

## Original Papers

*Polish Psychological Bulletin*  
2012, vol.43(4), 233-243  
DOI - 10.2478/v10059-012-0026-1

Krystyna Balawajder\*

### Styles of behaviour in interpersonal conflict concept and research tool (Conflict behaviour questionnaire).

**Abstract:** *The article presents the main types of conflict behaviour with the author's proposal of their classification. The suggested classification is based on the way in which an individual deals with a partner's adverse influence on his/her self-interest and welfare in a conflict situation. Four possible ways of coping i.e. attack, amicable settlement, defence, and yielding have been distinguished. On the basis of this behaviour classification, the Conflict Behaviour Questionnaire was compiled and its reliability and validity was assessed.*

**Key Words:** *Interpersonal conflict, conflict behaviour, attack, amicable settlement, defence, yielding*

Despite many years of research, the behaviour of conflict participants still poses a problem for both theoreticians and practitioners. Attempts are being made to formulate various concepts of behaviour oriented at coping in a conflict situation and to construct a variety of tools to study behaviour in a conflict. This article presents a review of the main typologies of conflict behaviours and a new proposal of classification of such behaviours, based on understanding conflict as a specific type of interaction, in which the partners' interaction threatens their interests and necessitates the need to take some action to protect them. On the basis of this conflict behaviour classification the Conflict Behaviour Questionnaire was devised. Its aim was to measure the predispositions to attack, to agree to an amicable settlement, to defend oneself and to yield in a situation of interpersonal conflict. The second part of the paper presents the results of the verification of the questionnaire's reliability and validity.

#### Understanding Interpersonal Conflict

The current state of knowledge concerning interpersonal conflicts shows that this phenomenon is both processual and complex. We can distinguish different states (those preceding a conflict, taking place during the conflict, and following it), as well as various phenomena in the interpersonal area (hostile or cooperative interactions, negotiation or mediation in order to resolve a dispute,

accompanied by complex events in the intrapersonal area of emotional, perceptual and behavioural character.

Many authors emphasize the role of negative influences in explaining the process of conflict between people. Thomas (1992) writes that a conflict occurs when an individual or a group feels subject to negative influence of another person or group. This concept can also be found in Wall and Callister (1995). Also, Deutsch (1973) believes that conflict exists whenever incompatible activities occur that is, those which prevent, obstruct, interfere, injure, or in some way make the other person's action less likely and less effective. Rahim (1990) recognizes conflict as an interactive process, manifested in contradiction, inconsistency or dissonance emerging between social units (individuals, groups, organizations, etc.). When writing about conflict in an organization, Kolb and Putnam (1992) state that conflict occurs when there are real or perceived differences, resulting from a specific organizational environment, which - in effect - evoke emotions.

Van de Vliert [1997] distinguishes three aspects of conflict interactions: perception of the problem of conflict, conflict behaviour and conflict outcome. Experiencing a conflict is of intrapersonal, internal character whereas behaviour refers to the interpersonal sphere. Conflict behaviours are a complex reaction of participants, either targeted at a specific purpose or expressing one's feelings (Van de Vliert, 1997). The result of a conflict is a state

\*University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Faculty in Katowice

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Krystyna Balawajder, University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Faculty in Katowice, Kossutha 9, 40-844 Katowice, Poland. e-mail: krystyna.balawajder@swps.edu.pl

which is the consequence of interaction between the parties, reflecting gains and losses on both sides.

On the basis of the above mentioned approaches the understanding of a conflict was adopted as an interaction in which there is an exchange of negative influences, posing a threat to the interests, prosperity and welfare of both parties. It was concluded that conflict operates in two areas - interpersonal and intrapersonal (Balawajder, 1992, 1995, 1998). The first is the area of social behaviour, the second is the individual experience (motivations, emotions, and perception) of the conflict participants. In conflict, interpersonal and intrapersonal processes mutually reinforce and determinate the dynamics of the conflict course. Conflictual interactions may develop through a negotiation process, leading to an amicable settlement of a dispute or to the escalation process in which the matter in question recedes into the background, and 'destroying' the partner, who is perceived as the opponent - the enemy, becomes the goal. Such a model of conflict is the starting point for typology in conflict, presented in this article.

### Typologies of Behaviour in Conflict

In the literature on conflict various classifications of conflict behaviour can be found. Moreover the basis on which these styles of behaviour are distinguished vary. In some, this is a reaction to the disagreement which has arisen, in others the motivation of conflict participants, their assertiveness, the desire to satisfy their own interests, to maintain good relations with the other party, or passivity and avoidance in dealing with a conflict.

Van de Vliert (1997) notes that over the last forty years of research on conflict, we can distinguish as many as four approaches to the classification of behaviour in this situation. The first approach (Deutsch 1973, Pruitt and Kimmel 1977) is dichotomic, where competition is opposed to cooperation. Deutsch (1973, 1994) distinguishes cooperative and competitive behaviour. According to Deutsch (1973) co-operation appears if in the case of conflict participants there is a positive correlation of purposes. This correlation is characterized by the fact that the achievement of the objectives by one person is possible only if others also satisfy their own desires. In such a situation, there are favourable conditions for effective communication and for joint efforts to resolve the dispute, since the participants are aware of their mutual dependence in achieving individual goals. Competition stems from negative correlation of purposes. In this situation, achieving the objectives by one party reduces the likelihood of achieving goals by the other. As a result, communication deteriorates, a climate of mistrust appears and a conviction that the success of one person is the failure for another. Tjosvold (1990) comes to similar conclusions. His research shows that cooperatively related goals and good communication are important predictors of constructive conflict resolution. Conviction about cooperatively related goals facilitates expressing

ideas, understanding others, and combining ideas given by the parties (Tjosvold, 1990).

The second approach is trichotomous. It refers to the assumptions made by Horney (1976, 1994), distinguishing "moving against", "moving away" and "moving toward" people in a conflict situation. Attitudes presented towards partners in a conflict may be directed against another person, which means the start of competition or confrontational behaviour aimed at overcoming the opponent. This is one of the basic reactions of people in conflict situations - attack. The opposite reaction is escape, a withdrawal in a conflict situation. If we perceive another person as being stronger and a serious threat to us, the sensible reaction is to avoid confrontation by getting out of the sphere of his or her activity. Whereas the third is a completely different, partner - oriented reaction, which is understood as an attempt to communicate in order to resolve disputes, in other words to co-operate. Referring to the orientations proposed by Horney (1976), Putnam and Wilson (1982) suggested identifying three styles of coping in a conflict: non-confrontational (understood as avoidance), solution oriented (cooperation), and control oriented (competition).

The third approach (Rubin, Pruitt, and Kim 1994) is the four-party-typology, in which a person may be either inactive or active. If he or she is inactive there are two possible forms of behaviour - withdrawing and yielding. In contrast, when activity is manifested, then we are dealing either with solving the problem (problem-solving behaviour), or with the activity aimed at defeating the enemy (contentious behaviour).

The fourth approach is based on the concept of the "dual interest model" proposed by Blake and Mouton (1964, 1970), and further developed by Thomas (1976) and Rahim (1983). Two dimensions describing human behaviour in a conflict comprise this typology: interest in the realization of one's personal goals and the interest in contact with people. On the basis of these dimensions Blake and Mouton (1964) distinguished five styles of coping with conflict: domination, soothing, problem solving, avoidance, and compromise.

The concept put forward by Blake and Mouton (1964) was further developed by Thomas (1976). He renamed the dimension of interest in achieving one's personal goals into assertiveness, understood as the desire to satisfy one's personal goals. Whereas the dimension of interest in people he reinterpreted as cooperativity, i.e. the desire to satisfy the partner's wishes. Thomas (1976) also distinguished five styles of coping with conflict:

- 1) competing (strong desire to satisfy one's self-interest, weak to satisfy the partner's interest),
- 2) accommodating (weak desire to satisfy one's self-interest, strong to satisfy the partner's interest),
- 3) collaborating (strong desire to satisfy both one's own and the partner's interest),

- 4) avoiding (weak desire to satisfy both one's own and the partner's interest),
- 5) compromising (moderate desire to satisfy both one's own and the partner's interest).

Rahim (1983), inspired by the Blake and Mouton (1964) model, also presents a two-dimensional model of behaviour in a conflict. In his opinion the basic dimensions are the focus on oneself and the focus on others. He distinguishes the following styles: dominating, obliging, integrating, avoiding, and compromising.

The dual concern model, drawn up by Pruitt and Rubin (1986), is another classification distinguishing five types of conflict behaviour. The first of these concern the interest in one's own results and the results of the other party. This is quite close to the proposal put forward by Thomas (1976). The second, called 'perceived feasibility perspective', takes into account the probability of success and the costs of implementing different strategies. This model forms the basis for distinguishing five strategic options of coping with a conflict (Pruitt and Rubin, 1986). Namely: fighting, accommodating, problem solving, compromising and avoiding.

In another approach to the classification of behavioural conflicts Rubin, Pruitt and Kim (1994) distinguish six possible ways of resolving a conflict. The already known ways as domination, capitulation, inaction, withdrawal and the new ways ones – negotiation and intervention of a third party. According to Rubin, Pruitt and Kim (1994), negotiation and intervention of a third party are the only truly constructive solutions of a conflict.

Peterson (1983) suggests a completely different approach in which he takes into account the effectiveness of the adopted strategies. He distinguishes six such strategies of behaviour in a conflict. They refer to types of behaviour leading from the disintegration of a relationship to the deepening of ties between the partners. Namely:

- 1) disintegration of a relationship or separation – withdrawal of one or both parties from contact
- 2) domination – conflict ending in which one party wins a victory over the other
- 3) submission – yielding to the other party's will
- 4) compromise - partners in a conflict partially reduce their desires, until they reach a state satisfying both parties
- 5) consensus, (integrative agreement) – conflict ending which fully satisfies the desires and aspirations of both parties
- 6) structural improvement – conflict ending which leads to a deeper mutual understanding and to the intensification of mutual positive feelings of the conflict participants.

In this typology, on the one hand there are types of behaviour that attempt to combine the desires of both partners in a conflict situation i.e. compromise, cooperation or complete agreement and on the other hand types of behaviour proving that efforts are only made to satisfy one's own needs (e.g. dominance, competition).

Review of literature shows that two typologies concerning styles of coping in a conflict seem to be the most popular. The first one is connected with the concept put forward by Deutsch (1973) who distinguishes both cooperative and competitive motivation. The second typology, backed by many supporters, distinguishes integrative, distributive, and the avoidance strategies. The integrative strategies are connected with the cooperative motivation whereas the distributive strategies relate to the competitive motivation. While the integrative and the distributive strategies require engagement in a conflict, the avoidance strategy does not.

### Conflict Behaviour as a Reaction to the Threat of a Partner.

The starting point in developing one's own typology of a conflict behaviour is the assumption that the negative impact of the other participant of a conflict interaction threatens the vital interests, prosperity and welfare of a given person. Therefore, behaviour in a conflict must be seen as a way of dealing with a threat. On the basis of the concept by Rosenzweig (1944), concerning the response to frustration, four basic reactions to threat caused by the partner have been distinguished - fight, mobilization, resignation and challenge (see Table 1). Reaction to threat is one of the essential characteristics of conflict behaviour. From the results of previous discussions and investigations, it was concluded that the second important feature to be taken into account in characterizing conflict behaviour is the concern for one's own interests and the interests of the partner. The third characteristic feature is the image of the partner. Assigning specific characteristics to the partner is reflected in the appropriate behaviour towards him or her. The last fourth feature, rarely recognized in existing studies but very clearly visible in everyday life, is the interest in control. Expanding or maintaining the desired scope of control is highly valued by conflict participants. These features formed the basis for a detailed characterization of behaviour models in a conflict situation.

In the situation when the partner poses a threat to one's interests, the reaction may be 'paying back', that is revenge in the form of *attack*. One can also apply measures to protect one's own interests and desires against the destructive influence of a partner - then we encounter *defence*. Sometimes, however, there is no possibility of withstanding the harmful effects of another person's influence on one's personal interests, then there is no choice but to accept the situation, that is *to yield*. However, one can give a positive response to the negative impact of the partner by proposing joint actions in order to find a mutually satisfying solution. Such an action is called an *amicable settlement*.

### Attack Behaviour Characteristics

*Reaction to threat.* Attack is a response to threat, which can be reduced to a brief statement: to fight and to defeat the enemy. In a threat situation, caused by the negative

Table 1. Characteristics of Conflict Behaviours

Types of Behaviour In Conflict	Reactions to Threat	Caring About Personal and Partner's Interests	Notions about the partner's intentions	Control
<b>ATTACK</b>	Fighting an obstacle (posing a threat to the interests of the partner)  Defeating the opponent	Making it difficult or impossible for the partner to implement his interests  Overestimation of one's personal interests	The partner wants to harm, cause pain  The partner wants me to submit to him	Enlarging the scope of one's control  Striving for advantage over the partner
<b>DEFENCE</b>	Mobilization in defence of one's own interests  Self-preservation	Persistent striving for the objective, despite difficulties  Lack of interest in the partner's wishes	The partner wants to prove me wrong  The partner wants me to do what I do not want to do	Maintaining equal range of control  Striving for relationship symmetry
<b>YIELDING</b>	Resignation from defence of self-interest  Submitting to the partner's will	Striving to satisfy the partner  Performing tasks imposed by the partner and resignation from one's own desires	The partner is stronger and it is better not to incur his displeasure	Consent to reduction of the scope of one's own control  Consent to the asymmetry in the relationship
<b>AMICABLE SETTLEMENT</b>	Challenge to find a way out from a situation threatening the interests of both parties  Seeking a solution to the difficulties / problem	Focusing on the desires of both parties  Achieving one's own objectives with a flexible attitude to the way of achieving them  Helping the partner in achieving his goals	The partner has peaceful intentions  The partner wants a rational solution to the problem	Maintaining autonomy of the partners relevant to the kind of relationship

influence of a partner, a person relinquishes his current activities and focuses on getting rid of what is hampering him, that is the partner. Dealing with the obstacle is a form of coping with a threat, in the belief that the weakening (and in pathological situations, the annihilation) of another person will eliminate the threat. One can say that an attack is undertaken in order to repay the other person, to “pay evil with evil” and to prevent him from accomplishing his plans.

*Personal and Partner's Interests.* In an attack a person, above all, wants to harm the partner - impede or prevent the implementation of plans. He also manifests a great attachment to personal wishes and desires. Sometimes even with a tendency to exaggerate, that is, he overrates his own interests which are endangered in a conflict situation. If such a person shows interest in the desires of the partner, it is because of an urge to learn about them in order to find his weak spot and then to be able to hit back by aiming at it. In this way the effectiveness of attack behaviour increases.

*Partner's Image.* The way the partner is perceived is essential to the behaviour in a conflict situation. Rapoport (1970) showed that we behave differently when we see the other person as an enemy and differently when we see him as a partner. When attacking, a person is often convinced that his partner is malicious, wants to harm, to distress and to dominate. Therefore, there is a vital reason to oppose him. However it is also important to impose one's will on the partner, to take over or to enlarge the scope of control over him. It can be seen that in a conflict situation we often ascribe to our partner intentions similar to our own.

*Control.* The object of an attack is also to enlarge the scope of one's own control.

It is a strife to maintain an asymmetric relationship with an advantage over the partner.

It is known that the person who has an advantage can control the partner's behaviour and finds it easier to implement his own goals - to satisfy one's own needs. Simultaneously he has the possibility of deciding about the extent of his partner's satisfaction. Striving to gain advantage over the partner is often an attack in itself. The intention of the attacker is to impose his will on another person.

### **Amicable Behaviour Characteristics**

*Reaction to threat.* The existing threat is treated as a challenge. The object of the challenge is to find the differences between the partners and to overcome them. In a threat situation the person taking a conciliatory attitude, although he sees that the partner is hampering him, he focuses his activity not on the partner but on the problem dividing them. This is an opportunity to understand what the partner wants, to discover contradictions and to overcome

them. It is the problem that is the object in amicable actions and it is the problem that must be ‘defeated’ not the partner. Partners should join forces to solve the issues dividing them.

The way out of a threat is solving the problem. In amicable activity a person is far from ‘paying evil with evil’ but takes actions that are beneficial and positive for the partner.

*Personal and Partner's Interests.* In amicable behaviour a person cares about finding a solution which will provide both partners with an opportunity to satisfy their own interests. Satisfying the partner's wishes is just as important as satisfying one's own desires.

*Partner's Image.* An amicably oriented person is usually convinced that a consensus is possible, that the partner wants to reach an agreement. The partner is seen as a peace-oriented person, with good intentions. Such a picture of a partner makes it much easier to work together on finding a rational solution to the problem which arose in the conflict.

*Control.* In amicable behaviour a person does not aim at controlling the partner. The aim is to solve the problem, not to subordinate the partner or fight for symmetrical relationship between participants of the conflict interaction. In amicable settlement behaviour people care about the autonomy of both parties which corresponds to the nature of their relationship.

### **Defence Behaviour Characteristics**

*Reaction to Threat.* Defence means mobilization in a threat situation, aimed at securing one's own interests from a negative impact of the partner. Despite the obstacles posed by the partner, one attempts to continue the project as planned. At the core of defence lies the belief that everyone has their own field of activities and is autonomous in this field and that each of them can do what he/she wants and the partner cannot forbid it. But if the partner enters my territory, I have the right to defend my own interests, my own independence.

*Personal and Partner's Interests.* Defensive behaviour is undertaken in order to protect one's own interests, without taking into account the interests, needs, and wishes of the partner. This means that a person does not have hostile intentions towards the partner but is not interested in what is important to him either. If the person using defence does not know what is important to the partner, he/she may easily hurt him, even unintentionally. A person using defence operates in a way that does not jeopardize the interests of the partner (this differentiates defence from attack) but to fully achieve what is important to him. This means that the person does not give up his own desires,

despite the obstruction on the part of the partner. People who undertake defence are strongly focused on defending their own independence, their own rights and to prevent their interests from being jeopardized again.

*Partner's Image.* People who undertake defence usually think: 'the partner wants to force me to do something I do not want to do', 'the partner wants to prove me wrong'. The partner is seen as someone who wants to take control of our behaviour and our situation. And it is against this control takeover that he strongly objects to.

*Control.* People using defence are generally interested in caring for a symmetry of their relations and in maintaining an equal scope of control by both partners. It is particularly important for them not allow the partner to have more control. Preference of equal rights and lack of superiority of one party in a relationship increases the chances of improving one's own situation.

### Yielding Behaviour Characteristics

*Reaction to Threat.* Yielding is resignation in the face of danger. It means submitting oneself to the course of the situation formed by the partner. Yielding is a form of "cooperation" with the partner which allows him to achieve what he wants.

*Personal and Partner's Interests.* By yielding a person neglects his own desires while trying to satisfy the partner. By behaving submissively a person fulfils the aims imposed by the partner and gives up the pursuit of his own goals. If the partner makes a demand, it is met. It should be emphasized that the person who yields wants to do so and sees the sense of yielding. Often the reason for this is to maintain the relationship.

*Partner's Image.* The partner may be seen as someone very strong or highly appreciated. Therefore it is pointless to fight him or insist on one's own rights. Better not to put him off. Sometimes the partner is seen as a ruthless person who it is dangerous to oppose. The second possibility is seeing the partner as weak and easy to hurt so it is better to give him what he wants.

*Control.* Yielding is agreeing to reduce the scope of personal control over matters that concern me. It is agreeing to the asymmetry in the relationship with a distinct predominance of the partner. It allows the partner to control my behaviour. In a conflict situation, each of its participants may present a different strategy of behaviour - may seek an amicable settlement, use defence, attack or yielding. Moreover with the development of conflict, strategies used by the partners change. If the ones most often used fail, other ways of action that lead to the resolving of the conflict are sought.

## AIM OF RESEARCH

The aim of the research is to verify the psychometric properties of the Conflict Behaviour Questionnaire (CBQ) and to determine its usefulness both in diagnosing the behaviour of various conflict participants as well as in scientific research. The discriminative power of the statements used in this questionnaire was verified and the internal consistency coefficients (Cronbach's *alpha*) for the individual scales were tested. Moreover, the intercorrelations between the different CBQ scales and the correlations with the generally known *Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument* (1974) were examined.

## Method

### Respondents

Conflict Behaviour Questionnaire research was conducted on 158 people, 58.2% of whom were women. Respondents were students of extramural studies, majoring in business management and psychology, aged between 23 and 47. The largest group was comprised of people between 24 and 35 that is fairly young people. The research was conducted in Upper Silesia in 2011.

### Research Tool - Conflict Behaviour Questionnaire

On the basis of detailed response characteristics in a situation of interpersonal conflict, a test examining the styles of behaviour was prepared (see Table 2). Work on compiling this questionnaire lasted over 10 years. The starting point was an abundance of statements relating to particular types of conflict behaviour. From these statements only the ones with the highest diagnostic value have been employed in the current version of the CBQ.

As far as the designing of the tool is concerned, we decided against the idea of the respondents commenting on individual items on the Likert-type scale as well as against the pairwise comparison of individual statements (this is how the *Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument* is formed).

The best solution seemed to be the one in which the tested person responds simultaneously to all four styles of behaviour, assigning each of them a number of points corresponding to his preferences. The more points the person assigns to a given statement the more likely he is to behave in this way in a conflict situation. Thus the questionnaire examines the preferences to manifest a specific behaviour in conflict situations.

The Conflict Behaviour Questionnaire (CBQ) consists of eleven parts, each containing 4 statements referring to various situations connected with interpersonal conflicts. Each of the four statements describes one of the possible types of behaviour. The statements constitute a part of four scales which correspond to the distinguished types of behaviour: attack, amicable settlement, defence,

Table 2. Statements in the Conflict Behaviour Questionnaire

**I. If I do not like the way the partner acts, then :**

ATTACK	AMICABLE SETTLEMENT	DEFENCE	YIELDING
1. I bully him and show my displeasure	1. I ask why he is acting this way, explain my own behaviour and try to find a solution that satisfies both of us.	1. I boldly defend my position, my case.	1. I do not oppose him because it will not help.

**II. If the partner has hurt me then :**

ATTACK	AMICABLE SETTLEMENT	DEFENCE	YIELDING
2. I pay him back	2. I can forgive him and reach out to make peace.	2. I protest strongly against such conduct and try to protect myself to make sure that this does not happen again.	2. I lack the courage to oppose him.

**III. If something is important to me then:**

ATTACK	AMICABLE SETTLEMENT	DEFENCE	YIELDING
3. I demand that my partner gives way to me in this matter.	3. In pursuing my own goals I care about the needs and views of the partner.	3. I pursue my goals, defending my right to do so.	3. I give up my goals because I cannot oppose the partner and get my way.

**IV. It is important to me that:**

ATTACK	AMICABLE SETTLEMENT	DEFENCE	YIELDING
4. The partner takes into account my desires and wishes in all his activities.	4. I fully communicate with my partner, therefore I take the appropriate steps to settle the problem	4. I convince the partner of the validity of my arguments and my right to take a particular stand.	4. That my partner is happy, so if he does not like what I am doing - I give up my plans.

**V. When the partner tries to impose his will on me:**

ATTACK	AMICABLE SETTLEMENT	DEFENCE	YIELDING
5. It motivates me to remain firm in my convictions.	5. I explain to him how I feel in such a situation and try to figure out why he is acting in this way, in order to find a solution that will satisfy both of us.	5. I protest, I remind him that he has no right to do so.	5. I accept this situation, although this is not what I want.

**VI. If the partner ignores my needs :**

ATTACK	AMICABLE SETTLEMENT	DEFENCE	YIELDING
6. I pay him back.	6. I am not offended but I strive to understand his behaviour.	6. I protest strongly and remind him about my rights.	6. I prefer not to make my partner cross because it only worsens my situation.

**VII. When the partner's behaviour angers me , then:**

ATTACK	AMICABLE SETTLEMENT	DEFENCE	YIELDING
7. I show my displeasure and take revenge by behaving in the same way.	7. I try to restrain my emotions and calmly talk to him to explain the misunderstanding	7. I reprimand him for his behaviour and demand that he stops such activities.	7. I do not protest so as not to worsen the situation.

**VIII. In a Conflict Situation:**

ATTACK	AMICABLE SETTLEMENT	DEFENCE	YIELDING
8. I can force the partner to do a thing he was initially opposed to.	8. I try to understand the partner's behaviour and I expect him to do the same.	8. I insist on having the right to decide on matters relating to me.	8. Rather than argue and fight, I prefer to give way and agree with the partner.

**IX. In a situation when my wishes differ substantially from the partner's desires, then:**

ATTACK	AMICABLE SETTLEMENT	DEFENCE	YIELDING
9. If I decide on something, I must achieve it at all costs .	9. I can fulfil my plans in a different way than I had planned if this makes it easier for my partner.	9. If the partner tries to stop me from carrying out my plans, I insist on him not interrupting me.	9. I refrain from carrying out my plans, if I notice that my partner objects to them.

**X. When in a Conflict with Somebody**

ATTACK	AMICABLE SETTLEMENT	DEFENCE	YIELDING
10. If I am right, I am not interested if the partner accepts my plans, I just have to make them happen.	10. I encourage the partner to jointly find a solution that would satisfy both me and him.	10. I try to convince the partner of the arguments supporting my position to get what I want.	10. I believe that in many cases giving way to the partner pays off more than insisting on one's own rights.

**XI. In a Conflict Situation**

ATTACK	AMICABLE SETTLEMENT	DEFENCE	YIELDING
11. If the partner makes it difficult for me to achieve what I care about, he deserves to be punished. Therefore I do not fulfil his wishes.	11. When the partner asks me for something, and I can do it, I do not hesitate to fulfil his request.	11. I object to being manipulated by the partner, I want to decide for myself.	11. I meet all my partner's expectations, because I care about good relations with him.

Table 3. Characteristics of CBQ Questionnaire Items

ATTACK		AMICABLE SETTLEMENT		DEFENCE		YIELDING	
M = 18,898 SD=10,625 N= 158		M =43,392 SD= 15,760 N= 158		M=34,943 SD=11,414 N= 158		M =12,765 SD=13,507 N= 158	
Statement no.	indicator	Statement no.	indicator	Statement no.	indicator	Statement no.	indicator
1	.527	1	.547	1	.443	1	.831
2	.708	2	.397	2	.434	2	.699
3	.497	3	.652	3	.497	3	.536
4	.422	4	.589	4	.406	4	.820
5	.708	5	.737	5	.408	5	.697
6	.497	6	.673	6	.543	6	.858
7	.430	7	.580	7	.540	7	.746
8	.472	8	.535	8	.493	8	.724
9	.635	9	.660	9	.541	9	.508
10	.470	10	.550	10	.453	10	.719
11	.465	11	.435	11	.565	11	.734

and yielding. Each of the scales contains 11 statements. Table 2 contains detailed information on the statements within each scale. The task of the respondents is to allot a total of 10 points to the four statements in each of the eleven parts of the test. As a result the respondent may obtain from 0 to 110 points in each of the CBQ scales. In this study the respondents were requested to refer their responses to conflict situations in relations with people they were close to.

## Results

### Discriminatory Power of Items in CBQ

It was assumed that the indicator of the statement's discriminatory power is its correlation with the overall result of the scale, depending on the scale it belongs to. Table 3 presents the means (M), the standard deviation (SD) and the indices of the discriminatory power of statements in each scale (Pearson's correlation coefficient  $r$ ).

All CBQ items are characterized by high indices of the discriminatory power (0.397 is the lowest and 0.858 is the highest). Therefore it can be assumed beyond doubt that the questionnaire statements were selected accurately.

### Intercorrelations Between Scales

In Table 4 Pearson's correlation coefficients  $r$  between CBQ scales are presented. The analysis of the correlation coefficients shows that:

- Attack correlates strongly with Amicable Settlement and this correlation is negative but it has a positive correlation with Defence. The weakest correlation is with Yielding,
- Amicable Settlement correlates negatively with both Attack and Defence,
- Defence correlates negatively with Yielding and Amicable Settlement,
- Yielding correlates negatively with the other scales and its strongest correlation is with Defence

Table 4. Correlations Between Individual Scales

	Attack	Amicable Settlement	Defence	Yielding
Attack	1	-,736**	,317**	-,195*
Amicable Settlement		1	-,387**	-,260**
Defence			1	-,642**
Yielding				1

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (bilaterally).

\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (bilaterally).

This arrangement of correlation coefficients leads to the conclusion that Attack and Defence are similar types of behaviour, linked by ignoring the needs and desires of the other party in the conflict. Amicable Settlement is a behaviour opposite to all the rest - Attack and Defence, but also to Yielding, which confirms the assumption that its objectives are quite different i.e. to focus on solving the problem in question together with the partner. Yielding, however, is strongly opposed to Defence which confirms the assumption that it is a behaviour manifested in a risk situation whereby the person ceases to defend his/her interests. It is important to emphasize that the Attack and the Amicable Settlement scales have a strong negative correlation. This may indicate that they are not two different dimensions of behaviour but one bipolar dimension.

### Reliability Analysis

Internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha coefficients) of the individual scales was estimated. The results (presented in Table 5) allow to conclude that the reliability is at a moderate level ( $> 0.708$ ).

Table 5. Internal consistency coefficients (Cronbach's  $\alpha$ ) for individual CBQ scales (N = 154)

Scale	Cronbach's $\alpha$
Attack	0.729
Amicable Settlement	0.744
Defence	0.708
Yielding	0.769

### Accuracy Analysis

As part of the Conflict Behaviour Questionnaire accuracy analyses, the accuracy of its factors was examined as well as the correlations between the CBQ results and those obtained for another test on studying styles of behaviour in a conflict - namely the *Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument*.

The CBQ Relevance factor was determined on the basis of the results of the confirmatory factor analysis (by applying the main component method with *Varimax* rotation) performed on the whole study group of 158 people. Table 6 presents the factor loadings of the items constituting each scale of the questionnaire. Four factors constituting 44.1% of the total variance in the total group were selected.

The resulting factor structure largely confirms the assumptions concerning the scales of conflict behaviour styles although it does not coincide entirely with the applied/chosen scales.

Table 6. Factor loadings of items constituting each scale (N=158)

	Component			
	1	2	3	4
YIE 6	<b>,863</b>	,014	,142	-,089
YIE 1	,837	,033	,069	-,077
YIE 4	<b>,815</b>	,052	,045	-,055
YIE 7	<b>,748</b>	-,010	,277	-,118
YIE 2	<b>,729</b>	,033	,131	,069
YIE 12	,723	-,110	,024	-,132
YIE 5	<b>,714</b>	,046	-,023	,030
YIE 9	<b>,681</b>	,132	-,130	-,248
YIE 11	<b>,664</b>	,175	-,310	-,232
YIE 3	,483	,093	,097	-,294
YIE 10	<b>,474</b>	-,062	-,180	-,004
DEF 3	<b>-,368</b>	,289	,243	,019
DEF 9	<b>-,354</b>	,149	,289	,106
DEF 1	-,333	,044	,245	,030
ATT 7	-,038	<b>,695</b>	-,164	-,049
AMI 11	-,291	<b>-,662</b>	,002	-,096
ATT 2	-,161	<b>,616</b>	,234	,267
ATT 6	-,123	<b>,577</b>	,081	,005
AMI 5	-,221	<b>-,546</b>	-,290	-,425
AMI 7	-,125	<b>-,546</b>	,082	-,444
ATT 5	-,206	<b>,540</b>	,406	,224
AMI 6	-,206	<b>-,532</b>	-,134	-,432
AMI 3	-,197	<b>-,498</b>	-,380	-,143
DEF 2	-,444	<b>-,445</b>	-,028	,326
ATT 1	-,100	<b>,426</b>	,235	,040
ATT 12	,030	<b>,304</b>	,220	,169
AMI12	-,082	,062	<b>-,729</b>	,025
DEF 12	-,383	-,174	<b>,592</b>	-,044
DEF 10	-,036	,122	<b>,505</b>	,149
AMI 4	-,250	-,250	<b>-,494</b>	-,204
AMI 10	-,237	-,190	<b>-,494</b>	-,440
DEF 4	-,336	,228	<b>,477</b>	-,318
AMI 1	-,247	-,394	<b>-,456</b>	-,001
AMI 9	-,146	-,230	<b>-,452</b>	-,228
ATT 11	-,113	,345	<b>,423</b>	-,023
AMI 2	,166	,005	-,225	<b>-,601</b>
ATT 4	-,085	,018	,060	<b>,587</b>
DEF 7	-,293	,030	-,124	<b>,541</b>
DEF 6	-,336	,168	-,017	<b>,521</b>
ATT 10	-,071	,192	,325	<b>,454</b>
ATT 3	,224	,289	,176	<b>,422</b>
DEF 11	-,259	,339	-,071	<b>,417</b>
ATT 9	-,123	-,035	,330	<b>,396</b>
DEF 5	-,121	,191	,020	<b>,363</b>

Factor 1 includes all the items from the Yielding scale and three items from the Defence scale (with a negative sign). This suggests that factor 1 reflects the conflict behaviour involving both resignation from defence of self-interest as well as the failure to work towards a dispute settlement. Factor 2 consists of six items from the Attack scale and five items from the Amicable Settlement scale (with a negative sign). Content analysis of these items indicates that this dimension refers to the Attack type of behaviour. However, one can seriously wonder whether this factor does not relate to the Amicable Settlement scale (with a negative sign). A strong negative correlation (-0.736, see Table 5) between Amicable Settlement and Attack suggests that this may be a bipolar dimension. Factor 3 includes three items related to Defence, one item to Attack, and four items to Amicable Settlement (with a negative sign). It seems that this factor can be called the defence dimension. Factor 4 is similar to the third one. It consists of four items relating to Attack, four to Defence and a statement associated with Amicable Settlement (with a negative sign). Thus, factor 1 is the most appropriate for the Yielding scale, factor 2 – for the Attack scale (or the Amicable Settlement). Factors 3 and 4 are less cohesive and relate both to the Defence and the Attack scale.

In addition, to supplement the research on the CBQ reliability, a study was conducted on the correlation of the questionnaire with the *Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument*. The results are presented in Table 7.

Behaviour study with the use of the *Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument* and the Conflict Behaviour Questionnaire shows that Attack is positively related with Competing and negatively with Amicable Settlement. Defence correlates positively with Competing and negatively with Avoiding and Accommodating. Amicable Settlement correlates positively with Collaborating and negatively with Competing. Whereas Yielding is similar to Accommodating (positive correlation) and correlates

Table 7. Correlations between CBQ scales and the *Thomas-Kilmann* test scales (N = 134).

CBQ	Attack	Defence	Amicable Settlement	Yielding
Thomas-Kilmann				
Competing	.32*	.38*	-.36*	-.20*
Collaborating	-.29*	.03	.31*	-.19*
Compromising	-.08	-.14	.10	.13
Avoiding	-.08	-.21*	.14	.04
Accommodating	-.12	-.26*	.10	.26*

\* means  $p < .05$

negatively with Competing and Collaborating. It can therefore be concluded that the Attack and the Competing types of behaviour are very similar – they aim to dominate the opponent and to accomplish one's own goals at all costs. Amicable Settlement and Collaborating are equally close. Here the objectives are different – it is about dispute settlement that is beneficial for both conflict participants. Yielding is close to Accommodating, in both there is resignation from one's own wishes. Defence, however, is quite a different type of behaviour; it is partially connected with a firm resolution to achieve one's own goals and partly with a reluctance to adapt. In summary, Attack and Competing as well as Collaborating and Amicable Settlement dimensions show a great similarity some similarities can also be noticed between Yielding and Accommodating. Compromise, on the other hand, cannot be linked with any of the CBQ scales. This which confirms some of the suggestions that compromise is not a characteristic type of behaviour in a conflict but a certain final state of conflict interactions.

### Discussion

The concept of conflict as an exchange of negative influence between parties, resulting in a threat of interests, prosperity and welfare is reviewed. On its basis the concept of behaviour styles in conflict is discussed and four ways of dealing with negative influence of a partner as well as with threat are distinguished. They comprise: attack, amicable settlement, defence, and yielding. This classification may serve as a possible approach to diagnosing behaviour of conflict participants. The Conflict Behaviour Questionnaire, which is based on it, meets the essential Accuracy and Reliability requirements of a questionnaire. Standards must still be developed for diagnostic tests.

The presented concepts of conflict behaviour classification raise questions regarding the dimensions underlying various typologies. The study of the CBQ factor structure does not give a definite answer as to the independence and relationship between the scales corresponding to the distinguished conflictive behaviour. It may be assumed that Yielding is a clearly defined type of behaviour, independent of other types of behaviour, one of unipolar dimension. Attack and Amicable Settlement are strongly linked and one can suppose that they represent one dimension with two opposing poles. Defence, on the other hand, is associated with Attack and its assertiveness that probably lies at the basis of these dimensions. In a conflict situation assertiveness is understood more as defending one's own interests and ignoring the interests of the partner than as an action aimed at respecting the rights and the feelings of both parties.

### References

- Balawajder, K. (1998). *Komunikacja, konflikty, negocjacje w organizacji* (Communication, conflicts, negotiation in organizations). Katowice, Poland: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Balawajder, K. (1995). Interpersonal conflict: internal syndrome, *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 26(1), 19–30.
- Balawajder, K. (1992). *Konflikty interpersonalne: analiza psychologiczna* (Interpersonal conflicts: psychological analysis). Katowice, Poland: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego
- Blake, R.R., Mouton, J.S. (1964). *The managerial grid*, Houston, Texas: Gulf Publishing.
- Deutsch, M. 1994: Constructive conflict resolution: principles, training, and research. *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 50, No. 1, 2, 13-3
- Deutsch, M. (1973). *The resolution of conflict. Constructive and destructive processes*. New Haven, London: Yale University Press.
- Horney, K., (1994): *Nasze wewnętrzne konflikty*. (Our inner conflicts). Poznań, Poland: Rebis Dom Wydawniczy
- Horney, K., (1976): *Neurotyczna osobowość naszych czasów* (The neurotic personality of our time). Warszawa, Poland: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe
- Kolb, D., Putnam, L.L. (1992). The multiple faces of conflict in organizations, *Journal of Organization Behaviour*; Vol. 13, 311–324.
- Peterson, D.R. 1983: Conflict. In H.H. Kelley, E. Berscheid, A. Christensen, J.H. Harvey, T.L. Huston, G. Levinger, E. McClintock, A.L. Peplau, D.R. Peterson (Eds.), *Close Relationships* (pp. 360-396). New York: Freeman and Company
- Pruitt, D. G., Rubin, J.Z. (1986): *Social conflicts. Escalation, stalemate and settlement*. New York: Random House
- Pruitt, D. G., & Kimmel, M. J. (1977). Twenty years of experimental gaming: Critique, synthesis and suggestions for the future. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 28, 363-392.
- Putnam, L.L., Wilson, C.E. (1982): Communication strategies in organizational conflicts: reliability and validity of a measurement scale. In M. Burgoon, N.E. Doran (Eds.), *Communication Yearbook 6* (pp. 629-632). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications,
- Rahim, M.A. (red.) (1990), *Theory and research in conflict management*. New York, Westport, Connecticut, London: Praeger.
- Rahim, M. A. (1983): A measure of styles of handling interpersonal conflict. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 26, No. 2, 368-376
- Rapoport, A. (1970). *Fights, games and debates*. Ann Arbor: University Michigan Press.
- Rosenzweig, S. (1944). An outline of frustration theory, In J. McV. Hunt (Ed.), *Personality and the Behaviour Disorders* (pp. 379-388). Oxford, England: Ronald Press
- Rubin, J.Z., Pruitt, D.G., Kim, S.H. (1994). *Social conflict: Escalation, stalemate, and Settlement*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Thomas, K.W. (1992). Conflict and negotiation processes in organizational psychology. In .D. Dunnette, L.M., Hough M. (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational Psychology* (pp. 651–717). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist Press, Thomas, K.W. (1976): Conflict and conflict management. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 889-935). Chicago, Rand McNally, Thomas, K., Kilmann, R. (1974). *Thomas-Kilmann conflict mode instrument*. Tuxedo, NY: Xicom, Incorporated
- Thomas, K., Pondy, L.R., 1977: Toward an "intent" model of conflict management among principal parties. *Human Relations*, Vol. 30, No. 12.
- Tjosvold, D. (1990): The goal interdependence. Approach to communication in conflict: an organizational study. In M. A. Rahim (Ed.), *Theory and research in conflict management* (pp. 15-27). New York: Praeger
- Van de Vliert, E. (1997). *Complex Interpersonal Conflict Behaviour: Theoretical Frontiers*. London: Psychology Press.
- Wall, J., Callister, R. (1995). Conflict and its management, *Journal of Management*, 21, 515–558