

The Determination Of The Conflict Resolution Strategies Of University Students That They Use When They Have Conflicts With People

Sibel Dincyurek & Ali H. Civelek

Abstract

This study is performed aiming to find out the resolution strategies our youth develop for the conflicts they live through along the way to being a mature individual, **grown teenager-young-teen-adolescent**, who can keep abreast of the rapid progress and improvement in technical and social areas today.

Keywords: Conflict Resolotion, University Students, Compromising Strategies

According to Cüceloğlu (2002:195), general opinion is that; “if individuals have good intentions and know how to speak to each other, there will be no arguments or conflicts”. If we look at the same understanding from a different point of view, it is seen that the outcome will be “people in conflict, are people who have bad intentions and who do not know manners”. These expressions, might be pronouncing certain good intentions, yet they do not stand for reality. Because, as long as people live together, no matter how good intentions they have or how understanding they are, conflicts and infighting are inevitable.

According to Öner (1996:191) people think that “conflict occurs when one ore more people cannot agree on a subject”. In some conflict cases, the discourses and behaviours of the individuals in conflict are different from each other, or the individuals perceive them in a different way. Conflicts generally happen when needs, instincts and desires of people counteract. These different needs, different instincts, different points of view and different perceptions cause conflicts. We all live through occasional conflicts for thinking in a different way. This is a part of being human.”

According to Taştan (2002:1) it will be best to mention two factors causing interpersonal conflicts in people’s lives. The reason for young individuals having interpersonal conflicts is the worry to achieve what they wish for themselves, and the ways and diversity of the relationships they have to pursue in order to get along with others. The assertive, self-sufficient, defensive attitude that emerges as a result when individuals act with the urge of satisfying their own needs, causes conflicts both within the individual and between individuals. (www.organizasyon.com)

The outbreak reasons of interpersonal conflicts may originate from personal factors like cognition, perception, emotion, non-conscious needs, and communicative skills, or cultural factors, real differences, social and physical environments or the quality of the message given in the communication process (Dökmen, 2004). Conflicts among individuals are naturally inevitable, as they differ from each other, in every aspect of these factors.

Conflicts are a normal segment of daily life. Yet, to many, conflict is considered to be negative, as it causes disagreements, stress, social chaos and violence, and moreover, the most significant indication of a good relationship is accepted to be the absence of conflicts (Johnson,1981). According to Johnson(1981), positive aspects of conflicts are; it helps the individual in knowing themselves, enhancing their awareness about others’ characteristics, noticing the relationship problems that they need to solve, and encouraging change, increases energy and motivation for problem solving, making life more interesting, and help find small problems that are perceived as big issues. After all, it is obvious that conflict, can induce constructive results both for the conflicting person, and the person or the group that conflict is about.

It has been acknowledged for a long time that conflicts are inevitable features of relationships, and that their resolutions determine whether a relationship is functional or not. (Thomas, 1976).

A conflict does not occur as a result of an object or a person, sometimes the individual may have a conflict within. The conflicts within the individual may occur in cases where two targets are equally attractive, or two internal needs or motivation oppose each other (Atkinson and others, 1999).

When we look at interpersonal relationships, conflict is defined in several ways. In one instance, Maurer (1991) defines conflict as “the unwanted result of **inharmonious/clashing** desires between two or more parties” (Cited in : Sweeney, Carruthers, 1996).

People in conflict, use certain conflict resolution styles. Johnson and Johnson (1994) , discussed conflict resolution styles in two dimensions and named these as “relation” and “purpose”. As the result of the interaction of these two dimensions, five conflict resolution styles emerged ; forcing, avoiding, accomodating, compromising, and collaboration. The conflict resolution styles used by the individuals, determine whether the relationship is constructive or destructive (Deutsch, 1973).

Interpersonal conflict is the situation that arises when either of the parties project changes in interests, wishes or values, or if there is a competition where one tries to surpass the other (Deutsch, 1973).

It is a process which comes about when a person perceives that the target or interest of themselves or the other’s are obstructed or are about to be obstructed (Dunnette, 1976).

It is an interpersonal process that happens when the actions of one obstruct the other’s actions(Kelley ve diğçerleri, 1983). It is the unwanted consequence of clashing targets of two or more parties(Maurer, 1991); (Cited in : Sweeney ve Carruthers, 1996). The condition that arises when there are inharmonious intentions, or a competition for a rare reward or resource between at least two independent parties (Duryea, 1992:5; Cited in : Sweeney ve Carruthers, 1996). It is also stated as the disagreement or tension that occurs when interacting individuals have different interests, ideas, beliefs, values or needs (Quest International, 1994; Cited in : Sweeney ve Carrutshers, 1996).

People in conflict, exhibit diverse behavioral patterns to solve their conflicts. Conflict resolution is defined by the following five behavioral patterns (Thomas,1976).

Forcing: The ambition of one party to dominate the other. In this case, people’s targets are more important than their relationships. According to Karip (1999), “this strategy to establish superiority over one another is used when either of the parties value satisfaction of their own interests and needs, at the expense of the opposing party’s interests and needs”.

Avoidance: Avoiding the conflict environment. It is the indifference of one party to the other’s wills. The individual does not confront the other and try for a solution, because it is hopeless? As Karip(1999) states; “in cases where the parties value each other’s interests and needs , the strategies of avoiding a conflict or ignoring the conflict are used”.

Accommodation: Forgoing one’s own needs. The basis of this most frequently used conflict resolution strategy is the sharing of differences. One party ignores their own desires in order to fulfill the other’s.According to Karip (1999), accommodation is “the case where one party forgoes the satisfaction of their own interests and needs, in consideration of the other party’s interests and needs.

Compromise : The condition where either of the parties forgo their desires in order to satisfy the other’s. In this case, persons seek a third way. Karip (1999) states that, “as long as both sides accept mutual compromise as a strategy, parties forgo certain issues in order to settle and achieve a solution.”

Collaboration: Problem is solved by considering the needs of both parties. Both parties work together. According to Karip (1999) “this strategy is used when the importance given to own and other’s interests and needs are high”.

1.1 Aim of the Research

Today, technology as well as social life is progressing and improving rapidly. People live through a long and challenging transitional period from childhood into maturity. The contribution of learning conflict resolution skills to the production of more constructive, happy and self sufficient individuals with insights cannot be denied.

The general aim of this paper is to determine the conflict resolution strategies which are used by university students, in their interpersonal conflicts. There are two sub-aims under the stated main aim: Firstly, determining the strategies that students use in different types of relationships (friends, close friends, emotional friends, mother and father), and secondly, determining which strategies are used in which type of relationships.

1.2 The Problem Phrase

1. Is there a meaningful difference between the conflict resolution strategies used by university students in their conflicts with other people(friends, close friends, emotional friends, mother and father)?

1.2.1 Sub Problems

1. Is there a meaningful difference between the conflict resolution strategies used by university students in conflicts with their friends?

2. Is there a meaningful difference between the conflict resolution strategies used by university students in conflicts with their close friends?

3. Is there a meaningful difference between the conflict resolution strategies used by university students in conflicts with their emotional friends?

4. Is there a meaningful difference between the conflict resolution strategies used by university students in conflicts with their mothers?

5. Is there a meaningful difference between the conflict resolution strategies used by university students in conflicts with their fathers?

Does the conflict resolution strategies used by university students show a meaningful difference according to the type of the relationship(friends, close friends, emotional friends, mother and father)?

1. Does the forcing strategy used by university students show a meaningful difference according to the type of the relationship?

2. Does the avoiding strategy used by university students show a meaningful difference according to the type of the relationship?

3. Does the accomodating strategy used by university students show a meaningful difference according to the type of the relationship?

4. Does the collaborating strategy used by university students show a meaningful difference according to the type of the relationship?

5. Does the compromise strategy used by university students show a meaningful difference according to the type of the relationship?

1.3 Importance of the Research

In today's world, technology and social life are in a rapid progress, with which our youth has to keep pace with along the process of growth. Within this process, the young are living through certain conflicts, and developing individual resolution strategies to end the conflicts. The aim of this research is to define the conflicts that our youth encounters and the resolution strategies they develop. The main target of the study is to light the inner world of young people, who are the representatives of our future, contribute to the resolution strategies they use, and to determine what can be done towards a healthier community through healthier individuals. It is also targeted to perform further studies using the data from the results of this research, and develop training programs in order to help the youth with Psychological Counseling and Guidance services given primarily in educational institutions and various other centers.

1.4 Assumptions of the Research

1. University students are assumed to experience conflicts and use conflict resolution strategies with their friends, close friends, emotional friends, mothers and fathers .
2. It is assumed that the students respond honestly to the survey.

1.5 Restrictions of the Research

This study is limited to

1. 2003-2004 year of education, Eastern Mediterranean University students of the Faculty of Architecture and Faculty of Education.
2. 2003-2004 year of education , Near East University Faculty of Education students, and
3. The context of "Conflict Resolution Survey".

1.6 Definitions

Conflict: Individuals face interpersonal conflict cases, when social roles, different opinions, needs, cultural factors, beliefs, wishes, and communication skills show differences and they have disagreements (Thomas,1976).

Conflict Resolution: Is defined as a process for ending the conflict in interpersonal conflicts (Thomas 1976).

Conflict resolution strategies: Individuals use various conflict resolution strategies when they encounter conflicts. Thomas (1976) has identified five different conflict resolution styles.

These are:

Forcing : For people who use *forcing* to resolve conflicts, personal targets are more important than the relationship.

Avoiding: People who use avoiding to resolve conflicts, forgo their personal aims and relationships in order to avoid a conflict.

Accommodating: In this case, relationships are so important that personal aims bear little or no significance.

Compromising : Individuals trying to resolve conflicts through compromising are temperate concerning their personal targets and relations with the others.

Collaborating : People who collaborate in order to solve a conflict, treasure their targets and relationships both.

1.7 Results of the Research on Conflict Resolution Strategies

In studies on the management of Conflicts at the workplace (Rahim 1983b, Ting-Toomey 1991, Hammound 1999), it is found that the integrating style is the primary choice, and second style is accomodating and compromise. Litton(1989) studied conflict management styles of high school administrators and found that they tend to use compromise, accomodation and avoiding less than competition and collaboration strategies .

Researchers Harr and Krahe (1999); Laursen and Collins (1994); Laursen, Hartup and Koplas (1996), studied the conflict behavior which young people use with their parents, siblings and peers. The findings led them to the conclusion that the differences between conflict behaviours of teenagers are caused by the level of relationship. Laursen (1993) found that the young use accomodating and avoiding strategies intensely and compromising strategy less often. He/she also found that they use compromising considerably, and avoiding strategy scarcely with their close friends. Laursen, Hartuh, Koplas (1996) in their research found that teenagers and young adults use compromising more with their friends, and in their relationships with peers, they use less forcing with the peers who are not family or friend.

In Furusawa's (1991) research, the resolution strategies of administrators who were responsible from the group of students between pre-school and 12th grade are investigated. The results of the research state that integrating strategy was the most frequently used, while avoiding was the least frequently used, yet Peterson and Peterson (1990), in their research which was performed in a school environment, stated that both students and adults either avoided the conflict or confronted the other person. It is identified in this research that avoiding is used twice as frequent as confronting.

Meyer (1999), at the end of 6 months of observations and interviews, found that 6th grade students and teachers used avoiding strategy more than other strategies. In addition to this finding, it is stated that teachers benefited from competing strategy as well in order to keep students under control and prevent potential conflicts. It is also found that students used accomodating strategy in order to be credited as "good students". Lung's (1999) research results on parent-adolescent conflicts, have contributed to the family conflicts and resolutions literature. According to these researches, students coming from Chinese American families mostly use avoiding strategy, while students from white American families use accomodating strategy.

McDaniel(1992), in his/her research investigating the school principals' perceptions on conflict resolution behaviour, finds that, administrators use problem solving and accomodating strategies more frequently, and avoiding and less frequently. In the same research, difference has been found between the perceptions of elementary school and middle school teachers. Accordingly, middle school teachers use forcing strategy more than elementary school teachers.

Johnson, Johnson, Dudley and Magnuson (1995) stated that 3rd and 4th year students resolve 97% of their conflicts by forcing.

According to Adams (1989) middle school principals use mixed strategies in conflict resolution management. Middle school administrators use problem solving strategy more than any other way. However, it has been stated that the same administrators used forcing strategy when conflict resolution cannot be achieved.

McDowell (1990) investigated the gender factor in her/his study on high school students. The findings stated that; as opposed to girls' tendency towards commenting and searching for a solution, boys made dominating statements trying to gain control over the debate.

Krapmann and Oswald's (1987) studies on 34 German students of ages between 6 and 12 include the conflict management behaviour. In this study, conflict resolution strategies are divided into three groups: (a) coercion and manipulation; (b) offer and reply and, (c) reasoning. It is discovered that majority of the students used coercion and manipulation. A small minority used offer and reply strategy, while 10-12 year old students used reasoning strategy slightly if ever.

In the research Higgins and Priest (1990) made on students from 24 schools in England, stated that conflicts at school were resolved by using prevention, avoiding, and mediating.

McFarland and Culp (1992) in their research on 11th grade students, observed that girls had more conclusive orientation than boys.

Although methodic differences and restrictions exist, it can be assumed from researches performed in organizations, that there is an inclination towards using constructive conflict resolution strategies. However, it is not possible to make the same assumption for the conflict resolution strategies used by children and adolescents. (Cited in : Beidoğlu, 2001).

Although researches made on the conflict resolution strategies that adolescents prefer are limited, the fact of young people using different strategies for different relationships can be accepted as an interesting result(Laursen, 1993; Laursen, Hartup ve Koplas; 1996). However, generally in studies on adults, it is observed that adults prefer the same strategy for different types of relationship (Tezer; 1996; Tankresley; 1990).

THE METHOD

3.1 Design of the Research

This research is a descriptive study which investigates the conflict resolution strategies that university students use.

3.1.1 Population and Sampling

Subjects of this research are a total of 100 students from Eastern Mediterranean University Faculty of Education (n=35) and Faculty of Architecture (n=40) , and from Near East University Faculty of Education Department of Psychological Counseling and Guidance (n=25), in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC).

Eastern Mediterranean University started education with 105 students, as Higher Technology Institute in 1979, and converted into a university in 1986. Located in Mağusa, there are 8 faculties and 3 schools of higher education in the Eastern Mediterranean University.

Near East University is a higher education institution in the capital of the TRNC, Lefkoşa, since 1988, serving with its high level education facilities and qualified staff. There are 8 faculties and 3 schools of higher education in the NEU.

Table 3.1 : Sampling

		<u>Classes</u>		
		I	II	III
EMU	Faculty of Education	20	25	10
	Faculty of Architecture	10	15	15
NEU	Faculty of Education	25	-	-

3.1.2 Data Collection Tool

The Conflict Resolution Survey, which is developed by Tezer (1986) and adapted by Bedioğlu (2001) is used in this research. This survey consists of five sections. These are defined as friend, close friend, emotional friend, mother and father. There are five definitions in each section, containing conflict resolution behaviour/strategies defined by Thomas (1976) as forcing, avoiding, accomodating, compromising, and collaborating strategies. Each student is asked to mark how frequently they use which strategy seperately on a Lickert scale. Grading is as Never (1), Seldom (2), Occasionally (3), Mostly (4), Always (5). Lowest and highest values are respectively (1) and (5). Higher point denotes higher frequency of usage.

Reliability Study

Reliability of this Conflict Resolution Survey (CRS), which is examined by test-repetition method by Tezer (1986), is stated to be .71 for forcing, .60 for avoiding, .69 for accomodation, .72 for compromising and .76 for collaborating.

Bedioğlu (2001) studied the reliability of Tezer’s CRS in the TRNC population where he/she adapted the survey. The Cronbach Alpha results are as follows; .73 for forcing, .74 for avoiding, .82 for accomodating, .70 for compromising and .92 for collaborating.

The Cronbach Alpha results for the reliability study of this research, performed with 50 students, are stated as .80 for forcing, .70 for avoiding, .70 for accomodating, .85 for compromising, and .57 for collaborating.

3.1.3 Data Collection Process

The Conflict Resolution Survey is distributed to university students by the author and collected back at the end of 15 minutes.

3.1.4 Data Analysis

In this research for the first problem phrase, using the Friedman Test, a ranking is made explaining which conflict resolution strategy is used how frequently - separately for each relationship type. For the second problem phrase, Repeated Variance Analysis method is used in order to determine how frequent each strategy is used according to different relationship types.

FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Findings and Interpretation Pertaining to the First Problem Phrase

Problem Phrase 1 : 1. Is there a meaningful difference between the conflict resolution strategies used by university students in their conflicts with other people(friends, close friends, emotional friends, mother and father?).

Findings and Interpretation Pertaining to the First Sub-Problem

Is there a meaningful difference between the conflict resolution strategies used by university students in their conflicts with their friends?

The Friedman Test results of the conflict resolution survey on whether there is a meaningful difference between the conflict resolution strategies used by university students in their conflicts with their friends are shown in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 : Friedman Test results for the comparison of conflict resolution strategies which students use with their friends, according to frequency of usage.

	Conflict Resolution Strategy	Mean Rank	
Strategies used in conflicts with friends	Forcing	2.82	χ^2 : 65.880 df: 4 p: .000
	Avoiding	2.46	
	Accomodating	2.45	
	Compromising	3.72	
	Collaborating	3.55	

According to the Friedman Test results given in Table 4.2, meaningful difference is found between the five conflict resolution strategies used by university students in conflicts that they have with their friends; [χ^2 (4)=65.880, $p < .05$]. Accordingly, university students use compromising strategy most frequently, and accomodating least frequently, in conflicts with their friends.

Findings and Interpretation Pertaining to the Second Sub-Problem

Is there a meaningful difference between the conflict resolution strategies used by university students in their conflicts with their close friends?

The Friedman Test results of the conflict resolution survey on whether there is a meaningful difference between the conflict resolution strategies used by university students in their conflicts with their close friends are shown in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3 : Friedman Test results for the comparison of conflict resolution strategies which students use with their close friends, according to frequency of usage.

	Conflict Resolution Strategy	Mean Rank	
Strategies used with Close Friends	Forcing	2.54	χ^2 : 70.026 df: 4 p: .000
	Avoiding	2.43	
	Accommodation	2.73	
	Compromise	3.68	
	Collaborating	3.63	

According to the Friedman Test results given under Table 4.3, there is a meaningful difference between the conflict resolution strategies used by university students, in conflicts with their close friends [$\chi^2 (4)=70.026, p < .05$]. Accordingly, university students use compromising most frequently, and avoiding least frequently, in conflicts with their close friends.

Findings and Interpretation Pertaining to the Third Sub-Problem

Is there a meaningful difference between the conflict resolution strategies used by university students in their conflicts with their emotional friends?

The Friedman Test results of the conflict resolution survey on whether there is a meaningful difference between the conflict resolution strategies used by university students in their conflicts with their emotional friends are shown in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4 : Friedman Test results for the comparison of conflict resolution strategies which students use with their emotional friends, according to frequency of usage.

	Conflict Resolution Strategies	Mean Rank	
Strategies used in conflicts with emotional friends	Forcing	2.74	χ^2 : 72.496 df: 4 p: .000
	Avoiding	2.44	
	Accommodation	2.48	
	Compromise	3.62	
	Collaborating	3.71	

According to the Friedman Test results given under Table 4.4, there is a meaningful difference between the conflict resolution strategies used by university students, in conflicts with their close friends [$\chi^2 (4)=72.496, p < .05$]. Accordingly university students use collaborating most frequently, and avoiding least frequently, in conflicts with their emotional friends.

Findings and Interpretation Pertaining to the Fourth Sub-Problem

Is there a meaningful difference between the conflict resolution strategies used by university students in their conflicts with their mothers?

The Friedman Test results of the conflict resolution survey on whether there is a meaningful difference between the conflict resolution strategies used by university students in their conflicts with their mothers are shown in Table 4.5.

Table 4.4 : Friedman Test results for the comparison of conflict resolution strategies which students use with their mothers, according to frequency of usage.

	Conflict Resolution Strategy	Mean Rank	
Strategies used with Mothers	Forcing	2.51	χ^2 : 54.047 df: 4 p: .000
	Avoiding	2.45	
	Accomodation	3.18	
	Compromise	3.70	
	Collaborating	3.16	

According to the Friedman Test results given under Table 4.5, there is a meaningful difference between the conflict resolution strategies used by university students, in conflicts with their mothers [χ^2 (4)=70.026, $p < .05$]. Accordingly university students use compromising most frequently, and avoiding least frequently, in conflicts with their mothers.

Findings and Interpretation Pertaining to the Fifth Sub-Problem

Is there a meaningful difference between the conflict resolution strategies used by university students in their conflicts with their fathers?

The Friedman Test results of the conflict resolution survey on whether there is a meaningful difference between the conflict resolution strategies used by university students in their conflicts with their fathers are shown in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6 : Friedman Test results for the comparison of conflict resolution strategies which students use with their fathers, according to frequency of usage.

	Conflict Resolution Strategy	Mean Rank	
Strategies used with Fathers	Forcing	2.22	χ^2 : 53.804 df: 4 p: .000
	Avoiding	2.72	
	Accomodation	3.37	
	Compromise	3.46	
	Collaborating	3.23	

According to the Friedman Test results given under Table 4.3, there is a meaningful difference between the conflict resolution strategies used by university students, in conflicts with their fathers [χ^2 (4)=53.804, $p < .05$]. Accordingly university students use compromising most frequently, and forcing least frequently, in conflicts with their fathers.

When we look at the conflict resolution strategies which university students use in five different types of relationships, it can be observed that, the most frequently used strategy with friends, close friends, mothers and fathers is compromising, while with emotional friends, the most popular strategy is collaborating. The least frequently used strategies are avoiding strategy with close friend, emotional friend and mother, accomodating strategy with friend, and forcing strategy with father.

Kıralp (2003) in his/her research, investigated the conflict resolution strategies used by high school students in interpersonal conflicts in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus and found that they used compromising strategy with friend, close friend, mother and teacher, and accomodating strategy with father.

If we compare the conflict resolution strategies used by high school students with those of university students, we can observe that the strategies used with friend, close friend and mother overlap.

In Tezer’s (1996) research, people’s attitudes towards their spouses and superiors in Turkey are investigated. According to the research findings, different relationship types do not create a change in the resolution. Both women and men prefer compromising in conflict resolution. They use avoiding, accomodating, collaborating and **medium level** competing strategies less frequently. Tezer’s findings show that there is no difference between conflict resolution strategies used for different types of relationships. In this study it is determined that compromising and collaborating strategies are used generally, instead of a different strategy for each relationship.

4.2 Findings and Interpretation Pertaining to the Second Problem Phrase

Problem Phrase 2 : Does the conflict resolution strategies used by university students show meaningful difference according to the type of relationship (friends, close friends, emotional friends, mother and father)?

Findings and Interpretation Pertaining to the First Sub-Problem

Does the forcing strategy used by university students show meaningful difference according to the type of relationship?

The one way variance analysis results for repeated calculation/estimation in the conflict resolution survey are given under Table 4.7, pertaining to the possibility of a meaningful difference that the forcing strategy may or may not show according to the type of relationship.

Table 4.7. One way variance analysis results for the repeated calculation/estimation of the forcing strategy usage in different types of relationships.

Source of the Variance	Sum of squares	SS	Mean Square	F	P	Meaningful Difference
Between to amoung sample group	62.178	99	0.628			
Measurement	20.328	4	5.082	5.218	.000	1-5 3-5 4-5
Error	385.672	396	.974			
Total	468.178	499				

It is found that according to the one way variance analysis results given unden Table 4.7, the forcing strategy which is used by students shows meaningful difference according to four types of relationships (friend, emotional friend, mother and father) [$F_{(1,99)} = 5.218, p < .05$]. Emotional friend

mean point ($\bar{X} = 2.99$); is found to be greater than friend mean point ($\bar{X} = 2.75$); mother mean point ($\bar{X} = 2.65$) and father mean point ($\bar{X} = 2.38$). This finding proves that students use forcing strategy mostly in conflicts with emotional friends. Forcing strategy does not show meaningful difference with close friends.

Findings and Interpretation Pertaining to the Second Sub-Problem

Does the avoiding strategy used by university students show meaningful difference according to the type of relationship?

The one way variance analysis results for **repeated calculation/estimation** in the conflict resolution survey are given under Table 4.8, pertaining to the possibility of a meaningful difference that the avoiding strategy may or may not show according to the 5 types of relationships.

Table 4.8. One way variance analysis results for the **repeated calculation/estimation** of the avoiding strategy usage in different types of relationships.

Source of Variance	Kareler Toplamı	SS	Mean Square	F	P	Meaningful Difference
Between to among sample group	68.310	99	.690			
Measurement	9.232	4	2.308	2.426	.048	1-5 2-5
Error	376.768	396	.951			
Total	454.31	499				

It is found that according to the one way variance analysis results given under Table 4.8, the avoiding strategy used by university students shows meaningful difference according to three types of relationships (friend, close friend, and father) [$F_{(1,99)} = 2.426, p < .05$]. Father mean point ($\bar{X} = 2.88$); is found to be greater than friend mean point ($\bar{X} = 2.54$); and close friend mean point ($\bar{X} = 2.50$). This finding proves that students use avoiding strategy mostly in conflicts with their fathers. Avoiding strategy does not show meaningful difference with emotional friends and mothers.

Findings and Interpretation Pertaining to the Third Sub-Problem

Does the accomodating strategy used by university students show meaningful difference according to the type of relationship?

The one way variance analysis results for repeated calculation/estimation in the conflict resolution survey are given under Table 4.9, pertaining to the possibility of a meaningful difference that the accomodating strategy may or may not show according to the type of relationship.

Table 4.9 : One way variance analysis results for the repeated calculation/estimation of the accomodating strategy usage in different types of relationships.

It is found that according to the one way variance analysis results given unden Table 4.9, the accomodating strategy which is used by students shows meaningful difference according to four types of relationships (friend, close friend, emotional friend and father) [$F_{(1,99)} = 18.391, p < .05$]. Father mean point ($\bar{X} = 3.47$); is found to be greater than close friend mean point($\bar{X} = 2.80$); emotional friend mean point ($\bar{X} = 2.77$); and friend mean point ($\bar{X} = 2.56$) This finding proves that students use accomodating strategy mostly in conflicts with their fathers. Accomodating strategy does not show meaningful difference with mothers.

Findings and Interpretation Pertaining to the Fourth Sub-Problem

Does the compromising strategy used by university students show meaningful difference according to the type of relationship?

The one way variance analysis results for repeated calculation/estimation in the conflict resolution survey are given under Table 4.10, pertaining to the possibility of a meaningful difference that the compromising strategy may or may not show according to the type of relationship.

Table 4.11 : One way variance analysis results for the repeated calculation/estimation of the compromising strategy usage in different types of relationships.

According to the one way variance analysis results given unden Table 4.10, the compromising strategy which is used by students do not show meaningful difference according to five types of relationships (friend, close friend, emotional friend, mother and father) [$F_{(1,99)} = 1,233, p < .05$].

Findings and Interpretation Pertaining to the Fifth Sub Problem

Does the collaborating strategy used by university students show meaningful difference according to the type of relationship?

The one way variance analysis results for repeated calculation/estimation in the conflict resolution survey are given under Table 4.11, pertaining to the possibility of a meaningful difference that the collaborating strategy may or may not show according to the type of relationship.

Table 4.11 : One way variance analysis results for the repeated calculation/estimation of the collaborating strategy usage in different types of relationships.

Variance Source	Sum of Squares	SS	Mean of Squares	F	P	Meaningful Difference
Between to amoung sample group	70.360	99	.711			
Measurement	15.388	4	3.847	4.365	.002	3-5
Error	349.012	396	.881			

Total	434.76	499
-------	--------	-----

It is found that according to the one way variance analysis results given under Table 4.11, the collaborating strategy which is used by university students shows meaningful difference according to two types of relationships (emotional friend and father) [$F_{(1,99)} = 4.365, p < .05$]. Emotional friend mean point ($\bar{X} = 3.73$); is found to be greater than father mean point ($\bar{X} = 3.27$). This finding proves that students use collaborating strategy mostly in conflicts with their emotional friends. Collaborating strategy does not show meaningful difference with friends, close friends and mothers.

When we look at the findings on conflict resolution strategies according to the relationship type, it can be observed that there is no meaningful difference in compromising strategy, forcing strategy is used mostly with emotional friend, avoiding and accommodation strategies are used mostly with father, and collaborating strategy with emotional friend. When we review the literature, these findings comply with the Dual Anxiety Theory findings of Johnson and Johnson (1996).

In Kiralp's research, on the other hand, if we have a general look at the findings on conflict resolution strategies used by high school students in interpersonal conflicts, we can observe that avoiding and accommodating strategies are used mostly in the relationships with their fathers.

In studies on the management of workplace conflicts (Rahim 1983, Ting-Toomey 1991, Hammound 1999), it is found that **integrating** style is the primarily preferred style, the second most preferred style is found to be accommodating and compromising.

In Furusawa's (1991) research, the resolution strategies used by the administrators responsible for the group of students from pre-school to 12th grade are investigated. The research results state that integrating strategy is the most frequently used, whereas avoiding is the least used strategy.

McDaniel(1992), in his/her research investigating the school principals' perceptions on conflict resolution behaviour, finds that, administrators use problem solving and accommodating strategies more frequently, and avoiding and ****** less frequently. In the same research, difference has been found between the perceptions of elementary school and middle school teachers. Accordingly, middle school teachers use forcing strategy more than elementary school teachers.

According to Adams (1989) middle school principals use mixed strategies in conflict resolution management. Middle school administrators use problem solving strategy more than any other way. However, it has been found that the same administrators used forcing strategy when conflict resolution cannot be achieved.

Litton (1989) has studied the conflict management styles of high school administrators. Results state that; high school administrators tend to use competing and collaborating strategies less than compromise, accommodating and avoiding strategies.

Peterson and Peterson (1990), in their study performed in a school environment, stated that both students and adults either avoid the conflict or confront the other person. It is acknowledged in this study that avoiding is used twice as often as confronting.

Meyer (1999), at the end of 6 months of observations and interviews, found that 6th grade students and teachers used avoiding strategy more than other strategies. In addition to this finding, it is stated that teachers benefited from competing strategy as well in order to keep students under control

and prevent potential conflicts. It is also found that students used accomodating strategy in order to be credited as “good students”.

Researchers Harr and Krahe (1999); Laursen and Collins (1994); Laursen, Hartup and Koplas (1996), studied the conflict behavior which young people use with their parents, siblings and peers. The findings led them to the conclusion that the differences between conflict behaviours of teenagers are caused by the level of relationship. Laursen (1993) found that the young use accomodating and avoiding strategies intensely and compromising strategy less often. He/she also found that they use compromising considerably, and avoiding strategy scarcely with their close friends. Laursen, Hartuh, Koplas (1996) in their research found that teenagers and young adults use compromising more with their friends, and in their relationships with peers, they use less forcing with the peers who are not family or friend.

Johnson, Johnson, Dudley and Magnuson (1995) found that 3rd and 4th year students resolve 97% of their conflicts by forcing.

Lung (1999) research results on parent-adolescent conflicts, have contributed to the family conflicts and resolutions literature. According to these researches, students coming from Chinese American families mostly use avoiding strategy, while students from white American families use accomodating strategy.

Although methodic differences and restrictions exist, it can be assumed from researches performed in organizations, that there is an inclination towards using constructive conflict resolution strategies. However, it is not possible to make the same assumption for the conflict resolution strategies used by children and adolescents.

Although researches made on the conflict resolution strategies that adolescents prefer are limited, the fact of young people using different strategies for different relationships can be accepted as an interesting result(Laursen, 1993; Laursen, Hartup ve Koplas; 1996). However, generally in studies on adults, it is observed that adults prefer the same strategy for different types of relationship(Tezer; 1996; Tankresley; 1990).

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Considering the results of this research, it can be stated that university students use compromising strategy in their conflicts with friends, close friends, mothers and fathers, and collaborating strategy with their emotional friends. According to Johnson and Johnson's (1996) Dual Anxiety Theory, it is assumed that parties in conflict have two concerns: the concern of achieving personal targets and the concern of pursuing the relationship with the other party. When the findings of this tesearch are reviewed, it is observed that university students value both their targets and their relationships, yet mutual compromise is made in these relationships. Whereas with their emotional friends, instead of compromising, it is seen that they can find a third way in which both parties are satisfied by using collaborating strategy. According to Lee (1990), in administrators' conflicts with their superiors, peers or inferiors, the resolution styles change according to status differences between individuals. Yet, it is found that in the process of becoming a mature individual, status difference does not change the conflict resolution strategies used by university students and that they value their relationships and ambitions.

Literature research shows that conflict resolution strategies are identified as constructive or destructive. Constructive resolution strategies which are collaborating and compromising, raises the individual to a more successful status in the society.

People in conflict, find themselves in a search for ways to help them cope with the phenomenon of conflict. As a result they exhibit certain behaviour in order to resolve the conflict. This paper discusses behaviour under conflict resolution strategies.

Conflicts are very important for psycho-social development. Conflicts may leave long term, strong and irreversible effects on people. These effects may be positive as well as negative. Especially transition to adulthood is a difficult process that young individuals have to overcome. In this process, people experience development and change which have significance in their lives. There are several factors affecting an individual's life. Conflicts may induce positive results such as orientation of personality and value development, improvement of social status, provision of personal improvement, or elevation of insight and courage. For all these reasons, psychological consultants should be effective in the preparation and application of conflict and resolution strategies education at schools. Psychological consultancy services are very important for prevention of problems as well as development of a sound resolution strategy. Preparing education programs on conflict resolution and training our children by reaching out to elementary schools should be undertaken by psychological consultants. It is highly possible that such work will be rewarded by a healthy future of our community.

Conflicts between students and unhealthy relationships at schools can only be prevented by conflict resolution strategies training. The conflict resolution strategies and communication skills that students will learn will give them peace, success and happiness within the society. Because, they will be learning to use collaborating and compromising strategies instead of the destructive resolution strategies. The issues of eliminating disciplinary events by teaching students to take responsibility for the resolution of their conflicts should be among the targets of conflict resolution training programs.

At the end of the education period in which students are trained for conflict resolution strategies, these acquisitions should be achieved (Koruklu, 1998)

- a) Improvement of the skill of differentiating emotions from thoughts,
- b) Improvement of effective listening skills
- c) Development of empathic skills
- d) The skill of using the above skills not only at school but also in social and future life.

One of the problems of the system of education is the discipline issue. The conflict resolution strategies developed in education programs will contribute to the solution of the discipline problem, both in the family and the school.

The next stage of the conflict resolution strategies training that will be given to students at schools should be the improvement of student-parent relationships and provision of the same education programs for parents as well, with the support of PTAs. It will be possible to communicate not only with the students but with their families and the whole community through these training programs. With this skill, the student's success and harmony/adaptation in educational, social and sports environments, and also within the family and society will improve. Such training programs provided at the PDRAMs in universities are thought to help students as well. Provision of all these should be the primary duty of psychological consultants.

Suggestions

It is not possible for psychological consultants to realize the mentioned developments in the TRNC at the moment. In order to realize these, firstly the following work should be completed and education programs peculiar to the TRNC should be prepared. The primary concerns are:

- 1) Research of conflict resolution programs for different age groups.
- 2) Research of conflict resolution strategies at different socio-economic regions.

- 3) Research of conflict resolution strategies in state or private schools, starting from the lowest grade.
- 4) Preparation of conflict resolution training programs and education of conflict resolution in all schools by psychological consultants.
- 5) In order to determine the effects of the first training programs on students, research should be made on the same groups before and after the training, and improvement of the training programs should be targeted according to such research.
- 6) Qualitative research in addition to quantitative research.
- 7) Collection of data using multiple scales.

References

- Adams, D.C. (1989). Perceptions of Conflict, Conflict Management Styles, and Commitment in Middle Level School. **Dissertation Abstract International**, 50, 7, 1854.A.
- Atkinson, Rita L. ve Diğerleri (1999). **Psikolojiye Giriş**, Ankara: Arkadaşlar Yayınevi.
- Beidoğlu, Müge (2001). The Effect of the “Program for Young Negotiators” on Preserves Elementary School Teachers Conflict Resolution Strategies. Ankara (Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi).
- Cüceloğlu, Doğan (2002). **Yeniden İnsan İnsana**, İstanbul, Remzi Kitabevi.
- Deutsch, M. (1973). **The Resolution of Conflict: Constructive and Destructive Processes**. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Dökmen, Üstün (2004). **İletişim Çatışmaları ve Empati**. İstanbul: Sistem Yayıncılık ve Mat. Sanayi Ticaret A.Ş.
- Dunnette, Marvin D (1976). Editor. **Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology**. Chicago, Rand McNally.
- Duryea, M. L. (1992). **Conflict and Culture: A Literature Review and Bibliography**. Victoria, British Columbia, Canada: University of Victoria Institute for Dispute Resolution.
- Furusawa, J. (1991). Conflict Resolution Strategies Utilized by k-12 site Administrators in Los Angles Country Public School Districts. **Dissertation Abstract International**, 52, 12, 4161-A.
- Harr, B.F., (1999). Strategies for Resolving Interpersonal Conflicts in Adolescence. **Journal of Cross- Cultural psychology**, 30, 6, 667-684.
- Hammond, L. J. (1999). An Investigation of The Primary and Secondary Conflict Management Style Preferences of Males and Females in The Roles of Managers and students. **Digital Dissertation**. AAT9933304.
- Higgins, A. and Priest, S. (1990). Resolving Conflicts Between Young People. **Education Psychology in Practice**, 6, 2, 60-64.
- Johnson David ve R. Johnson (1997). “The Impact of Conflict Resolution Training in Middle School.” **Journal of Social Psychology**, No: 12.

- Johnson, D. W., and Johnson, R. T. (1996). Conflict Resolution and Peer Mediation Programs in Elementary and Secondary Schools: A Review of The Research. **Review of Educational Research**, 66, 4, 459-506.
- Johnson, D.W., Johnson, R., Dudley B., and Magnuson, D. (1995). Training of Elementary Schools Student to Manage Conflict. **Journal of Social Psychology**, 135, 6, 673-686.
- Johnson, David W. ve R.T. Johnson (1994). "Constructive Conflict in the Schools" **Journal of Social Issues**, No: 30.
- Johnson, David W.(1981). **Reaching out Interpersonal Effectiveness and Self Actualization**. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc..
- Karip, Emin (1999). **Çatışma Yönetimi** Ankara: Pegema Yayıncılık.
- Kelley, Harold H. ve Diğerleri (1983). **Close Relationship**, New York: Freeman.
- Kiralp, Yeliz (2003). Lise öğrencilerinin kullandıkları Çatışma Çözümleme Stratejilerinin Belirlenmesi. Lefkoşa (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Yakın Doğu Üniversitesi).
- Krappmann, L., and Oswald, H. (1987). Negotiation Strategies in Peer Conflicts: A Follow-Up Study in Natural Setting. **ERIC Document Reproduction Service** No: EO282641.
- Laursen, B. (1993). **Conflict Management Among Close Friends**, in B. Laursen (Ed.), *Close Friendships in Adolescence: New Directions for Child Development*, 39-59. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Laursen, B. and Collins, A. (1994). Interpersonal Conflict During Adolescence. **Psychological Bulletin**, 115,2,197-209.
- Laursen, B., Hartup, W.W., and Koplas, A.L. (1996). Towards Understanding Peer Conflict. **Merrill-Palmer Quarterly**, 42, 1, 76-102.
- Lee, C. W. (1990). Relative Status of Employees and Styles of Handling Interpersonal Conflict: An Experimental Study With Korean Managers. **International Journal of Conflict Management**, 1, 327-340.
- Litton, L.G. (1989). Conflict Management Practices of North Carolina Public High School Principals. **Dissertation Abstract International**, 51, 7, 2219-A.
- Lung, A.Y. (1999). Parent-Adolescent Conflict and Resolution in Chinese-American and Caucasian Families. **Digital Dissertations**, AAAT 9939053.
- McDaniel, A.K. (1992). A Comparison of Elementary and Secondary Schools With Respect to Levels of Conflicts, Conflict Resolution Behaviors, Teacher Commitment, and Organizational Commitment. **Dissertation Abstract International**, 53, 7, 2190-A.
- McDowell, E.E. (1990). A Study of the Relationship Between Willingness to Communicate and Preferred Conflict Strategy: Implication for Teaching Communication and Conflict. **Eric Document Reproduction Service** ED 3225561.

- McFarland, W.P., and Culp, W.H. (1992). Interpersonal Skill Training for Effective Conflict Resolution. **The School Counselor**, 39, 304-311.
- Öner, Uğur (1996). **İlk Öğretimde Rehberlik**. Yıldız Kuzgun (ed). Ankara Nobel Yayınları.
- Peterson, C., and Peterson, J., (1990). Fight or Flight: Factors Influencing Children's and Adults Decision to Avoid or Confront Conflict. **Journal of Genetic Psychology**, 151, 4, 461-471.
- Rahim, M. A. (1983a). A Measure of Styles of Handling Interpersonal Conflict. **Academy of Management Journal**, 26, 368-376.
- Rahim, M. A. (1983b). Measurement of Organizational Conflict. **Journal of General Psychology**, 109, 189-199.
- Sweeney, B., and Carruthers, W. L. (1996). Conflict Resolution: History, Philosophy Theory, and Educational Applications. **The School Counselor**, 43, 5, 326-344.
- Tankersley, K. S. (1990). How Elementary School Principals Handle Conflict. **Dissertation Abstracts International**, 52, 1 July 1991.
- Taştan, Seçil (2002). [Http://www.google.com/Yönetim-Organizasyon](http://www.google.com/Yönetim-Organizasyon) ve İnsan Kaynakları Bilgi Sitesi.
- Tezer, E (1986). Evli Eşler Arasındaki Çatışma Davranışları: Algılama ve Doyum, Ankara (Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi).
- Tezer, E (1996). Conflict-Handling Behavior Toward Spouses and Supervisors. **The Journal of Psychology** 130, 3, 281-292.
- Thomas, K. W. (1976). Conflict and Conflict Management. In M. Dunnette (Ed.) **Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychological**. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Ting-Toomey, S., Gao, G. , Trubisky, P., Yang, Z., Kim, H. S., Lin, S. L., and NISHIDA, T. (1991). Culture, Face Maintenance, and Conflict Styles of Handling Interpersonal Conflict: A Study in Five Cultures. **International Journal of Conflict Management**, 2, 275-291.

Author Contact Information:

Sibel Dincyurek
Near East University
Institute of Educational Sciences
Nicosia, N.Cyprus via Mersin 10 Turkey
+90 392 630 2295
sibel.dincyurek@emu.edu.tr

Ali H. Civelek
Eastern Mediterranean University
Faculty of Education
Department of Educational Sciences
Famagusta, N.Cyprus via Mersin 10 Turkey
+90 392 630 1019
ali.civelek@emu.edu.tr