   B. Hem kendimin hem de profesörün sorunları ile baş etmeye çalışırım.
3. A. Kendi hedeflerinin peşinde koşarım.
   B. Profesörün duygularını ilişkiyi korumak için yumuşatırdım.
4. A. Orta yol bir çözüm aramayı denerdim.
   B. Kendi isteklerimi başka birisinin istekleri için feda edebilirim.
5. A. Problemi çözmek için devamlı olarak profesörün yardımını arardım.
   B. Gereksiz gerginlikten kaçınmak için ne gerekiyorsa yapardım
6. A. Kendim için tatsızlık yaratmaktan kaçınırım.
   B. Pozisyonumu kazanmayı denerdim.
7. A. Sorunu düşünecek vaktimin olduğu bir zamana ertelemeyi denerdim.
   B. Profesör için birkaç puandan feragat ederim.
8. A. Kendi hedeflerinin peşinde koşarım.
   B. Endişelerimi ve sorunlarımı ortaya koymayı denerim.
9. A. Farklılıkların derde değer olduğunu sanmıyorum.
   B. Kendi yolumu çizmek için efor sarf ederim.
10. A. Kendi hedeflerinin peşinde koşarım.
    B. Orta yol bir çözüm aramayı denerdim.
11. A. Endişelerimi ve sorunlarımı ortaya koymayı denerim.

B. Profesörün duygularını ilişkiyi korumak için yumuşatırdım.

12. A. Tartışma yaratacak konumlardan kaçınabilirim.

   B. Eğer profesör benim duruşumu sergilememe izin verirse, onunda kendi duruşunu sergilemesine izin veririm.

13. A. Ortak anlaşma zemini sağlardım

   B. Kendi amacı için baskı kurardım.

14. A. Kendi fikirlerimi profesöre söyler onların fikirlerini sorardım.

   B. Kendi durumumun mantığını ve yararlarını gösterirdim.

15. A. Profesörün duygularını ilişkiyi korumak için yumuşatırdım.

   B. Gereksiz gerginlikten kaçınmak için ne gerekiyorsa yapardım

16. A. Profesörün duygularını incitmemeye çalışırım.

   B. Profesörü kendi pozisyonumun faydalarına inandırırdım.

17. A. Kendi hedeflerinin peşinde koşarım.

   B Gereksiz gerginlikten kaçınmak için ne gerekiyorsa yapardım

18. A. Profesörü mutlu ediyorsa görüşlerini devam ettirmelerine izin verebilirim.

   B. Eğer profesör benim duruşumu sergilememe izin verirse, onunda kendi duruşunu sergilemesine izin veririm.

19. A. Endişelerimi ve sorunlarımı ortaya koymayı denerim.

   B. Sorunu düşünecek vaktimin olduğu bir zamana ertelemeyi denerdim.

20. A. Farklılıklarımız üzerine hemen bir çalışmaya başlarım.

   B. Kayıplar ve edinimler üzerine ortak çıkarlarımı göz ardı ederim

21. A. Anlaşmaya varırken, diğerlerinin duygularını göz ardı ederim.

   B. Problem üzerine münakaşaya yoğunlaşırım.

22. A. Kendim ve profesör için ortak yol bulmayı denerim.

   B. İsteklerimi bildiririm.

23. A. Büyük ihtimalle kendi isteklerimi yerine getirmekle meşgul olurum.

   B. Profesörün problemi çözmesi için sorumluluk almasına izin verirdim.

24. A. Profesörün durumu onlar için önemliyse, isteklerini yetirene getirmeye çalışırım.

   B. Profesörü uzlaştırmaya çalışırım.

25. A. Profesöre benim düşüncemin mantığını ve faydalarını göstermeye çalışırım.

   B. Anlaşmaya varırken, profesörün isteklerini değerlendirmeyi denerim

26. A Ortak anlaşma zemini sağlardım

   B. Büyük ihtimalle kendi isteklerimi yerine getirmekle meşgul olurum.

27. A. Tartışma yaratacak konumlardan kaçınabilirim.

   B. Eğer diğer kişiyi mutlu ediyorsa, görüşlerini sürdürmelerine izin verebilirim.

28. A. Büyük ihtimalle kendi hedeflerinin peşinde koşarım.
    B. Farklılıkların derde değer olduğunu sanmıyorum.
29. A. Ortak anlaşma zemini sağlardım
    B. Farklılıkların derde değer olduğunu sanmıyorum.
30. A. Diğerlerinin duygularını incitmemeye çalışırım.
    B. Problemi çözebilmek adına diğer kişiyle paylaşırdım