The impact of (dis)similarities in personality traits on conflict attributes in buyer-seller relationships

Open University of the Netherlands
Faculty of Management Sciences
Master of Business Administration – Marketing and Supply Chain Management
First supervisor:  dr. C.J. Gelderman
Second supervisor:  dr. P.W.Th. Ghijsen
Johannes G. de Jong
Student number: 837508592

Final May 18, 2008
Preface

This thesis is the result of several years of study in free hours in the evening and in the weekends. It is the ending of my master’s degree, Marketing and Supply Chain management, at the Faculty of Management Sciences of the Open University of the Netherlands.

It was always a wish to study again. The internal drive to accomplish to study further awaked several years ago. However, it was not an easy and smoothly way. During the study, we started a family and this family get bigger, several changes of work, etc.

One is expected to complete the study by performing a scientific research study, as student of the Master of Business Administration. To add knowledge to the scientific world is a strive I want to accomplish with my research study; Are there (dis) similarity(s) in buyer-seller relationships concerning conflict attributes and what is the impact.

Therefore I would like to acknowledge to many contributors to my research study. First of all, I would like to address a word of thanks to Kees Gelderman of the Open University, who secured that I remained on the track of the scientific process of research. After all it is not my “core business”. During the process of adding knowledge to the academic world, I have developed a different way of observing and experiencing the world, recognizing more dimensions. Second, I thank Beatrice van de Heijden of the Open University for her feedback on the research study. A special word of thanks goes out to all the respondents who where willing to complete the questionnaire. The views expressed herein are mine and should not be attributed to any of the particular people who have provided commentary and review.

Finally, the research process was not always continued smoothly. As expected, my wife Jeannette remained firmly and convinced me to get the job done. This research study has been accomplished with her support and affection. I am most grateful to her. I also thank our daughters Cleo and Binbin for giving me some time in the weekends. I love you.
Summary

Buyer and seller relationships have become an integral part of business-to-business operating strategies over the past twenty years (Wilson, 1995; Zhou, 2007). In any relationship conflicts may arise. Conflict refers to a process that begins when one party perceives that the other has frustrated, or is about to frustrate, some concern (Plank 2006). Many studies have reported evidence of the negative impact of conflict on various aspects of buyer-seller relationships, such as trust (Kwon, 2004), loyalty (Plank and Newell, 2007), and relationship development (Plank et al, 2006). Conflict is a multi-dimensional concept (Amason, 1997; Hunger, 1976; Jehn, 1994, 1995, 1997; Kumar, 1995), with various conflict attributes, such as conflict frequency, conflict intensity, conflict cognitiveness (work related disagreement) and conflict affectiveness (interpersonal incompatibilities or problems among persons). The extant literature does not provide decisive answers to the question how we can explain conflict attributes in buyer-seller relationships.

Problem statement

In many psychological studies all kinds of human behaviour is explained by the concept of personality traits. Currently the most popular approach among psychologists for studying personality traits is the five-factor model or Big Five dimensions of personality (McCrae and Costa, 1990): agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, emotional stability and openness to experience. Bono et al (2002) found a relationship between conflict attributes and the personality of the parties involved. The personality of the buyer and the personality of the seller are likely to impact conflict attributes of their relationship. However, within the academic purchasing and supply management literature, personality traits are predominantly excluded in studies that are aimed at explaining conflict attributes and other relationship outcome variables (Van Raaij and De Jong, 2005). This study is therefore aimed at gaining insights in the impact of personality on conflict (attributes). More specific, it identifies (dis)similarities between buyer’s and seller’s personality traits in order to explain conflict attributes of buyer-seller relationships. The problem statement of this study is: What is the impact of (dis)similarities of buyer’s and seller’s personality traits on conflict attributes of buyer-seller relationships?

Conceptual model

In order to explain conflict attributes in buyer-seller relationships, we assume that dissimilarities of personality traits have a stimulating effect on conflict attributes, while similarities of personality traits have a tempering impact on conflict attributes. In addition, we assume that the conflict management style is a mediator between (dis)similarities and conflict. Personality traits have an influence on the conflict management styles and conflict management styles will have an influence on conflict. Park and Antonioni (2006) investigated how an individual’s interpersonal conflict resolution behavior is affected by the individual’s personality (assessed by the Big 5) and a situational factor (the other party’s conflict...
behavior), as well as how the two factors interact. They suggested to consider both dispositional and situational factors and their interaction in order to explain conflict attributes. The conceptual model of our study includes a mediator effect of the conflict management style on the relationship between personality traits and conflict attributes.

The ‘similarity-attraction hypothesis’ posits that similarity reduces psychological discomfort and conflict arising from cognitive or emotional disparity (Makela et al, 2007).

It is assumed that dissimilarities in personality traits between buyers and sellers have a positive impact on conflict attributes (conflict affectiveness, conflict cognitiveness and conflict manifest). This results in the following hypothesis:

**H1** Dissimilarities in personality traits between buyers and sellers have a positive impact on conflict attributes.

It is assumed that dissimilarities in personality traits between buyers and sellers mediate the relationship between conflict management style (integrating and dominating conflict management style) and conflict attributes (conflict affectiveness, conflict cognitiveness and conflict manifest). This results in the following hypothesis:

**H2** Dissimilarities in personality traits between buyers and sellers mediate the relationship between conflict management style and conflict attributes.

**Research method**

This study focuses on the dyadic relationship between buyers and sellers (the unit of analysis). In order to test the hypotheses a questionnaire was developed in order to collect survey data from buyer-seller dyads. The sampling units for this research are buyers and sellers of a large Dutch industrial service company who provided data on the constructs of interest. The sampling frame consisted of 51 buyers who were asked to provide the personal particulars of a business partner. The same procedure was followed for the sampling frame of a total number of 83 sellers who were asked to provide the personal particulars of a supplying business partner.
Results

The response rates of the buyer’s sample was 37% (n = 19) and 24% for the supplier’s sample (n = 20). These participants provided 25 names and addresses of persons with whom they have business relations. Regrettably, most of these business partners did not want to participate in our study. At the end of the day, we had survey data from only 3 dyads. An additional survey was set up, in order to get information from more dyads. However, the response was disappointing too. As a result, the hypotheses could not be tested. However, we have performed additional analyses, still from a dyadic perspective. Separately, for buyers and for suppliers, we have investigated the relationships between personality traits, conflict management style and conflict attributes. We did not use the (dis)similarities as explaining variables, but the personality traits of the buyer and seller separately. In the next three tables we give an overview of the found results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Trait</th>
<th>Conflict Affectiveness</th>
<th>Conflict Cognitiveness</th>
<th>Conflict Manifest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>Buyer</td>
<td>(β = 0.74, p &lt; 0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>Buyer</td>
<td>(β = -0.40, p = 0.05)</td>
<td>(β = -0.61, p = 0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seller</td>
<td>(β = -0.42, p = 0.03)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>Buyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>Buyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seller</td>
<td>(β = -0.58, p = 0.03)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>Buyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seller</td>
<td></td>
<td>(β = -0.03, p = 0.05)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Impact of personality traits on conflict attributes (regression coefficients)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Trait</th>
<th>Integrating Conflict Management Style</th>
<th>Dominating Conflict Management Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>Buyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>Buyer</td>
<td>(β = 0.26, p = 0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>Buyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>Buyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>Buyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Impact of personality traits on conflict management styles (regression coefficients)
Table 3 Impact of conflict management styles on conflict attributes (regression coefficients)

For the buyers it seems that the personality trait Neuroticism has a positive impact on Conflict Cognitiveness. The personality trait Extraversion has a negative impact on Conflict Cognitiveness.

For the sellers it seems that the personality trait Extraversion has a negative impact on Conflict Affectiveness and Conflict Cognitiveness and a positive impact on the Integrating conflict management style. The personality trait Agreeableness has a negative impact on Conflict Cognitiveness. The Integrating conflict management style of the sellers has a negative impact on Conflict Affectiveness, the Dominating conflict management style of the sellers has a positive impact on Conflict Cognitiveness.

Comparing buyers and sellers, we found that buyers (Mean Rank: 28.08) are more inclined to use the dominating conflict management style than sellers (Mean Rank 16.72). It seems that buyers and sellers are not similar in their main conflict management style.

**Recommendations**

An integrating conflict management style reduces the level of conflict cognitiveness and the level of conflict affectiveness as well. In contrast, a dominating conflict management style increases conflict cognitiveness, which, in turn, increases conflict affectiveness. Although the literature suggests that conflict management styles are stable individual dispositions, individuals can be overridden by means of appropriate training and support. The necessity for proper training of sales representatives and buyers as well in basic personal interactions, seems apparent. Implementing specific training programs that focus on developing behaviors and attitudes that minimize conflict affectiveness and utilize conflict cognitiveness could be helpful. Training may help people to learn to act in ways that improve their work environment and decrease their individual experience of conflict.

According to this study, buyers use a more dominating conflict management style than sellers. Future studies could try to explain this finding, by using explanatory variables such as power, cooperation, relationship quality, trust, commitment and relationship type, and their impact on conflict.
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1. Introduction

Buyer and seller relationships have become an integral part of business-to-business operating strategies over the past twenty years. The fact that buyers and sellers have relationships is nothing new. Relationships between buyers and sellers have existed since humans began trading goods and services. These relationships developed in a natural way over time as the buyers and sellers developed trust and friendships supported by quality products and services. An important phenomenon related to buyer-seller relationships is that many buyers are developing single source suppliers because of the pressure to increase quality, reduce inventory, develop just-in-time systems, and decrease time to market. Therefore it is necessary to have a good relationship with your business partner (Kwon, 2004). The findings of the study of Plank (2006), how conflict impacts ongoing buyer–seller relationships, suggest that affective conflict, as perceived by the buyer, has a negative impact on the relationship. This suggests that the supplier's representative needs to be aware of the importance of managing affective conflict in their business relationships. Given a dyadic perspective, it can be surmised that gaps in customer and supplier perceptions may well dampen relationships (Marr, 1984, 1988), and will inevitably occur, since a perfect match is highly unlikely between two exchange parties (Barnes, 2006). Specifically, the results of a number of studies indicate that conflict negatively impacts performance (Amason and Sapienza, 1997; Jehn, 1994, 1995).

In any relationship conflicts may arise. Scholars in various disciplines have generated a wide variety of definitions for the term, and, depending on the purpose of given studies; they range from very broad to narrow. Conflict has been broadly defined as perceived incompatibilities, discrepant views, or interpersonal incompatibilities between two parties. Conflict refers to a process that begins when one party perceives that the other has frustrated, or is about to frustrate, some concern of his. Within the tradition of broad definitions, Thomas defines conflict as “the process that begins when one party perceives that the other has negatively affected, or is about to negatively affect, something that he or she cares about.” (1990, p. 653 cited in Duarte, 2003 p. 93)). Conflict is a reality in everyone’s life and should be considered a natural process that occurs daily. Dealing with conflict between and among individuals can be one of the most frustrating and uncomfortable experiences for humans. (Plank, 2006). In particular, conflict of an affective type (personal focus) is thought to be potentially more damaging than task or cognitive conflict (content focus) which may be beneficial to problem solving and decisions (Jehn, 1994, 1995).

Conflict is multi-dimensional construct (Amason, 1997; Hunger, 1976; Jehn, 1994, 1995, 1997; Kumar, 1995). In this study we introduce conflict attributes as the outcome variables. This will be in short conflict affectiveness, conflict cognitiveness, frequency conflict and intensity conflict. Relationship conflicts exist when there are interpersonal incompatibilities or problems among persons that are not necessarily related to work. Task (cognitive) conflicts
are conflicts about ideas and disagreement about the content and issues of the task, including differences in viewpoints, ideas, and opinions.

In explaining the conflict attributes as outcome variables we assume that the personality traits has an influence as the independent variables. The study of Bono et al (2002) provide evidence between a relation of personality traits and two conflict attributes, namely affective – and cognitive conflict. Bono et al (2002) found evidence of individual differences in the tendency to attribute conflicts to task or relationship issues. The strongest personality predictors of relationship conflict were partner effects, difference effects, and mean level effects, implying that individuals conflict interpretations may be partner specific. According to Bono et al (2002) it is likely that the attributes individuals make about any particular conflict episode are a function of their own personality and the personality of their partner, in combination with factors of the situation. In a dyadic conflict we can assume the individual differences as a source of the conflict, due mismatch of personality traits. This will be the (dis) similarities as the explaining background. People with a certain personality or culture use a conflict behavior what can be harmful to the relation. When conflict left unmanaged, it leads to negative consequences for the parties involved.

Conflict has been studied extensively in the business research literature. Research has been both qualitative and quantitative and has focused primarily on the antecedents of conflict, the process of conflict, and how conflict is (Plank, 2006). Within the academic purchasing and supply management literature, findings suggest an important role for emotionality and conscientiousness as dimensions of personality in explaining job satisfaction, and a variety of soft skills in explaining internal relationship quality and the occurrence of maverick buying (Van Raaij and de Jong, 2005). We conclude that personality traits are normally not included in purchasing research.

However, to the best of my knowledge, no research has studied the causal relationship between the personalities of buyers and sellers and conflict attributes in their relationships. This study aims at addressing this gap by developing a comprehensive conceptual model and by testing the assumed relationships between the identified variables. Relatively little is known about what the potential impact of personality traits will be on a business relationship, concerning conflict attributes (for example frequency-, intensity- & importance- or affective- and cognitive conflict)

Clearly, there is a need for an empirical study what the relation is of personality traits and conflict attributes, and what will be the impact on their relationship. Are there (dis)similarities for explaining this?

The problem statement of this study is: What is the impact of (dis)similarities between the demographic characteristics and personality attributes of buyers and sellers on conflict attributes in buyer supplier relationships?
This study will examine the use of individual conflict management styles when engaged in conflict outcomes with buyer and supplier relation in personal and organizational contexts. Furthermore, the role played by personality traits in the use of conflict management styles across contexts will be considered.

Thus, this research adds to the extant literature by examining the drivers and outcomes of conflict in a buyer-seller relationship. It will maybe provide us insights on conflict and personality match or mismatch.

We assumed first a connection between (dis)similarities in personality traits and conflict attributes. Second we assume that the conflict management style is a mediator between (dis)similarities and conflict attributes. The relationship between personality and conflict has captured the attention of researchers for decades. One line of research has focused on the degree to which individuals differ in the strategies they use in response to conflict. This work demonstrates that individuals differ in their propensity to avoid, accommodate, compromise, compete, or collaborate with others (Rahim, 1983). Personality traits have an influence on the conflict management styles and conflict management styles will have an influence on conflict. The study of Park and Antonioni (2006) investigates how an individual’s interpersonal conflict resolution behavior is affected by the individual’s personality (assessed by the Big 5) and a situational factor (the other party’s conflict behavior), as well as how the two factors interact. The study is done with students and students roommates. Park and Antonioni (2006) suggested as latest sentence the following: “To fully understand conflict behavior we need to consider both dispositional and situational factors and how these factors interact.”

Personality affects an individual’s choice of conflict strategy through various motivational, cognitive, and affective processes. For example, people with different personalities may have different motivations, and thus use different conflict strategies because they value and seek different outcomes in the conflict situation (Park and Antonioni, 2006). On the other hand Ting-Toomey et al (1991) assert that, often, it is not the conflict issue itself, but the differences in conflict management styles that create the greatest tension in conflict situations.

Our conceptual model is given in Figure 1-1. The model consists three terms, namely (1) (Dis)similarities, (2) conflict management styles as a mediator and (3) the outcome; conflict attributes.
The literature review is aimed at modelling the relationships between personalities and the conflict attributes of buyer-supplier relationships. Hypotheses will be developed and tested via a survey among buyers and sellers. The survey will be characterized by a dyadic approach, using pairs of buyer and suppliers. The dyad is considered as the unit of analysis.

Structure of the thesis

This report is structured in the following order. This study starts with a literature review to provide the background and content validity for the primary constructs of the research in section 2. The research method will be further described in section 3. The sample research data and empirical findings will be presented in section 4 followed by conclusions and implications of the study and limitations and future directions of this research in section 5.
2. Literature study

The relationship between personality and conflict has captured the attention of researchers for decades. First goal of this chapter is to clarify the terms: (a) types of conflict, (b) conflict management styles (c) conflict in buyer-seller relationships and (d) role of personality. The second goal of this chapter is to shed light on personality in combination with conflict by analysing the existing literature in order to distinguish the personality term in relation with the conflict management style. The third goal is to propose hypotheses between the buyer-supplier personality in relation with their conflict management style in conflict situations.

Section 2.1 starts with explanatory information of several types of conflict. In section 2.2 we will explain several conflict management styles. Section 2.3 gives insight in the conflict in buyer-supplier relationships. Finally in section 2.4 we will explain the concept of personality. It takes a closer look at the literature on personality. In section 2.5 we propose the conceptual model for this study, including the development of hypotheses.

2.1. Types of conflict

To understand the complexity of conflict, it is better to see it as a dynamic process rather than as a single state (Pondy, 1967; Thomsom 1967). In what became a seminal article, Pondy (1967) proposed conflict to be composed of a sequence of episodes where each episode builds upon the previous one and provides the background for the subsequent ones. (Duarte, 2003)

Each episode comprises several states:
(1) latent conflict (conditions);
(2) perceived conflict (cognition);
(3) affective conflict (affect);
(4) manifest conflict (behaviour); and
(5) conflict aftermath (conditions).

These five states are not necessarily sequential and not every conflict passes through every stage. For example, the businesses in a relationship may not even perceive latent conflict, or the issue may be settled before any manifest conflict behavior occurs [Pondy, 1967]. Despite being the most frequently cited model of organizational conflict, Pondy's ideas have never been directly empirically validated [Lewicki, 1992; Pondy, 1992]. The model seems to have gained its place in the literature on face validity and inherent appeal to both academics and practitioners [Lewicki, 1992]. It has been useful in identifying the main dimensions of conflict, particularly latent, manifest and affective. (Duarte, 2003)

Conflict has been defined several ways in both channel and organizational behavior literatures [Gattorna, 1978; Pondy, 1967]. Early definitions of conflict focused on a wide variety of phenomena, including:
the antecedent conditions of behavioural conflict (e.g., scarcity of resources);
affective states of the channel members involved (e.g., tension, hostility);
the perception or awareness of a conflict situation; and
actual conflict behaviour, ranging from passive resistance to overt aggression [Pondy, 1967]. (Duarte, 2003)
Pondy [1967] considers attempts to decide which of these phenomena is really ‘conflict’ to be an empty controversy. Instead, he argues for a broad working definition to embrace the entire conflict process, and thus all the phenomena above. Within the tradition of broad definitions, Thomas ([1990], p. 653) defines conflict as “the process that begins when one party perceives that the other has negatively affected, or is about to negatively affect, something that he or she cares about.” Other definitions emphasise the idea of one party impeding another: “Channel conflict is a situation in which one channel member perceives another channel member(s) to be engaged in behavior that prevents or impedes it from achieving its goals” ([Stern, 1996], p. 306). Similarly, Gaski ([1984], p. 11) considers channel conflict to be “the perception on the part of a channel member that its goal attainment is being impeded by another, with stress or tension the result.” The implications for the researcher are that conflict should not be considered to be a single phenomenon. It follows that any comprehensive study should include more than one measure. (Duarte, 2003)
The two most frequently studied states of conflict are manifest and affective [Kumar, 1995]). Manifest conflict (conflict is perceived to exist) is often measured by first identifying major areas of disagreement and then by asking respondents to rate them in terms of the perceived amount of conflict. Alternative measures of manifest conflict build in (1) the frequency of conflict [Kim, 1997]; (2) frequency and importance [Brown, 1978]; (3) frequency and intensity [Hunger, 1976]; and (4) frequency, intensity, and importance (e.g., Ref. [Brown, 1981]) (Duarte, 2003). Most measures of affective conflict assess extensive listings of conflict statements, adjectives for conflict situations, and traits (e.g., Refs. [Gundlach, 1994; Hunger, 1976; Pearson, 1976]. Although the escalation of conflict may be strongly influenced by emotions, few measures have focused on them [Kumar, 1995]. Identifying and prioritizing critical success factors for conflict management in collaborative new product development (Duarte, 2003)

Rahim (2001) asserted that conflict has both functional and dysfunctional outcomes. Functional outcomes include stimulating innovation and creativity, and better decision making, whereas dissatisfaction, mistrust, damaged commitment and relationship are the common dysfunctional outcomes. It has been well accepted that conflict is functional when it is task-oriented and focused on judgmental differences about the best way to achieve objectives (Jehn, 1997; Amason, 1996). This type of conflict, often called cognitive conflict, contributes to good decision making as a result of the effective use of evidence and
information from diverse perspectives as the synthesis of the diverse perspectives is superior to the individual perspectives themselves (Amason, 1996; Lam, 2005).

Jehn (1997) found that there are three different types of conflict: (1) relationship conflicts, (2) task-related conflicts, and (3) process conflicts. Relationship conflicts exist when there are interpersonal incompatibilities or problems among group members that are not necessarily related to work. This type of conflict often includes, for example, arguments about religion, politics, or fashion. She found also that organizational members called these types of conflicts “people problems,” “personal conflicts,” and “interpersonal problems.” Typically, with this type of conflict, people just don’t like each other; they don’t get along. Task conflicts are focused on the work, not a specific person or their attributes. Task conflicts are conflicts about ideas and disagreement about the content and issues of the task, including differences in viewpoints, ideas, and opinions. People often describe these conflicts as “work conflict,” “work disagreements,” and “task problems”. The third type of conflict: “process conflict” which is defined as conflicts about how task accomplishment should proceed in the work unit. An example for relationship conflict: If you are arguing about the worth or entertainment value of a film you saw last night insulting someone’s personal preferences, then you are having a relationship conflict. This may seem to be a trivial example, but you can imagine things getting more heated if the relationship conflict is related to religion or politics. An example for task conflict: you are working on a paper with co-authors and you have a fight about what theories are relevant for the front end of your paper or to develop the hypotheses. Examples of such are disagreements about who should do what, debates about resources, and fights about how to schedule tasks efficiently, administrative issues. Continuing with the above example of the research team, when four researchers disagree about data interpretation and the meaning of the results, they are experiencing task conflict. If they argue about who is responsible for writing up the final report and who will make the presentation and get travel funds, they are having a process conflict. The outcome of relationship conflicts were basically always negative. They caused members to be dissatisfied, perform less effectively, to have lower levels of trust and respect, and more miscommunication. The outcome of task conflict, however, was found to be beneficial under certain circumstances for example, task conflicts increased performance in groups working on creative, non-routine, thinking tasks.

2.2. Conflict management styles

Even though conflict appears to be a common phenomenon in human experience, each person deals with conflict situations differently. In a variety of studies regarding conflict, the way in which people manage it, has received a great deal of attention. Styles of conflict management are characterized by the general tendency for an individual to display a certain type of conflict behavior repeatedly and across situations.
Scholars have used many instruments to capture styles of conflict management in interpersonal and organizational contexts. These instruments reflect similar constructs, but many different models, involving specific terms for them, are evident in the work of different researchers (e.g., Blake & Mouton, 1964; Rahim, 1983; Thomas & Kilmann, 1974) (Duke, 1998)

More than four decades ago, Blake and Mouton (1964) identified five main methods for resolving or handling conflict. These 5 classical methods or modes of conflict resolution are described below.

1. Withdrawal or ignore or deny an actual or potential disagreement.
2. Smoothing to emphasise the commonalities or strong points and to de-emphasise or even suppress any differences in viewpoints among conflicting parties.
3. Forcing or exert one’s point of view at the expense of another and often lead to a win/lose situation.
4. Compromising to determine ‘acceptable’ solutions in which conflicting parties have some degree of satisfaction with a ‘give and take’ attitude.
5. Problem Solving to face or confront conflict directly with a problem-solving attitude and generate the ‘best’ solution even though the original views of either or both conflicting parties may need to be modified or discarded. Both parties set out to seek for a win-win situation.

Subsequent researchers have largely concurred on these but some have called them by different terms. An effective integration of this knowledge and its application to buyer-supplier relationships was offered by Thomas (1976). Thomas presents a process model which describes conflict processes in terms of two dimensions: desire to satisfy own concerns and desire to satisfy others’ concerns. Within the two-dimensional joint outcome space thus delineated, five positions, corresponding to five conflict handling styles, are identified: avoidant, competitive, accommodative, sharing and collaborative (illustrated by Figure 2-1). We see in this figure conflict management styles as described by several scholars. Thomas also uses this approach to identify two additional dimensions, distributive and integrative (Figure 2-2), giving us the concepts of the distributive approach, where the two parties negotiate to share a fixed amount of benefit (‘dividing up the pie’ would be the applicable aphorism) and the integrative approach, in which the parties cooperate to increase the total amount of benefit to be shared (‘increasing the size ‘of the pie’). The relative merits of these two approaches are the focus of current debate in buyer-supplier relationships in many industries, not the least of which is grocery manufacturing and retailing. They are broadly identified by researchers and managers using a variety of labels: the integrative approach is compatible to the coordinative approach, collaboration, cooperation and partnering, while the distributive approach matches confrontational, competitive and adversarial approaches. (Duke, 1998)
Figure 2-1 Overlay of conflict resolution styles and authors derived from dual concerns theory. Although the majority of this figure is original, the idea was based on “Fig. 1, Composite of the Hall, Pruitt, Rahim, and Thomas two-dimensional models with associated conflict styles” (Sorenson et al, 1999, p. 27 (Holt & De Vore, 2005)).

Figure 2-2 Integrative and distributive dimensions in the joint outcome space (Thomas, 1976)

Based on the conceptualizations of Follett (1940), Blake and Mouton (1964), and Thomas (1976), Rahim and Bonoma (1979) differentiated the styles of handling interpersonal conflict on two basic dimensions, concern for self and for others. (Rahim, 2001). The first dimension explains the degree (high or low) to which a person attempts to satisfy his or her own concern. The second dimension explains the degree (high or low) to which a person attempts to satisfy the concern of others. Combining the two dimensions results in five specific styles of handling conflict. Descriptions of these styles are presented below (Rahim, 1983, 2001).
1. **Integrating** (high concern for self and others) style involves openness, exchange of information, and examination of differences to reach an effective solution acceptable to both parties. It is associated with problem solving, which may lead to creative solutions. Rahim (1994) indicates that "this style involves collaboration between the parties for problem solving. This requires trust and openness so that the parties can exchange information and analyze their differences to reach a solution acceptable to them" (p.6).

2. **Obliging** (low concern for self and high concern for others) style is associated with attempting to play down the differences and emphasizing commonalities to satisfy the concern of the other party. According to Rahim (1994); "this style is associated with attempting to play down the differences and emphasizing similarities to satisfy the concerns of the other party. It may take the form of self sacrifice, selfless generosity, charity, or obedience to another person’s wishes" (p.6).

3. **Dominating** (high concern for self and low concern for others) style has been identified with win–lose orientation or with forcing behaviour to win one’s position. Rahim (1994) states that; A dominating or competing person goes all out to win his or her objective and, as a result, often ignores the needs and expectations of the other party. Dominating may mean standing up for one's rights and / or defending a position that the party believes to be correct (p.6).

4. **Avoiding** (low concern for self and others) style has been associated with withdrawal, buck-passing, or sidestepping situations. According to Rahim (1994) this style; "...may take the form of postponing an issue until a better time, or simply withdrawing from a threatening situation. This style is often characterized by an unconcerned attitude toward the issues or parties involved in conflict. Such a person may refuse to acknowledge in public that there is a conflict that should be dealt with (p.6).

5. **Compromising** (intermediate in concern for self and others). Rahim (1994) suggests that this style is neither zero-sum, nor exactly positive sum in nature as he puts it as “mixed” or “no-win / no-lose”, and states that; This style involves give-and-take or sharing, whereby both parties give up something to make a mutually acceptable decision. It may mean splitting the difference, exchanging concession, or seeking a quick middle-ground position. A compromising party gives up more than a dominating party but less than an obliging party. Likewise, such a party addresses an issue more directly than an avoiding party, but does not explore it in as much depth as an integrating party (p.7).

**2.3. Conflict in relationships**

We will provide some insights of conflict in relationships as they were encountered by several scholars during their studies.
In the study of Kwon and Suh (2004) emerged the following: if the partner perceives a potential conflict with its trading partners, there will be considerable reluctance by the other trading partner to engage in the trust-building process and ultimate relationship. Accordingly, a negative relationship is hypothesized between the degree of perceived conflict (PPC) and the level of trust. The study of Kwon and Suh (2004) reveals a statistically significant negative relationship between these two constructs. Accordingly, his following hypothesis is supported: Perceived conflict with his/her trading partners attenuates the level of trust among trading partners. Skarmeas (2006) examined the role of functional conflict in international buyer–seller relationships. He was the first who reported in his research demonstrating the positive link between functional conflict and future purchase intentions.

Plank and Newell (2007) did a study about the effect of social conflict on relationship loyalty in business markets. This study investigated how conflict impacts ongoing buyer–seller relationships. The two primary constructs of interest in their research are social conflict (made up of affective and cognitive conflict) and relationship loyalty. There findings suggest that affective conflict, as perceived by the buyer, has a negative impact on relationship loyalty. Cognitive conflict, or conflict over ideas, has little or no impact on perceived loyalty, either negatively or positively. This suggests that the supplier’s representative needs to be aware of the importance of managing affective conflict in their business relationships. However, it may also suggest that cognitive conflict can be harnessed to either hold an existing account or execute a switch and take business away from a competitor. (Plank and Newell, 2007)

Kozan et al (2006) did a study of buyers in automakers and supplier in conflict management in a Turkish buyer-supplier relationship. They had three clusters: strategic partnership, captive supplier and marked exchange as one of the independent variables. The second one was whether the respondent was a buyer or a supplier. The independent variable of cluster membership had no significant effect on the conflict management style (as dependent variable). In other words, the type of supplier relations based on specific investment did not influence the style of handling conflicts. On the other hand, buyers and suppliers different significantly in their use of the followings three conflict styles, namely, problem solving, accommodation and avoidance. Buyers reported using more problem solving in conflicts than suppliers. The suppliers reported using more accommodation and avoidance in their contentious relations with buyers. The buyers are more and the suppliers are less assertive.

Kaushall and Kwantes (2006) explored in their study the relationships among culture (values and beliefs/cognitions), power, personality (self-monitoring and EQ) and styles of conflict resolution. These strategies are usually applied to organizational settings; however it is possible to generalize them to any setting involving interpersonal interactions. Conflicts can occur at both intergroup and interpersonal levels; however the reasons for conflict range from social to personal. The effects of cultural variables may influence the way a person acts at social level. How (s)he perceives the situation and the way (s)he choose the resolution on the
situation encountered. We can say for predicting conflict behavior, that it is important to acknowledge both group-level (cultural) and individual-level (personality) processes. First variable of culture is value, people from individualistic cultures are more likely to resolve conflicts using a dominating or obliging style, whereas those from collectivistic cultures are more likely to do so using an integrating or avoiding style (Rahim, 1992). For the second culture variable they used the Social Axiom Scale (SAS) to measure the culturally learned beliefs. This measure is developed by Leung et al (2002) and contains five factors (social cynicism, social complexity, reward for application, spirituality and fate control). Thus, both cultural values and social beliefs play an important role in predicting a person’s choice of conflict resolution strategy. Social cynicism is positive related to dominating, avoiding and obliging strategy, where social flexibility related is to avoiding strategy. Vertical collectivism is positive related to dominating, avoiding and obliging strategy, Vertical individualism is positive related to dominating and avoiding strategy. Similar findings are evident in the conflict literature, providing additional support for the idea that culture influences the conflict process in a subtle yet significant way. The findings of their study have demonstrated that cultural values and social beliefs do predict a person’s choice of conflict strategy. However the personal variables EQ and self monitoring do not.

2.4. The role of personality

First we will discuss personality in general. Second we give insight how personality predict conflict resolution behavior and third we do this also for predicting the type of conflict.

2.4.1. Personality in general

The role of personality can be explained by the science of personality psychology as an area of basic psychology. This study focuses on people’s characteristic tendency to behave, think and feel in certain ways. It is concerned with issues like how people differ from each other psychologically, and how those differences can be measured. It is also increasingly recognises that situations as well as personality influence a person’s behaviour, thoughts and emotions. Hence some attention is also paid to defining how situations differ from each other. To understand human behaviour we will use in this study the trait approach. Trait approaches emphasise the importance of stable and measurable difference between people’s psychological functioning which are frequently reflected in their work behaviour. This approach is essentially concerned with measuring a person’s psychological characteristics. These characteristics, which include intellectual functioning, are generally assumed to be quite stable. That is, a person’s personality in unlikely to change much, especially during adulthood (McCrae & Costa, 1990). Some theorists have developed personality types, or ‘pigeon-holes’ in which any individual can be placed. One good example dates back to ancient Greek times
when Hippocrates wrote of four types: phlegmatic (calm); choleric (quick-tempered); sanguine (cheerful, optimistic) and melancholic (sad, depressed). These days, psychologists are thinking in terms of traits than types. A trait is an underlying dimension along which people differ one from another. Trait psychologists as Eysenck (1967) and Cattell (1965) have identified specific traits through much careful experimental and statistical investigation. A trait is a temporally stable, cross-situational individual difference. Currently the most popular approach among psychologists for studying personality traits is the five-factor model or Big Five dimensions of personality. The five factors were derived from factor analyses of a large number of self- and peer reports on personality relevant adjectives and questionnaire items. The following are some of the important characteristics of the five factors. First, the factors are dimensions, not types, so people vary continuously on them, with most people falling in between the extremes. Second, the factors are stable over a 45-year period beginning in young adulthood (Soldz & Vaillant, 1999). Third, the factors and their specific facets are heritable (i.e., genetic), at least in part (Jang, McCrae, Angleitner, Riemann and Livesley, 1998; Loehlin, McCrae, Costa and John, 1998). Fourth, the factors probably had adaptive value in a prehistoric environment (Buss, 1996). Fifth, the factors are considered universal, having been recovered in languages as diverse as German and Chinese (McCrae and Costa, 1997). Sixth, knowing one’s placement on the factors is useful for insight and improvement through therapy (Costa and McCrae, 1992).

As personality researchers have indicated, one comprehensive description of an individuals traits is known as the Big Five (McCrae and John, 1992). The five-factor model is a hierarchical organization of personality traits in terms of five orthogonal dimensions including Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness to Experience (McCrae and John, 1992). The basic dimensions of the five factors have been shown to organize the hundreds of personality traits proposed by theorists (McCrae and Costa, 1991), to have convergent and discriminant validity, to endure across decades in adults (McCrae and Costa, 1990), to describe individual differences in behavior (Fleeson, 2001), and to be at least somewhat replicable in some other cultures (De Raad, 1998). Thus, the Big Five seems appropriate for capturing a broad picture of an individual’s personality.

A high degree of consensus has emerged and investigators have agreed that a five-factor structure represents an adequate way of describing the basic dimensions of personality. These five factors, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism and Openness to Experience, were named the “Big Five” (Goldberg, 1990). This fivefold structure involves:

1. **Agreeableness**
   Being courteous, flexible, trusting, good-natured, cooperative, forgiving. One of the facets of agreeableness is the propensity for cooperative behaviour.

2. **Conscientiousness**
Being careful, thorough, responsible, organized and planful. Conscientious persons have the tendency to think carefully before acting, and perform best under focused and structured tasks.

3. **Extraversion**  
   Being sociable, gregarious, assertive, talkative, and active.  
   Introvert persons are kept to oneself, are shy, passive and pessimistic (McAdams, 1992). Various studies show that introvert persons avoid stimuli because they react physiologically violently (McAdams 1992).

4. **Neuroticism (or Emotional stability)**  
   Associated with being anxious, depressed, angry, embarrassed, worried, and insecure.  
   Unstable people are moody and unpredictable.

5. **Openness to experience**  
   Being imaginative cultured, curious, original, broadminded, intelligent and artistically sensitive.

High Scores on each dimension are characteristic of the following: High Extroversion: Someone who is outgoing, sociable, and uninhibited. High Neuroticism: Someone who has a high level of distress in their life. High Openness to Experience: Someone who is daring and imaginative, and welcomes change and challenges. High Agreeableness: Someone who is good natured, caring, and forgiving. High Conscientiousness: Someone who is careful, reliable, persevering, and well organized.

There has been great progress in trait psychology in the past 20 years. The most celebrated achievement is a general, if not quite universal, consensus on the Five-Factor Model (FFM) as a reasonably comprehensive taxonomy of personality traits. Neuroticism (N), Extraversion (E), Openness to Experience (O), Agreeableness (A), and Conscientiousness (C) appear to be the basic factors underlying both English language trait adjectives and theoretically based personality scales (McCrae and John, 1992). To the extent that this taxonomy is comprehensive, we know the range of trait variables that need to be considered in personality-and-culture studies. We also know now that traits are not cognitive fictions, but real psychological structures. We have learned that traits are important for a wide range of applications (McCrae, 2004).
In simplified form, Five Factor Theory (FFT) can be represented by Figure 2-3, in which causal pathways between biology, culture, traits, characteristic adaptations, and behavior are indicated. The only unfamiliar term here is Characteristic Adaptations. These are all the psychological structures that people acquire in the course of life for getting along in the world. They include knowledge, skills, attitudes, goals, roles, relationships, schemas, scripts, habits, even the self concept. Characteristic adaptations comprise the bulk of the phenomena that psychologists are concerned with, but they do not include personality traits, which FFT depicts as deeper structures, basic tendencies that are grounded in biology. Characteristic adaptations are shaped by the interaction of personality traits and the environment. For example, people who are by nature extraverted are likely to be talkative, but whether they speak Danish or Telugu or Korean depends on the linguistic environment in which they live. (McCrae, 2004).

The represents of the Old World distribution of Extraversion is shown in Figure 2-4. Data here are taken from study’s of McCrae (2002). In this Figure, the darker the shading, the higher is the Extraversion score (the US would fall between the two darkest categories). Notice the light gray in Taiwan, Korea, and Japan, in India, and in all three African nations. This map is quite clear: Asia and Africa are introverted, Europe extraverted. Europeans as a group also tend to be higher in Openness to Experience and lower in Agreeableness and Conscientiousness (Allik and McCrae, 2004)).
Costa et al (2001) examined gender differences in 26 cultures. They found that women in almost every culture were higher than men in Neuroticism and Agreeableness, and that men were higher on a few specific facets, including Openness to Ideas, Assertiveness, and Excitement Seeking. Curiously, these effects were largest in progressive, Western cultures that emphasized equality of the sexes, perhaps because respondents attributed masculine and feminine qualities to sex roles rather than traits in traditional cultures. (McCrae, 2004)

In general we can conclude that personality is shaped by both genetic and environmental factors; among the most important of the later are cultural influences.

2.4.2. **Personality and conflict resolution behavior**

The study of Park and Antonioni (2006) investigates how an individual’s interpersonal conflict resolution behavior is affected by the individual’s personality (assessed by the Big 5) and a situational factor (the other party’s conflict behavior), as well as how the two factors interact. The study is done with students and students roommates. Agreeableness and Extraversion were positively associated with the student’s use of collaboration strategy. The effect of Agreeableness was significant in both student and roommate/friend samples, but stronger in the friend sample than in the roommate sample. Neuroticism was also positively associated with collaboration, suggesting neurotic students used more collaboration than emotionally stable students. Openness was negatively associated with collaboration. Agreeableness was negatively associated with use of competition, and Extraversion was positively associated.
Agreeableness was positively associated with use of accommodation and the student’s Extraversion was negatively. Extraversion was negatively associated with avoiding. Results for roommate/friend’s conflict strategies show that for all conflict strategies except accommodation, the reciprocity hypothesis was supported. That is, the roommate/friend’s collaboration, competing, and avoiding were positively associated with the student’s collaboration, competing, and avoiding, respectively. Agreeableness interacted with roommate/friend’s use of collaboration to predict students’ own use of collaboration. Openness interacted with roommate/friend’s use of competing strategy and with roommate/friend’s use of accommodation to predict student’s use of competing strategy. The effect of Agreeableness on the student’s use of collaboration was decreased as the roommate/friend used more collaboration strategy. Openness was negatively associated with the student’s use of competing when the roommate/friend scored low in the use of competing. However, when the roommate/friend scored high in competing, the student’s Openness was positively associated with the student’s use of competing strategy. The moderating effect of the roommate/friend’s accommodation was the opposite. When the roommate/friend scored low in accommodation, the student’s Openness was positively associated with the student’s use of competing strategy; however, the student’s Openness was negatively associated with the student’s use of competing when the roommate/friend scored high in the use of accommodation.

### 2.4.3. Personality and conflict

Bono et al (2002) have studied the role of personality in task and relationship conflict. They addressed two general questions: First, are there stable individual differences in the tendency to make task and/or relationship attributes about conflict? And second, does personality predict these tendencies? Their findings support the idea that individual differences matter. Although there was a small association between agreeableness and conflict frequency in the individual data, there were no significant actor or partner effects in the paired data. Moreover, although the correlation was in the expected direction, the mean level of agreeableness in a pair was not associated with frequency of conflict. They also found no evidence of gender effects for agreeableness. Their dyadic analysis indicates that extraversion plays a key role in the attributes individuals make about the conflict they experience. The results found in their study suggest that extraverts do not experience more conflict. However, the partners of extraverts tend to attribute their conflicts to their extraverted partner or their relationship with their partner. Moreover, mean levels of extraversion in a pair are associated with reports of relationship conflict. Finally, differences in extraversion between partners are associated with more conflict and task related conflict. Although extraversion and agreeableness share a facet of warmth and affection toward others, it is clear from the results of their study that the traits have a very different influence on conflict. Since conscientiousness tends to be associated more with self-control and achievement orientation than with interpersonal relationships, the findings regarding
conscientiousness are noteworthy. Partners of highly conscientious individuals tended to report relationship conflict. Furthermore, mean levels of conscientiousness in a dyad were associated with reports of relationship conflict. The differences in conscientiousness however, did not give conflict. Perhaps due to their tendency to be argumentative, individuals scoring high on the trait openness to experience have more frequent conflict. Further, they are more likely to attribute their conflicts to task issues. Although there is empirical evidence that task conflict is neither good nor bad for relationship satisfaction, the position-oriented conflict of open individuals is the sort of conflict that has been found to be beneficial to work group performance (Amason, 1996; Jehn, 1995, 1997). However, individuals who score high on openness to experience also tended to attribute their conflicts to relationship concerns, which can have detrimental effects on both relationships and work group performance (Jehn, 1995, 1997). Bono et al (2002) has found that openness to experience is worthy of further attention in the study of conflict. Individuals who score high on the trait neuroticism report more conflict, their partners do not. Nor did high mean levels of neuroticism in a pair influence conflict attributes. However, it was interesting to note that differences between partners in neuroticism scores were associated with reports of relationship conflict. The relationship between personality and the attributes individuals make in interpreting conflict is complex. Bono et al (2002) found evidence of individual differences in the tendency to attribute conflicts to task or relationship issues. The strongest personality predictors of relationship conflict were partner effects, difference effects, and mean level effects, implying that individuals' conflict interpretations may be partner specific. According to Bono et al (2002) it is likely that the attributes individuals make about any particular conflict episode are a function of their own personality and the personality of their partner, in combination with factors of the situation.

2.4.4. Demographic diversity

We introduce the term demographic diversity. This includes the following: visible demographic characteristics, job-relatedness demographic characteristics and personality traits. This will be the demographic and personal attributes. We will use the theory of Tsui et al (1992) and describe this as follows. Demography researchers have established that the more similar an individual is with the members of his or social context, the easier it is to be integrated with the social unit through three major psychological processes: similarity attraction, social identification and social categorization. Most academic research concerns the impact of demographic similarity on individual, group and organizational outcomes within dyadic relationships and groups (Tsui et al, 1992). Underlying the concept of relational demography is the construct of demographic similarity/diversity that characterizes the degree to which an individual's demographic attributes are shared by other members of a social unit (Tsui et al, 1992).

In general, then, demographic characteristics may be relevant categories that individuals use as part of their self-identity in the context of a given social unit, such as an organization or a
work group The social unit may be more attractive to the individual if it is composed of others whose demographic profiles are consistent with the categories that the individual has chosen to categorize him or herself (Tsui et al, 1992). Demographic attributes usually consist of age, sex, race, education level, work experience, and organization tenure. Research in this area has classified these attributes on two dimensions: visibility and job-relatedness (Tsui et al, 1992). Visible demographic characteristics refer to age, sex, and race; job-relatedness demographic characteristics refer to differences among individuals related to education level, work experience, and organization tenure. For example, if an individual uses gender as a category for self-definition, the individual may be most attracted to and satisfied in groups that are composed of members of the same gender category because the group contains an important part of the individual’s existing self-identity (Tsui et al, 1992). In addition, people use visible demographic characteristics for categorization processes, which can cause hostility, anxiety, and stereotyping (Tsui et al, 1992).

In the case study of Makela et al (2007) they described interpersonal similarity as a key driver of knowledge sharing within multinational corporations. They found evidence of several similarity factors driving connection between managers in the studied cases; these factors include gender, age, nationality and language. They also observed similarity related to organizational status; these are the function or position, tenure in the company and shared local environment. "On the one hand, what they call ‘the similarity-attraction hypothesis’ posits that similarity reduces psychological discomfort and conflict arising from cognitive or emotional disparity, while on the other hand, ‘the theory of self-categorization’ suggests that individuals define their social identity through the formation of psychological groups. In other words, these two theories approach the same issue from slightly different angles. The first one argues that people are often more attracted to individuals who are similar to themselves in terms of some demographic or personal attribute(s); alternatively, the second theory focuses on self categorization through a comparison of social identity and status (Tsui et al, 1992; Williams & O'Reilly, 1998)" (cited from Makela et al, 2007)

In the model we can use social axioms as a predictor for conflict management. A social axiom is a generalized belief which is central in a person's belief system, and its function is to enhance the survival and functioning of the person in his/her social and physical environment. There are five factors. Social cynicism, a negative view of human nature and social events. Reward for application, the belief that effort will lead to positive outcomes. Social complexity, multiple solutions to problems and the uncertainty of events. Fate control, a deterministic view of social events. Religiosity (previously named as Spirituality), the existence of a supreme being and positive consequences of religions (Leung et al, 2002). In the study of Combining Social Axioms with values in predicting social behaviours, there were three classes of behavioural tendencies to predict: first the style of conflict resolution, second the ways of coping, and last the vocational interests. These three behaviours were chosen because they are distinct from one another, and because they have been subjected to considerable cross-
cultural research where value differences are often used as an explanation for the observed differences (Bond et al, 2004).

Social cynicism is negatively related to collaboration (integrating) and compromising conflict style. Social flexibility is positively related to collaboration (integrating) and compromising conflict (Bond et al, 2004).

Social cynicism is positively related to dominating, avoiding and obliging conflict style. Social flexibility is positively related to avoiding conflict style (Kaushall and Kwantes, 2006). In this study we will not use the items of the social axioms, because we are primary focussing on the personality traits.

Culture is a predictor of conflict management style. These variables are not in this study used, because this study is not in an international or intercultural context, but in the Netherlands. An individualistic culture is described as one in which the goals and needs of the individuals take precedence over in-groups such as extended family, community, work organizations etc, whereas individuals in a collectivistic culture view personal goals and needs as subordinate to the goals and needs of these in-groups. However, it has been noted that differences exist within individualist or collectivist cultures. Singelis et al (1995) made a further distinction between individualism (I) and collectivism (C), arguing that both individualism and collectivism may be either horizontal (H) (that is emphasizing equality) or it may be vertical (V) (that is emphasizing hierarchy). A brief description of the four patterns at the individual level is as follows: (1) Horizontal individualist (HI) people want to be unique and self-reliant, but they are not especially interested in becoming distinguished or having high status. (2) Vertical individualist (VI) people try to compete with others for distinction and status. (3) Horizontal collectivist (HC) people perceive themselves as an aspect of in-group and emphasize common goals with others, and (4) Vertical collectivist (VC) people sacrifice their personal goals for the sake of in-group goals, but the members of the in-group are different from each other, some having more status than others.
2.4.5. Conflict management style as outcome

Figure 2-5 Findings (correlations) of scholars with conflict management style

The findings of the scholars mentioned earlier in our study are put in the cells in the above matrix (See Figure 2-5). We can see in the matrix (conflict handling model (adopted from Rahim)) above, that the compromising style doesn’t occur. The most things happen in the right cells of the matrix. This is in the dimension high concern for self.
Thus in our study we will examine only the cells integrating and dominating.

2.5. Hypotheses

The ‘similarity-attraction hypothesis’ posits that similarity reduces psychological discomfort and conflict arising from cognitive or emotional disparity (Makela et al, 2007).
It is assumed that dissimilarities in personality traits between buyers and sellers have a positive impact on conflict attributes (conflict affectiveness, conflict cognitiveness and conflict manifest). This results in the following hypothesis:

**H1**

**dissimilarities in personality traits between buyers and sellers have a positive impact on conflict attributes.**

It is assumed that dissimilarities in personality traits between buyers and sellers mediate the relationship between conflict management style (integrating and dominating conflict management style) and conflict attributes (conflict affectiveness, conflict cognitiveness and conflict manifest). This results in the following hypothesis:

**H2**

**dissimilarities in personality traits between buyers and sellers mediate the relationship between conflict management style and conflict attributes.**
3. Methodology and data collection

This section describes the research design, sample and data collection procedure, the measure development, the measures used in the research, and the data analysis approach used.

3.1. Research method

Buyer-supplier relationships can be studied using different units of analysis such as a single party, both parties (the dyad) or multiple parties (the network). In this study we use the dyad. For the purposes of this study, the approach has been adopted whereby the purchaser is asked to reply to questions with respect of its most important supplier, with whom the purchaser personally maintains a relationship. The supplier taken in taught by the purchaser, will be request to fill in the survey also (snowball). Snowball sampling is a term used for sampling procedures that allow the sampled units to provide information not only about themselves but also about other units. This action will be also done whereby the seller is asked to reply to questions with respect of its most important client, with whom the seller personally maintains a relationship.

3.2. Population and sample

The target respondents for the survey are purchasing professionals and sales professionals. Buyers and sellers are in the best position to answer the questions of this survey, because of their experience, expertise and insight with respect to the development, maintenance and reduction of supplier relationships in practice.

The main goal is to get a completed questionnaire, where the respondent provides a name of the business partner with whom (s)he normally does business and with whom the relationship encounters some stumbling. This has mostly been done with buyers and sellers in a large Dutch industrial service company.

3.3. Design and procedure

In accordance with the research objectives, a written questionnaire has been used, gathering information from a large number of respondents.

The survey procedure will include two mailings:

1. The buyers and sellers in the previous named Dutch company will be emailed with an invitation letter and a questionnaire.
2. From the information of the filled in questionnaires, we will do a second mailing for the dyads of the buyer as well the seller (so called snowball sampling).
For developing the questionnaire and the construction of the questionnaire items we have studied the literature of Industrial Marketing, Purchasing, Supply Chain Management, International business and Psychology. The result is a structured questionnaire based on existing and mostly already applied measurement scales for the research constructs (see appendix B).

In designing the letters, a strong emphasis was placed on three essential features of the Total Design Method (TDM) and has been developed by Dillman (1978). First, respondents were told how their names were selected, that their responses would represent those of many other buyers or sellers, and that their participation was invaluable. Second, the confidentiality of the survey was emphasized and participants were promised that their names would never be placed on the questionnaire. Finally, as an incentive for participation, a decision was made that respondents would be offered a report of the results of this study. This method has been successful in securing high response rates from general and special samples. Dillman’s method is generally regarding as the standard for mail surveys in the social sciences.

As it is generally perceived that a high response rate only is feasible with high motivation of participants to participate on the questionnaire, the relatively long questionnaire was a concern. The questionnaire, containing 94 questions, would make it probable that the completion of the questionnaire would take more time than “only ten minutes” the inviting letter stated and could de-motivate respondents to participate or finalize the questionnaire. This could jeopardize a sufficient level of response.

Various actions have been undertaken, aimed at increasing the response:

1. Approximately one week before the first mailing of the questionnaire, an advance letter was sent to all the buyers and sellers introducing the researchers and explaining the importance of the study. The letters were not personalized and not individually signed. The letter noted that the participant would receive the questionnaire in a couple of days.

2. In the first questionnaire mailing, the participants received a letter again explaining the importance of the study and assuring confidentiality and the questionnaire. Identification number markers were used on questionnaires so that respondents could be checked off the mailing list.

3. Approximately one week after the questionnaire was mailed, a follow-up email was sent to all members of the sample. The email thanked those that have already responded and requested a response from those who have not yet responded.

4. Two weeks after the reminder email was mailed, a new inviting letter, and questionnaire was send to those who had not responded. This email, in each case conveyed the message that the researchers had not heard from the respondent and their comments were important to the success of the survey.

5. Questions about the personality characteristics of the buyer or seller were deliberately placed at the end of the questionnaire, to avoid that persons would not respond,
because of the reservation to answer possible sensible questions about their personality.

6. Questions about the name and email address of the business partner was deliberately placed at the end of the questionnaire, to avoid that persons would not respond, because of the reservation to answer.

7. A summary of results was offered to the respondents, reporting on the main conclusions of the study.

8. Respondents were offered a summary of their own main scores on the personality characteristics.

9. All respondents were guaranteed confidentiality with respect to their answers.

### 3.4. Measurement

The operationalization of a concept translates the conceptual model into measurable terms. An operationalization specifies what the researcher must do in order to measure the construct concerned. In this study, constructs do cover the research areas of personality, type of conflict and conflict management style. For these constructs, the items used in this study have been validated in previous research.

The respective items are further described in this session. The items mentioned under section 3.4.1. to 3.4.3, were measured on a five-point Likert scale (ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree).

The adaptation of the measurement instrument list was done using translation-back-translation method (Hambleton, 1994), which is a judgmental procedure for investigating the conceptual equivalence (i.e. symmetry) of the original and translated versions. The measurement instrument has been translated from one language (English) to another (Dutch) and then back-translated to the original language by an independent translator. The purpose of this double translation was to allow experts to examine both versions of each questionnaire item to establish conformity of meaning. Where inconsistencies were, the items have been reformulated or, if necessary, eliminated.

### 3.4.1. Measurement of personality.

As one of the independent variables, we will use for measuring personality characteristics the NEO Personal Inventory (NEO-PI-R). The NEO PI-R (Costa and McRae, 1992) is a commercially published 240 item questionnaire that measures five dimensions of personality: Neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. The NEO PI-R provides a comprehensive overview of emotional, interpersonal, experiential,
attitudinal, and motivational styles. This is one of the most internationally recognised and researched measure of personality.

In this study we will use the NEO-PI-short and this measurement of personality consists of 60 statements only, otherwise the questionnaire will be too long.

The Dutch version is used, originally developed by Costa and McCrae (1992) and translated and validated into the Dutch language by Van der Heijden et al (2005). From the NEO-PI-short the five subscales were measuring the items on a five-point Likert scale (from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree”). Respondents are requested to indicate for each statement the extent to which the statements correspondent with the respondent’s self (see Appendix B for scale items).

3.4.2. Measurement of conflict management style.

We will measure on both sides of the dyad and we will speak about ‘buyer’s conflict management style’ en ‘seller’s conflict management style’. The Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory-II (ROCI-II) (Rahim, 1983a) was used to assess the five styles: integrating (7 items), dominating (5 items), obliging (6 items), compromising (4 items) and avoiding (6 items). Responses are assessed using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). In the ROCI-II, specific behaviours, are described to subjects, respondents are asked to assess the degree to which each behaviour reflects their own typical behaviour in a conflict situation. The ROCI-II has three forms (A, B and C), with conflict with subordinates, peers, or supervisors as referents. While Rahim (1983b) provides evidence suggesting that an individual’s style varies with the status of the other party, the magnitude of these differences, though statistically significant, is small in absolute terms. Also, as a practical matter, is it very hard to get respondents for answering three times. The ROCI-II measures the way in which people react to conflict situations.

In the former paragraph 2.4.5, what handles about the conflict management style, we found the following in the matrix (Figure 2-5) of conflict styles done by several scholars, that personality traits have impact on the right cells. The right cells are about integrating and dominating.

The 12-item measure, which was slightly modified (changed my supervisor into the other party) to fit the research context, was utilized (see Appendix B).

3.4.3. Measurement of conflict attributes

These are the outcome variables (conflict attributes) and consist of four variables, namely: (1) conflict affectiveness, (2) conflict cognitiveness, (3) conflict frequency and (4) conflict intensity.
The two primary constructs of interest in this research are social conflict (made up of affective and cognitive conflict). The original measure of social conflict was developed by Jehn (1994), modified slightly by Amason (1996) and slightly modified to fit the research context (Plank, 2006). As has been noted previously, it consists of two related sub-con structs, affective or personality conflict and cognitive or idea conflict. A seven-item measure was utilized in the study of Plank (2006). In our study we use the following names: conflict affectiveness and conflict cognitiveness.

We will use some items of Plank (2006) and Bradford (2004) and the used items are slightly modified for our measures. The final measure used three for each sub-construct (See Appendix B).

The variable conflict frequency is a five item measure: (1) Very Frequently – (5) very rarely

The variable conflict intensity is five item measure: (1) = not exist; (2) = exist, but not intense; (3) = intense; (4) = very intense; and (5) = extremely intense).

The following demographic information was also gathered in the questionnaire: (1) Gender (1 = male; 2 = female), (2) Age (year of birth), (3) Educational level, (4) Job function, (5) Marital status (1= married, spouse present, 2 = married, spouse absent, 3= unmarried, 4=widow, 5= divorced), job function and tenure (how long do you work for this company?).
4. Analysis and results

This section is divided into the following parts: analysis and the validity of constructs.

4.1. Analysis

All analyses were conducted separately for buyers and sellers.

4.1.1. Participants

The participants included 45 individuals, recruited for almost 87% from one organization. The sampling frame for the study was a list of 51 persons from a purchasing department and 83 persons from a sales department. They returned 19 and 20 questionnaires, which give a return rate of 37% for the purchasing department and 24% for the sales department. These participants have given us 25 names and addresses of persons with whom they have business relations. We received only 3 questionnaires for this sampling frame, which give a return rate of 12% for the dyads (the unit of analyses for this study). A third survey was set out to get more dyads, the response rate of this survey was only 3 out of 220 (1.36%), what was disappointing.

4.1.2. Sample composition

More than 23% of the participants bear ‘Purchase manager’ as their job title, while the job title ‘Senior Buyer’ is represented by more than 33% and the job title buyer is covered by almost 43% (see Table 4-1 Profession of Buyers). Based on these figures, the participants can be considered as being well informed about the purchasing operation in their companies. They have frequent contacts with a ‘sales person’ within a business relation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job title</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing Manager</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Buyer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buyer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-1 Profession of Buyers

More than 54% of the participants bear ‘Account Manager’ as their job title, while the job title ‘Sales Engineer’ is represented by more than 16% and the job title ‘Males manager’ is also covered with 16%. The other two jobs ‘Director Sales’ and Commercial Manager’ are the remaining participants. (See Table 4-2 Profession of Sellers). Based on these figures, the
participants can be considered as being well informed about the sales operation in their companies. The have frequent contacts with a ‘Buyer’ within a business relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job title</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director Sales</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Manager</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16,70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Engineer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16,70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Manager</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54,20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td><strong>100,00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-2 Profession of Sellers

The level of education among buyers and sellers is predicted in Table 4-3. We can see that the overall level of the ‘Sellers’ are higher than of the ‘Buyers’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Sellers Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Buyers Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mbo</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33,30%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42,90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>havo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,20%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14,30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hbo</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45,80%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33,30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vwo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16,70%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td><strong>100,00%</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td><strong>100,00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-3 Educational qualification

In the next Table 4-4 we can see the marital status of the buyers and sellers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Sellers Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Buyers Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>married / living together, spouse absent</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75,00%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62,50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>married / living together, spouse present</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20,00%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29,20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unmarried</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,00%</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>divorced</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td><strong>100,00%</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td><strong>100,00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-4 Marital Status
4.1.3. Non-response

To check for non-response bias, the following action was taken. Normally the test is done by comparing the waves. However we had three waves of small samples, so we did the test with the first 75% (returned questionnaires) against the last 25%. Using t-tests, we compared early with late participants on all constructs and the descriptive variables. No statistically significant differences were observed between the groups compared (at $\alpha=0.05$), indicating the research sample was representative of the population from which it was extracted. This suggests a minimal level of non respondent bias; non response bias does not appear to be a problem (Armstrong and Overton, 1977).

4.2. The validity of constructs

4.2.1. Reliability analysis

Reliability is the fact that a scale should consistently reflect the construct it is measuring. In statistical terms, the usual way to look at reliability is based on the idea that individual items (or sets of items) should produce results consistent with the overall questionnaire. The simplest way to do this is in practice is to use split half reliability. This method randomly splits the data set into two. A score for each participant is then calculated based on each half of the scale. If a scale is very reliable a person’s score on one half of the scale should be equal (or similarly) to their score on the other half: therefore, across several participants scores from the two halves of the questionnaire should correlate perfectly. The problem with this method is that there are several ways in which a data set can be split into two and so the results could be a product of the way in which the data were split. To overcome this problem, Cronbach (1951) came up with a measure that is loosely equivalent to splitting data in two in every possible way and computing the correlation coefficient for each split. The average of these values is equivalent to Cronbach’s alpha, which is the most common measure of scale reliability. The generally accepted value of 0.8 is appropriate for cognitive testing. In the journal articles we often see a value of 0.7 – 0.8 what is an acceptable value for Cronbach’s alpha; values substantially lower indicate an unreliable scale. When dealing with psychological construct values below even 0.7 can, realistically, be expected because of the diversity of the constructs being measured. However, Cortina (1993) noticed that such general guidelines need to be used with caution because the value of alpha depends on the number of items on the scale.

With the NEO-PI we have reverse scored items. These reversed phrases items are important for reducing response bias, participants will actually have to read the items in case they are phrased the other way around. In reliability analysis these reversed scored items make a difference: in the extreme they can lead to a negative Cronbach’s alpha.
A reliability assessment of each of the 10 constructs employed revealed Cronbach’s alphas ranging from 0.60 to 0.87, which could be considered satisfactory (see Table 4-5 Cronbach alpha scores).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Cronbach alpha Buyers</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Cronbach alpha Sellers</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict affectiveness</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict cognitiveness</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict manifest</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating Conflict Management Style</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominating Conflict Management Style</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to experience</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-5 Cronbach alpha scores

Openness to experience construct with the buyers, had an increased Cronbach alpha with deleting item 6. Extraversion construct with the sellers, had an increased Cronbach alpha with deleting item 2, 3, 9 and 10.

4.2.2. Factor analysis

Factor analysis will be used for uncovering the latent structure (dimensions) of a set of variables. In this study we will use confirmatory factor analysis to purify the scales. Factors should theoretically independent (unrelated to each other). Confirmatory factor analysis will be used to validate a scale or index by demonstrating that its constituent items load on the same factor and to drop proposed scale items which cross-load on more than one factor. A minimum requirement of confirmatory factor analysis is that one hypothesises beforehand the number of factors in the model. The factor analysis is done on the combined group of buyers and sellers. This is done for comparing the groups with equal results. For the full sample, we conducted confirmatory factor to purify the scales. Scales had to be adjusted by excluding some of the items when testing the scale reliability with Cronbach’s Alpha and item-to-item correlations. Some items had to be removed due to low (<0.4) or “wrong” loadings, making up the Big Five scales with less items than the originally 12 items each. These findings and the necessary modifications are not surprising, as other researchers reported similar results of the NEO-PI scales computed in confirmatory factor analysis with five components (See Table A-1 ). All loadings are shown. Almost all scales were close or exceeded the level of 0.60 for
Cronbach’s Alpha providing evidence of reliability. The Cronbach’s Alpha for Neuroticism was low for the buyer group as well the sellers group and will be discarded for further analysis. This include also for the Conscientiousness variable of the sellers group. (See Table 4-7).

Because of the relatively high correlation between cognitive and affective conflict and between frequency and intensity conflict, we carried out a confirmatory factor analysis (principal components analysis with varimax rotation) of the items in these scales and the conflict management scales. As Table 4-6 shows, a 5-factor solution emerged with all items loading strongly and distinctly on their appropriate factor, strong evidence that the respondents distinguished between the three types of conflict and two types of conflict management styles. Loadings lower than 0.4 are not shown. Almost all scales were close or exceeded the recommended level of 0.70 for Cronbach’s Alpha providing evidence of reliability. The exception was for the variable Conflict Affectiveness of the buyers group. Because for comparing the two groups the level close to 0.6 and therefore not discarded (see Table 4-7).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Conflict Manifest</th>
<th>Integrating Conflict Management Style</th>
<th>Conflict affectiveness</th>
<th>Dominating Conflict Management Style</th>
<th>Conflict cognitiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CON AFF 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON AFF 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON AFF 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON COG 1</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON COG 2</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON COG 3</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON FRQ 1</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON FRQ 2</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON INT 1</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS INT 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS INT 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS INT 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS INT 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS INT 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS INT 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS INT 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS DOM 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS DOM 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS DOM 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS DOM 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS DOM 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
Rotation converged in 7 iterations.
Table 4-6 Buyer Seller Rotated Component Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Cronbach alpha Buyers</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Cronbach alpha Sellers</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict affectiveness</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict cognitiveness</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict manifest</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating Conflict Management Style</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominating Conflict Management Style</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to experience</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-7 Cronbach Alpha after factor analysis
Below in Table 4-8 we present the means and standard deviations scores for personality traits, conflict attributes and conflict management styles for the two profession groups.

The means were calculated as an equally weighted average of the item scores, after factor analysis. The average participants tend to score high on agreeableness, high on extraversion and high on openness to experience. The average participant can be characterized as someone who is sympathetic, cooperative, organized, responsible, assertive and energetic.

The participant is also stable, calm, has wide interests and original. The average age of the buyer is higher than the seller. The average tenure of the buyer is also higher than the seller. The mean level of educational qualifications is higher with the sellers than with the buyers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Buyers (N=20)</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Sellers (N=23)</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational qualification</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>12.55</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>6.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>48.38</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>43.21</td>
<td>8.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict affectiveness</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict cognitiveness</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict manifest</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating Conflict Management Style</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominating Conflict Management Style</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to experience</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-8 Main scores respondents

According Schmitt (1996), it is not enough presenting only Alpha information. "Researchers fairly routinely report the level of alpha associated with the various measures they use in operationalizing key constructs. However, the intercorrelations among the measures are often not presented." Schmitt (1996) has the following recommendation for scholars to obtain: "The minimum information that should be provided in these instances includes the alpha coefficients, the observed correlations, and the correlations corrected for attenuation due to unreliability."

We did follow the recommendation of Schmitt (1996) and show the results of the data before and after the factor analysis. The Cronbach alpha’s depicted in the table’s are calculated after the factor analysis.

Table 4-9 shows the correlations coefficients between the personality traits, conflict attributes and conflict management styles for the buyers.

Table 4-10 shows the correlations coefficients between the personality traits, conflict attributes and conflict management styles for the sellers.
## Table 4-9 Correlations for the buyers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>(8)</th>
<th>(9)</th>
<th>(10)</th>
<th>(11)</th>
<th>(12)</th>
<th>(13)</th>
<th>(14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational qualification (1)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status (2)</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure (3)</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>0.50(*)</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (4)</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.50(*)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.59(**)</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict affectiveness (5)</td>
<td>0.54(*)</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>(0.59)</td>
<td>0.56(**)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict cognitiveness (6)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>0.62(**)</td>
<td>(0.76)</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.70(**)</td>
<td>-0.46(*)</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict manifest (7)</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>(0.90)</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating Conflict Management Style (8)</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>(0.86)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominating Conflict Management Style (9)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>-0.60(**)</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>(0.86)</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism (10)</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion (11)</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.48(*)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.61(**)</td>
<td>(0.65)</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.65(**)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to experience (12)</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>(0.70)</td>
<td>-0.47(*)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness (13)</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>0.72(**)</td>
<td>-0.49(*)</td>
<td>(0.66)</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness (14)</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.45(*)</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.46(*)</td>
<td>(0.61)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).  
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).  
Note: Correlations before factor analysis below the diagonal and correlations after factor analysis above the diagonal. Alpha coefficients are presented on the diagonal.
### Correlations for the sellers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>(8)</th>
<th>(9)</th>
<th>(10)</th>
<th>(11)</th>
<th>(12)</th>
<th>(13)</th>
<th>(14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational qualification (1)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.63(**)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status (2)</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.65(**)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.49(*)</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure (3)</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>0.48(*)</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.49(*)</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (4)</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.48(*)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.42(*)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict affectiveness (5)</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>(0.81)</td>
<td>0.50(*)</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-0.52(*)</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.45(*)</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict cognitiveness (6)</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.58(**)</td>
<td>(0.88)</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.41(*)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.49(*)</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.46(*)</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict manifest (7)</td>
<td>0.63(**)</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>-0.49(*)</td>
<td>-0.42(*)</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>(0.87)</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating Conflict Management Style (8)</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.65(**)</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>(0.68)</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.45(*)</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominating Conflict Management Style (9)</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.42(*)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>(0.75)</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism (10)</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.44(*)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>(0.54)</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.52(**)</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion (11)</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.56(**)</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.49(*)</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>(0.65)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to experience (12)</td>
<td>0.49(*)</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>(0.70)</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness (13)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.56(**)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.51(*)</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>0.46(*)</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>(0.76)</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness (14)</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-0.49(*)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>(0.38)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Note: Correlations before factor analysis below the diagonal and correlations after factor analysis above the diagonal. Alpha coefficients are presented on the diagonal.

Table 4-10 Correlations for the sellers
4.2.3. Empirical findings

The correlation analysis has given some insight, but we have to dig further to shed some light on the relations in our study model. We will use the purified mean item scores, calculated as an equally weighted average of the item scores, after factor analysis. Regression analysis has been applied, in order to give more insight of the impact of the independent variable’s on the dependent variable’s and the mediator. We will show only the regression analysis of variables that had a significant impact.

We start with the regression analysis of our samples from the buyers.

For the regression analysis on the outcome variable Conflict Cognitiveness, the following program variable was found to have a significant impact on this variable: Extraversion has a significant impact on the variable Conflict Cognitiveness. The outcome of the regression for the outcome variable Conflict Cognitiveness is summarized in the Table 4-11. Other independent variable’s had no significant impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>-2.15</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Conflict Cognitiveness

Table 4-11 Regression analysis: dependent variable conflict cognitiveness

For the regression analysis on the outcome variable Conflict Cognitiveness, the following program variable was found to have a significant impact on this variable: Neuroticism has a significant impact on the variable Conflict Cognitiveness. The outcome of the regression for the outcome variable Conflict Cognitiveness is summarized in the Table 4-11. Other independent variable’s had no significant impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Conflict Cognitiveness

Table 4-12 Regression analysis: dependent variable conflict cognitiveness

For the regression analysis on the mediating variable Dominating Conflict Management Style, the following program variable was found to have a significant impact on this variable: Age has a significant impact on the Dominating Conflict Management Style. The outcome of the
regression for the mediating variable Dominating Conflict Management Style is summarized in the Table 4-13. Other variable’s had no significant impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Dependent Variable: Dominating Conflict Management Style

Table 4-13 Regression analysis: dependent variable dominating conflict management style

For the regression analysis on the outcome variable Conflict Affectiveness, the following variable was found to have a significant impact on this variable: Conflict Cognitiveness has a significant impact on the variable Conflict Affectiveness. The outcome of the regression for the outcome variable Conflict Affectiveness is summarized in the Table 4-14. Other Conflict attribute variable’s had no significant impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Cognitiveness</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Dependent Variable: Conflict Affectiveness

Table 4-14 Regression analysis: dependent variable conflict affectiveness

Now we start with the regression analysis of our samples of the sellers.

For the regression analysis on the outcome variable Conflict Cognitiveness, the following program variable was found to have a significant impact on this variable: Agreeableness has a significant impact on the variable Conflict Cognitiveness. The outcome of the regression for the outcome variable Conflict Cognitiveness is summarized in the Table 4-15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.39</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Dependent Variable: Conflict Cognitiveness

Table 4-15 Regression analysis: dependent variable conflict cognitiveness
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For the regression analysis on the outcome variable Conflict Cognitive, the following program variable was found to have a significant impact on this variable: Extraversion has a significant impact on the variable Conflict Cognitiveness. The outcome of the regression for the outcome variable Conflict Cognitive is summarized in the Table 4-16. Other independent variable’s had no significant impact.

For the regression analysis on the outcome variable Conflict Affectiveness, the following program variable was found to have a significant impact on this variable: Extraversion has a significant impact on the variable Conflict Affectiveness. The outcome of the regression for the outcome variable’s Conflict Affectiveness is summarized in the Table 4-17.

For the regression analysis on the mediating variable Integrating Conflict management style, the following program variable was found to have a significant impact on this variable: Extraversion has a significant impact on the variable Integrating Conflict management style. The outcome of the regression for the mediating variable Integrating Conflict management style is summarized in the Table 4-18. Other independent variable’s had no significant impact.
For the regression analysis on the outcome variable Conflict Manifest, the following variable was found to have a significant impact on this variable: Age has a significant impact on the variable Conflict Manifest. The outcome of the regression for the outcome variable Conflict Manifest is summarized in the Table 4-19. Other variable’s had no significant impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-2.13</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Conflict Manifest

Table 4-19 Regression analysis: dependent variable conflict manifest

For the regression analysis on the outcome variable Conflict Affectiveness, the following mediating variable was found to have a significant impact on this variable: Integrating Conflict Management Style has a significant impact on the variable Conflict Affectiveness. The outcome of the regression for the outcome variable Conflict Affectiveness is summarized in the Table 4-20. Other variable had no significant impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating Conflict Management Style</td>
<td>-0.83</td>
<td>-2.81</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Conflict Affectiveness

Table 4-20 Regression analysis: dependent variable conflict affectiveness

For the regression analysis on the outcome variable Conflict Cognitiveness, the following mediating variable was found to have a significant impact on this variable: Dominating Conflict Management Style has a significant impact on the variable Conflict Cognitiveness. The outcome of the regression for the outcome variable Conflict Cognitiveness is summarized in the Table 4-21. Other independent variable had no significant impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominating Conflict Management Style</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Conflict Cognitive

Table 4-21 Regression analysis: dependent variable conflict cognitive

For the regression analysis on the outcome variable Conflict Affectiveness, the following variable was found to have a significant impact on this variable: Conflict Cognitiveness has a
significant impact on the variable Conflict affectiveness. The outcome of the regression for the outcome variable Conflict Affectiveness is summarized in the Table 4-22. Other Conflict attribute variable's had no significant impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Cognitiveness</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Conflict Affectiveness

Table 4-22 Regression analysis: dependent variable conflict affectiveness

4.2.4. Mediation analysis

A primary purpose of research is to identify the relationship between two variables, typically referred to as the independent and dependent variables. Often theory suggests that a third variable may improve understanding of the nature of the relationship between the two primary variables. When the third variable is considered a mediator, it is hypothesized to be linked in a causal chain between the independent and dependent variables. In other words, the independent variable causes the mediator and the mediator causes the dependent variable. The search for intermediate causal variables is called mediation analysis. Evidence for mediation occurs when the relationship between two variables can be partially or totally accounted for by an intervening variable, the mediator. In this approach, the relationship between an independent variable and a dependent variable is decomposed into direct and indirect (mediated) effects as shown below in Figure 4-1:

![Figure 4-1 Mediating model](image)

\[
\text{Direct Effect} = \tau' \quad \text{Mediated Effect} = \alpha \beta \\
\text{Total Effect} = \tau' + \alpha \beta
\]

The significance of the mediated effect can be tested with a series of regression equations. These methods indicate a series of requirements which must be true for the mediation model to hold. As outlined by Baron and Kenny (1986) and Judd and Kenny (1981), the steps require that:
(1) The total effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable must be significant (t in Model 1 above) Regressing the dependent variable on the independent variable.

(2) The path from the independent variable to the mediator must be significant (α in Model 3 above). Regressing the mediator variable on the independent variable.

(3) The path from the mediator to the dependent variable must be significant (β in Model 2 above). Regressing the dependent variable on the mediator variable.

(4) The fourth step is required only for complete mediation. If the independent variable no longer has any effect on the dependent variable when the mediator has been controlled, the complete mediation has occurred (non significant t’). Regressing the dependent variable on both the independent variable and the mediator.

\[ M = a X + e_2 \] The independent variable (X) causes the mediator variable (M)

\[ Y = c X + e_1 \] The independent variable (X) causes the outcome variable (Y)

\[ Y = c' X + bM + e_3 \] The mediator (M) causes the outcome variable (Y) when controlling for the independent variable (X).

If the effect of X on Y is zero when the mediator is included (c' = 0), there is evidence for mediation (Judd and Kenny, 1981). This would be full mediation. If the effect of X on Y is reduced when the mediator is included (c' < c), then the direct effect is said to be partially mediated.

Our conceptual model consist the conflict management styles as a mediator. So we had to do the necessary steps as described above. The steps are done for the variables extraversion, integrating conflict management style and conflict affectiveness. For step 1 we found significant evidence that this occur (see Table 4-17). For step 2 we found significant evidence that this occur (see Table 4-18). For step 3 we also found significant evidence that this occur (see Table 4-20). According step 4, we can conclude that the direct effect is to be partially mediated (See Table 4-23).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>-4.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>-0.247</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating Conflict Management Style</td>
<td>-0.637</td>
<td>-1.96</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent variable: Conflict Affectiveness

Table 4-23 Step 4 mediating affect

**4.2.5. Unit of analysis; Dyads**

We only have three dyads, our unit of analysis (See Table 4-24). From the found data we can give with caution some explanatory insight of the unit of analysis. We can see that there is some similarity in the demographic variables, such as sex, marital status and education. Also the conflict attributes are moderate to low rates and can be seen as a proxy of some
similarity. For dyad one and three we can see that the score of the buyer and seller for conflict management style integrating is higher than the other one (high against moderate). They both have a high concern for themselves as well a high concern for the other. In dyad two we see for the seller the conflict management style integrating and for the buyer a moderate for the two styles. Maybe the buyer bases his style on the style of the seller in this case. For the personality traits we can see some similarity on the personality trait neuroticism, this one goes from very low to moderate for the participants. For the personality trait consciousness we see that this one is the highest in rank or second best for the participants. We could say in a cautious way, that there could be beneficial relationships. At the other hand there can be also harmful relationships, but we have not met them in the unit of analysis; the dyad. This doesn’t mean they aren’t there.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession group</th>
<th>Dyad 1 Buyer</th>
<th>Dyad 1 Seller</th>
<th>Dyad 2 Buyer</th>
<th>Dyad 2 Seller</th>
<th>Dyad 3 Buyer</th>
<th>Dyad 3 Seller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth year</td>
<td>1.957</td>
<td>1.961</td>
<td>1.951</td>
<td>1.967</td>
<td>1.951</td>
<td>1.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to experience</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Affectiveness</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Cognitiveness</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Manifest</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating Conflict Mana</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominating Conflict Mana</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-24 Summary dyads, unit of analysis
4.2.6. Other findings

Evidently according the study it appears to be that buyers (Mean Rank: 28.08) the dominating conflict management style uses more than the sellers (Mean Rank 16.72) in comparing the groups. This difference is significance (U=108.5; p < 0.005) (see Figure 4-2).

![Figure 4-2 Dominating Conflict Management Style of profession group](image)

From the study it appears that there is a difference in the study group “Sellers”, concerning the outcome variable Conflict Manifest, between people with different educational qualification. Participants with a higher level of education experience more conflict manifest. The difference between these groups is significant at p < 0.05 (Krushall-Wallis-test Chi² 9.08; df=3). The difference between MBO level and the bachelor and master degree is bigger in positive way than between bachelor and master degree. The mean rank for people with a MBO level is 7.94 (n=8), for people with bachelor degree will this be 13.10 (n=10) and for people with a master degree will this be 19.38 (n=4). We found no significance evidence in the study group “Buyers”. But if we look to the combination group; buyers and sellers together, we will see that education level does matters. The difference between these groups is statistically significant at p < 0.05 (Krushall-Wallis-test Chi² 12.638; df=5). The difference between MBO level and the bachelor and master degree is bigger in positive way than between bachelor and master degree. The mean rank for people with a MBO level is 15.85 (n=17), for people with bachelor degree will this be 25.91 (n=16) and for people with a master degree will this be 35.50 (n=5). We can conclude that people with a higher education level experience more Manifest Conflict in this kind of relations.
The empirical finding of this study can be summarized as follows:

For the buyers

1. Buyers who have an increasing rate on the personality trait of extraversion will have a decreasing experience of cognitive conflict.
2. Buyers who have an increasing rate on the personality trait of neuroticism will have a decreasing experience of cognitive conflict.
3. Buyers who have an increasing age will have a lower conflict management style dominating.
4. Buyers who have an increasing cognitive conflict will have also an increasing experience affective conflict.

For the sellers

1. Sellers who have an increasing rate on the personality trait of agreeableness will have a decreasing experience of cognitive conflict.
2. Sellers who have an increasing rate on the personality trait of extraversion will have a decreasing experience of affective conflict.
3. Sellers who have an increasing rate on the personality trait of extraversion will have a decreasing experience of cognitive conflict.
4. Sellers who have an increasing rate on the personality trait of will have an increasing experience of integrating conflict management style.
5. Sellers who have an increasing age will have a decreasing experience of conflict manifest.
6. Sellers who have increasing conflict cognitive will have also increasing affective conflict.
7. Sellers who have an increasing rate on integrating conflict management style will have a decreasing experience of affective conflict.
8. Sellers who have an increasing rate on dominating conflict management style will have an increasing experience of cognitive conflict.

From the explanatory study of the dyads, we can summarize:

1. Dissimilarity in personality traits, similarity in demographic variables and a preferred use of integrating conflict management style reduces experience of relationship conflict (Conflict Affective)
5. Conclusions and implications

In this final section the main conclusions will be presented, by summarizing the results. In addition implication and recommendations for business and research are made. Limitations of this study and recommendations for further research complete this section.

5.1. Discussion (Theoretical contributions)

The disappointing results from the questionnaire has given us only three dyads. As a result, the hypotheses could not be tested. However, we have performed additional analyses, still from a dyadic perspective. Separate, for buyers and for suppliers, we have investigated the relationships between personality traits, conflict management style and conflict attributes. Not the (dis)similarities are the explaining variables, but the personality traits of the buyer and seller separately. The purpose of these studies was to examine the role of personality in the attributes individuals make about the conflicts they experience and the main conflict management styles they make. The findings of this study are instructive. As we have seen in other contexts, conflict and resolving conflict plays a major role in buyer-seller relationships.

Comparing the two samples together we found revealing significance evidence that it appears to be that buyers (Mean Rank: 28.08) uses the dominating conflict management style more than the sellers (Mean Rank 16.72) in comparing the groups. This difference is significance (U=108.5; p < 0.005). With this evidence we can conclude the main conflict management styles among buyers versus sellers are different.

From the study it appears that there is a difference in the study group “Sellers”, concerning the outcome variable Conflict Manifest, between people with different educational qualification. Participants with a higher level of education experience more conflict manifest. The difference between these groups is significant (Krushall-Wallis-test Chi² 9.408; df=3 : p < 0.05). The difference between MBO level and the bachelor and master degree is bigger in positive way than between bachelor and master degree.

People with a high level on the personality trait neuroticism have a tendency to: experience many forms of emotional distress, have unrealistic ideas and troublesome urges. We have seen in the group of buyers that a higher rate on the personality trait neuroticism will led to an increasing level of more cognitive conflict (β = 0.74, p < 0.01). Cognitive or task conflicts are conflicts about ideas and disagreement about the content and issues of the task,
including differences in viewpoints, ideas, and opinions. Perceiving of more cognitive conflict is probably due the unrealistic ideas done by the person in fact.

People with a high level on the personality trait extraversion have a tendency to: prefer intense and frequent interpersonal interactions, be energized and optimistic. We have seen in the group of buyers ($\beta = -0.40, p = 0.05$) and also sellers ($\beta = -0.61, p < 0.05$) that a higher rate on the personality trait extraversion will led to decreasing level of less cognitive conflict. In the group of the sellers a higher rate on the personality trait extraversion will also led to decreasing level of less affective conflict ($\beta = -0.42, p < 0.05$) and it will led to an increasing level of integrating style of management style ($\beta = 0.26, p < 0.05$). Probably due the intense and frequent interpersonal interactions done by extravert persons, will this have an effect on perceiving lesser cognitive conflict and or the combination of lesser cognitive and affective conflict. Also other facets of this trait such as warmth, assertiveness and positive emotions will contribute during interpersonal relationships. This personality trait will have his contributions to the integrating style of conflict management in a positive way.

People with a high level on the personality trait agreeableness have a tendency to: regards others with sympathy and act unselfishly. We have seen in the group of sellers that a higher rate on the personality trait agreeableness will led to decreasing level of cognitive conflict ($\beta = -0.58, p < 0.05$). This can be explained as follows: "McCrae and Costa (1991) argued that Agreeableness should be related to happiness because agreeable individuals have greater motivation to achieve interpersonal intimacy, which should lead to greater levels of well-being. Organ and Lingl (1995) apparently agreed, commenting that Agreeableness "involves getting along with others in pleasant, satisfying relationships" (p. 340)" (Judge et al, 2002).

For buyers ($\beta = 0.64, p = 0.01$) as well sellers ($\beta = 0.38, p < 0.05$) we find that a higher level of cognitive conflict will led to a higher level of affective conflict. In both studies, cognitive conflict was higher than affective conflict. The fact that affective conflict was low, it perhaps suggests that this is being managed well, while cognitive conflict suggests a need for better relationship skills.

For the group of the sellers we found that a higher level on conflict management style integrating led to a lower level on affective conflict ($\beta = -0.83, p = 0.01$). The high concern for the other person as well a high concern for itself contribute to an integrative behavior what reflects the interpersonal relationship and the perception of a lower level of affective conflict.

For the group of the sellers we found that a higher level on conflict management style dominating led to a higher level on cognitive conflict($\beta = 0.45, p = 0.05$). The low concern for the other person as a high concern for itself contribute to an atmosphere on pursuing his own
ideas or goals and not concerning for the needs of the other person and this gives the perception of a higher level of cognitive conflict.

Only for the group of sellers we did mediating analysis. Because extraversion was significantly associated with affective conflict ($\beta = -0.42$, $p < 0.05$), but not cognitive conflict or manifest conflict, we were only able to test mediators predicting affective conflict. Extraversion was also significantly associated with integrating conflict management style ($\beta = 0.26$, $p < 0.05$). The mediator integrating conflict management style was significantly associated with affective conflict ($\beta = -0.83$, $p = 0.01$). In a model with extraversion and integrating conflict management style predicting affective conflict, extraversion diminished in predicting affective conflict ($\beta = -0.25$, $p = 0.21$), but the predictive power of integrating conflict management style diminished slightly ($\beta = -0.64$, $p = 0.06$), suggesting the possibility of partial mediation. Clearly, these are complex relationships. Future research would benefit from further examination of the mediating roles of these variables on the personality traits-conflict relationship.

We also examined the effects of heterogeneity of age, education level, and tenure. The only demographic variable that was significantly related to conflict attributions and conflict management style’s was age. For people who are aging, we see different findings in the both groups; namely for the buyers group we have seen that the higher the age of a buyer the lower the level of conflict management style of dominating will be ($\beta = -0.05$, $p < 0.05$). In the group of the sellers we find that the higher the age is the lower will be the experience of manifest conflict (intensity and frequency) ($\beta = -0.03$, $p = 0.05$). Generally it may indicate the following conclusion: with increasing maturity, people becoming better adapted as they get older.

People need to be aware of their own characteristic adaptation they do. These are specific patterns of behavior that are influenced both by dispositional traits and by situational variables. If personality traits sketch an outline of human individuality, characteristic adaptations fill in some of the details. Characteristic adaptations more closely map onto the social ecology of everyday life. Characteristic Adaptations: “These are all the psychological structures that people acquire in the course of life for getting along in the world. They include knowledge, skills, attitudes, goals, roles, relationships, schemas, scripts, habits, even the self-concept. Characteristic adaptations comprise the bulk of the phenomena that psychologists are concerned with, but they do not include personality traits, which FFT depicts as deeper structures, basic tendencies that are grounded in biology” (McCrea, 2004).

We will describe the measurement framework for behavioral flexibility by Yiu (2006). They used the model of Rahim for this framework. The model was already explained. “In summary, when dealing with conflict, those who have high behavioral flexibility, will adopt a resolution
style contingent to their/the other's need. As such, the conflict level can be controlled or even reduced. However, with low behavioral flexibility, it will be difficult to accommodate the concern of the opposing party, the conflict level will likely to escalate.” (Yiu, 2006).

Figure 5-1 The splitting factor—behavioral flexibility (adopted from Yiu (2006) page 441)

Buyers and sellers who have a higher level of behavioral flexibility can be contributing to each other's goals in a win/win relationship. We can see this as follows. Integrating style of conflict management reduces experience of cognitive conflict and a lower level of cognitive conflict reduces on his return affective conflict. By contrast dominating style of conflict management increase experience of cognitive conflict and a higher level of cognitive conflict increase on his return affective conflict.

5.2. Managerial Implications

One finding from this research is that the buyers uses more the conflict management style of dominating than the sellers. The sellers on the other hand are thus using the integrating style of conflict management. The integrating style of conflict management is the normative ideal conflict management style.

"Appropriately, managing cognitive conflict seems to be important in creating a positive relationship for both the buyer and seller. Managing affective conflict seems to be an important issue. Common sense would suggest that buying from someone you like is more pleasant then buying from someone you do not like. Managing cognitive conflict can lead to this conflict having positive outcomes. Buyers and sellers need to have relationships that contribute to each other's goals in a win/win fashion. Managing conflict, even just being aware of the constructive and destructive aspects of it, will lead to better, stronger, more productive buyer–seller relationships” (Plank et al, 2006).

The practical implications include the following. One should use interpersonal (dis)similarity to build bridges. For example, for new task situations the buyer and seller are more efficient if the are dissimilar, it encourage the merging of divergent thinking, knowledge bases and networks. On the other hand for routine situations (modified re-buy or straight re-buy) the buyer and seller are more efficient if they are similar, it may increase the efficiency of communication, reduce time and lead to lower costs. People need to be aware of their own
characteristic adaptation they do. These are specific patterns of behavior that are influenced both by dispositional traits and by situational variables. If personality traits sketch an outline of human individuality, characteristic adaptations fill in some of the details. Characteristic adaptations more closely map onto the social ecology of everyday life. It may be that people understand that conflict about opinions and ideas is a natural part of working with others to get work done, whereas relationship conflict is a negative interference to getting work done. The specific types of behavior that are most beneficial to an individual, according to our data, is the one that have been previously suggested as the normative ideal. Integrating style of conflict management reduces experience of cognitive conflict and affective conflict. By contrast, dominating of conflict management increase cognitive conflict, which, in turn, increases affective conflict. While there is evidence that conflict styles may be treated as stable individual dispositions, people can and do override personal biases of all types with appropriate training and support. Thus, the necessity for proper training of sales representatives and buyers as well in basic personal interactions, seems apparent. Implementing specific training programs that focus on developing behaviors and attitudes that minimize affective conflict and utilize cognitive conflict would be desirable. Training in mutual-gains bargaining and creative problem-solving (integrating style), may help people to learn to act in ways that improve their work environment and decrease their individual experience of conflict.

5.3. Study Limitations

As always, there are reasons to exercise caution in generalizing too much from one study. The limitations of this study must be noted when readers are interpreting and applying the findings. Several potential limitations of both general and specific nature of this study are to be noted.

The most important limitation of this study is that it is cross-sectional in design. The cross-sectional nature of the data did not allow the investigation of the trends that may be present in the (complex) relationships. The second limitation of this study is the risk of common-method variance or mono-method bias and recall bias, as all studied variables emerged from the same survey instrument. However the recall aspects should not be a major issue as respondents did self select the relationship they wanted to evaluate. Common method variance can artificially inflate bivariate correlations. Our study relied upon self-report measures, and as a consequence runs the risk of potential common method variance. However, several factors reduce this concern. Spector (1987) has shown that studies using properly developed and standardized instruments are resistant to method variance. All of our scales have been used previously, some, such as the ROCI-II scales, extensively.

The third limitation is that the present study examined the generally used conflict management styles and not the conflict management styles used in a specific conflict. Thus,
we could not examine how types of conflict affect the choice of conflict strategy. Conflict management styles were measured by self-reported measures, not actual behaviors. Further studies that examine actual conflict behaviors are needed.

The fourth limitation: the correlation evidence between the different variables of the study does not necessarily reflect causal links between them. The relatively small sample used for this study may limit the generalizability of the results. Therefore, the study should be considered exploratory in its nature and the results of the analysis should not be accepted without reservation.

Finally, a limitation of the present study was that the unit of analysis was not matched: buyer–seller pairs.

**5.4. Directions for future studies**

Based on the above discussion of the theoretical contributions and of the limitations of the research, we would like to suggest the following directions for future studies. First, we suggest that future studies use a large sample and more compatible paired data. Second, we suggest conducting similar studies with different variables. For example, future studies may investigate whether or not there is perceptual difference between buyer-seller relations of other relational variables such as power, cooperation, relationship quality, trust, and commitment, and whether or not these differences lead to conflict. Our measurement of manifest conflict only captured the intensity and frequency dimension. The measure could be improved by including the dimension of importance. Our knowledge on the perceptual difference of relational variables and their impact on relationship behaviors will largely advance through such studies. Type of relationship can be encountered as examined by Kozan et al (2006). They had three clusters of strategic partnership, captive supplier and marked exchange as one of the independent variables. Future research is needed using independent variables of conflict types to analyze links between conflict issues and affective variables. However, the dynamic and interactive nature of conflict complicates the validity of this kind of study.

It is hoped that this study will inspire further research on the important issue of conflict attributes concerning buyer-Seller relationships.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Agreeableness</th>
<th>Openness</th>
<th>Extraversion</th>
<th>Conscientiousness</th>
<th>Neuroticism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEURO 8</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEURO 9</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEURO 11</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEURO 12</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTRA 1</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTRA 4</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTRA 6</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTRA 12</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEN 5</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEN 8</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEN 9</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEN 10</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEN 11</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEN 12</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE 2</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE 3</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE 5</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE 7</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE 8</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE 12</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCI 2</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCI 5</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCI 6</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCI 12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
\( ^a \) Rotation converged in 8 iterations.
Table A-1 Results factor analysis personality variables
Appendix B  Measures

Conflict management style of Rahim

The aggregate variables (based on the ROCI-II) were as follows: Integrating 1 (items 1, 4, 5, 12); Integrating 2 (items 22, 23, 28); Obliging 1 (items 2, 10, 11); Obliging 2 (items 13, 19, 24); Dominating 1 (items 8, 9, 18); Dominating 2 (items 21, 25); Avoiding 1 (items 3, 6, 16); Avoiding 2 (items 17, 26, 27); Compromising 1 (items 7, 14); and Compromising 2 (items 15, 20)

1. I try to investigate an issue with the other party to find a solution acceptable to us. CMS-INT01*
2. I generally try to satisfy the needs of the other party. CMS-OBL01
3. I attempt to avoid being "put on the spot" and try to keep my conflict with the other party to myself. CMS-AVO01
4. I try to integrate my ideas with those of the other party to come up with a decision jointly. CMS-INT02*
5. I try to work with the other party to find solutions to a problem which satisfy our expectations. CMS-INT03*
6. I usually avoid open discussion of my differences with the other party. CMS-AVO02
7. I try to find a middle course to resolve an impasse. CMS-COM01
8. I use my influence to get my ideas accepted. CMS-DOM01*
9. I use my authority to make a decision in my favor. CMS-DOM02*
10. I usually accommodate the wishes of the other party. CMS-OBL02
11. I give in to the wishes of the other party. CMS-OBL03
12. I exchange accurate information with the other party to solve a problem together. CMS-INT04*
13. I usually allow concessions to the other party. CMS-OBL04
14. I usually propose a middle ground for breaking deadlocks. CMS-COM02
15. I negotiate with the other party so that a compromise can be reached CMS-COM03
16. I try to stay away from disagreement with the other party. CMS-AVO03
17. I avoid an encounter with the other party. CMS-AVO04
18. I use my expertise to make a decision in my favor. CMS-DOM03
19. I often go along with the suggestions of the other party. CMS-OBL05
20. I use "give and take" so that a compromise can be made. CMS-COM04
21. I am generally firm in pursuing my side of the issue. CMS-DOM04
22. I try to bring all our concerns out in the open so that the issues can be resolved in the best possible way. CMS-INT05*
23. I collaborate with my supervisor to come up with decisions acceptable to us. CMS-INT06*
24. I try to satisfy the expectations of the other party. CMS-OBL05
25. I sometimes use my power to win a competitive situation. CMS-DOM05*
26. I try to keep my disagreement with the other party to myself in order to avoid hard feelings. CMS-AVO05
27. I try to avoid unpleasant exchanges with the other party. CMS-AVO06
28. I try to work with the other party for a proper understanding of a problem. CMS-INT07*

Only the items CMS-INT01 until CMS-INT07 and CMS-DOM-01 until CMS-DOM-05 are in the survey questionnaire.

*final measures.

Personality measurements

a. strongly disagree
b. disagree
c. neutral
d. agree
e. strongly agree

1. I am not a worrier. NEOPER1
2. I like to have a lot of people around me. NEOPER2
3. I don’t like to waste my time daydreaming. NEOPER3
4. I try to be courteous to everyone I meet. NEOPER4
5. I keep my belongings clean and neat. NEOPER5

6. I often feel inferior to others. NEOPER6
7. I laugh easily. NEOPER7
8. Once I find the right way to do something, I stick to it. NEOPER8
9. I often get into arguments with my family and co-workers. NEOPER9
10. I’m pretty good about pacing myself so as to get things done on time. NEOPER10

11. When I’m under a great deal of stress, sometimes I feel like I’m going to pieces. NEOPER11
12. I don’t consider myself especially “light-hearted.” NEOPER12
13. I am intrigued by the patterns I find in art and nature. NEOPER13
14. Some people think I’m selfish and egotistical. NEOPER14
15. I am not a very methodological person. NEOPER15

16. I rarely feel lonely or blue. NEOPER16
17. I really enjoy talking to people. NEOPER17
18. I believe letting students hear controversial speakers can only confuse and mislead them. NEOPER18
19. I would rather cooperate with others than compete with them. NEOPER19
20. I try to perform all the tasks assigned to me conscientiously. NEOPER20

21. I often feel tense and jittery. NEOPER21
22. I like to be where the action is. NEOPER22
23. Poetry has little or no effect on me. NEOPER23
24. I tend to be cynical and skeptical of others’ intentions. NEOPER24
25. I have a clear set of goals and work toward them in an orderly fashion. NEOPER25

26. Sometimes I feel completely worthless. NEOPER26
27. I usually prefer to do things alone. NEOPER27
28. I often try new and foreign foods. NEOPER28
29. I believe that most people will take advantage of you if you let them. NEOPER29
30. I waste a lot of time before settling down to work. NEOPER30

31. I rarely feel fearful or anxious. NEOPER31
32. I often feel as if I’m bursting with energy. NEOPER32
33. I seldom notice the moods or feelings that different environments produce. NEOPER33
34. Most people I know like me. NEOPER34
35. I work hard to accomplish my goals. NEOPER35

36. I often get angry at the way people treat me. NEOPER36
37. I am a cheerful, high-spirited person. NEOPER37
38. I believe we should look to our religious authorities for decisions on moral issues. NEOPER38
39. Some people think of me as cold and calculating. NEOPER39
40. When I make a commitment, I can always be counted on to follow through. NEOPER40

41. Too often, when things go wrong, I get discouraged and feel like giving up. NEOPER41
42. I am not a cheerful optimist. NEOPER42
43. Sometimes when I am reading poetry or looking at a work of art, I feel a chill or wave of excitement. NEOPER43
44. I’m hard-headed and tough-minded in my attitudes. NEOPER44
45. Sometimes I’m not as dependable or reliable as I should be. NEOPER45
46. I am seldom sad or depressed. NEOPER46
47. My life is fast-paced. NEOPER47
48. I have little interest in speculating on the nature of the universe or the human condition. NEOPER48
49. I generally try to be thoughtful and considerate. NEOPER49
50. I am a productive person who always gets the job done. NEOPER50

51. I often feel helpless and want someone else to solve my problems. NEOPER51
52. I am a very active person. NEOPER52
53. I have a lot of intellectual curiosity. NEOPER53
54. If I don’t like people, I let them know it. NEOPER54
55. I never seem to be able to get organized. NEOPER55

56. At times I have been so ashamed I just wanted to hide. NEOPER56
57. I would rather go my own way than be a leader of others. NEOPER57
58. I often enjoy playing with theories or abstract ideas. NEOPER58
59. If necessary, I am willing to manipulate people to get what I want. NEOPER59
60. I strive for excellence in everything I do. NEOPER60

CONFLICT (adapted from Plank, 2006)

(7 Items) Scaled 1 = None 2 = Almost none 3 = A little 4 = Moderate amount 5 = A great deal.

Affective Conflict (4 Items)
1. How much anger was there between you and the salesperson during this negotiation? CONAFF1*
2. How much personal friction was there between you and the salesperson during the course of the negotiation? CONAFF1*
3. How much of a personality clash was there between you and the salesperson during this negotiation? CONAFF2*
4. How much tension was there between you and the salesperson during this negotiation? CONAFF3

Cognitive Conflict (3 Items)
1. How many disagreements about the content of the decision were there between you and the salesperson during this negotiation? CONCOG1*
2. How many differences about the content of the decision were there between you and the salesperson during this negotiation?
3. How many general differences of opinion were there between you and the salesperson during this negotiation? CONCOG3*

*Indicates items in the final measures.

Conflict (adapted from Bradford 2004)

Scaled 1 to 7 Strongly disagree – strongly agree

Inter-personal conflict (5 items)

1. Our personalities occasionally clashed.
2. There was a lot of tension between us at times.
3. At times, there were bad feelings between us.
4. Sometimes we became irritated with one another.
5. There was personal friction among network members.

Task conflict
1. We disagreed over ideas.CONCOG1*
2. Group members disagreed over how to complete the project.
3. Group members had differences of opinion over how to complete the project.
4. We experienced differences of opinion. CONCOG2*

*Indicates items in the final measures.

Other items
Age
Gender
Educational qualification
Marital status
Tenure
Appendix C  Survey List

We beginnen met enkele algemene vragen, dan komen de vragen over een, zelf te kiezen, zakelijke relatie van u. Deze relatie willen we ook benaderen om dezelfde vragen te beantwoorden. Alle formulieren worden anoniem verwerkt.

De meeste vragen zijn geformuleerd als stellingen waarbij u kunt aangeven in hoeverre u het ermee eens bent, van "volledig mee oneens" tot "volledig mee eens". De gehele vragenlijst bestaat uit 6 pagina's.

U kunt met de cursor op een vakje gaan staan om het met uw linker-muisknop aan te klikken. Om een antwoord te corrigeren klikt u nogmaals op hetzelfde vakje, daarna klikt u op het bedoelde antwoord. Per vraag mag slechts één vakje zijn aangekruist. Het is voor dit onderzoek van belang dat u op alle vragen antwoord geeft.

1. Enkele algemene vragen

1. Wat is uw geslacht?  □ Man  □ Vrouw

2. Wat is uw geboortejaar? →

3. Wat is uw hoogst genoten, voltooide opleiding?
   □ mavo
   □ middelbaar beroepsonderwijs
   □ havo
   □ hoger beroepsonderwijs
   □ vwo
   □ wetenschappelijk onderwijs

4. Wat is uw gezinssituatie?
   □ getrouwd/samenwonend, met kinderen
   □ getrouwd/samenwonend, zonder kinderen
   □ alleenstaand
   □ weduwe / weduwnaar
   □ gescheiden

Vervolgens enkele vragen over uw beroep en de organisatie waar u werkt.

5a. Indien u werkzaam bent binnen de verkoopafdeling, wat is dan uw functie in uw organisatie?
5b. Indien u werkzaam bent binnen de inkoopafdeling, wat is dan uw functie in uw organisatie?
6. Hoelang werkt U in uw huidige bedrijf? : ➔ jaar

7 In welke bedrijfstak is uw bedrijf voornamelijk werkzaam? (één antwoord aankruisen)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>semi-procesindustrie</th>
<th>discrete productie (serie- en stukproductie)</th>
<th>utiliteitssector</th>
<th>bouwnijverheid</th>
<th>gezondheidszorg</th>
<th>groothandel/retail</th>
<th>transport</th>
<th>banken en verzekeringen</th>
<th>zakelijke dienstverlening</th>
<th>overheid</th>
<th>onderwijs</th>
<th>anders,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Een bepaalde zakelijke relatie waar u zelf persoonlijk contact mee onderhoudt

Bij de volgende vragen moet u eerst een “belangrijke zakelijke relatie” van u in gedachten nemen. Een relatie waarmee u zelf persoonlijk contact heeft. We vragen u te reageren op een aantal stellingen die gaan over wrijvingen en conflicten met die zakelijke relatie. U kunt een kruis zetten in het hokje dat uw mening het beste weergeeft.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Volledig mee eens</th>
<th>Mee oneens</th>
<th>Niet mee oneens, niet mee eens</th>
<th>Mee eens</th>
<th>Volledig mee eens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Er bestaat persoonlijke wrijving tussen u en uw zakelijke relatie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Er is een conflicterende persoonlijkheid tussen u en uw zakelijke relatie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Er is spanning tussen u en uw zakelijke relatie tijdens onderhandelingen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Onze ideeën lopen vaak uiteen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>We blijken regelmatig van mening te verschillen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>We verschillen regelmatig van mening tijdens zakelijke onderhandelingen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hoe vaak is er bij deze zakelijke relatie sprake van:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Zeer zelden</th>
<th>Zelden</th>
<th>Nu en dan</th>
<th>Vaak</th>
<th>Zeer vaak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 - onenigheid over de prijs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - onenigheid over de levertijd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - onenigheid over de inkoop of verkoopvoorwaarden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 - overige onenigheden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wat is de intensiteit van onenigheid tussen u en uw zakelijke relatie over:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Niet aanwezig</th>
<th>Aanwezig, maar niet heftig</th>
<th>Heftig</th>
<th>Zeer heftig</th>
<th>Extreem heftig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 - de prijs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 - de levertijd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - de korting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - de leveringsvoorwaarden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

De volgende stellingen gaan over de manier waarop u omgaat met uw relatie.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Volledig mee oneens</th>
<th>Mee oneens</th>
<th>Niet mee oneens, niet mee eens</th>
<th>Mee eens</th>
<th>Volledig mee eens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Enkele persoonlijke aspecten.

Tot slot een serie persoonlijke vragen, waarvan de antwoorden uiteraard volledig vertrouwelijk zullen worden behandeld.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Volledig mee eens</th>
<th>Mee eens</th>
<th>geen mening</th>
<th>Mee oneens</th>
<th>Volledig oneens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Ik ben geen piekeraar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Ik wil graag veel mensen om me heen hebben.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Ik wil mijn tijd niet verspillen met dagdromen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Ik probeer hoffelijk te zijn voor iedereen die ik ontmoet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Ik houd mijn eigendommen schoon en netjes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Ik voel me vaak minderwaardig aan anderen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Ik lach snel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Als ik eenmaal de juiste manier gevonden heb om iets te doen, dan hou ik daaraan vast.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Ik heb vaak onenigheid met mijn familie en collega's.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Ik ben redelijk goed in het indelen van mijn tijd, zodat ik dingen op tijd afkrijg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Ik heb vaak onenigheid met mijn familie en collega's.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Als ik onder veel druk sta, voelt het soms alsof ik er aan kapot ga.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Ik beschouw mezelf niet als bijzonder zorgeloos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Ik word geïntrigeerd door de patronen die ik in de kunst en in de natuur tegenkom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Sommige mensen denken dat ik zelfzuchtig en egoïstisch ben.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Ik ben niet bepaald een zeer gestructureerd persoon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Ik voel me zelden eenzaam of melancholiek.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Ik geniet er echt van om met mensen te praten.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Ik denk dat als je studenten naar controversiële sprekers laat luisteren, dit slechts verwarrend en misleidend voor hen kan zijn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Ik zou liever met anderen samenwerken dan met hen te wedijveren.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Ik probeer alle aan mij toegewezen taken nauwgezet uit te voeren.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Ik voel me vaak gespannen en nerveus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Ik ben graag waar iets te beleven valt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Gedichten hebben weinig of geen invloed op mij.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
58 Ik heb de neiging om cynisch en sceptisch tegenover andermans bedoelingen te staan. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
59 Ik heb heldere doelen en werk hier op een gestructureerde manier naar toe. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
60 Soms voel ik me volkomen waardeloos. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
61 Meestal geef ik er de voorkeur aan om dingen alleen te doen. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
62 Ik probeer vaak andersoortig en buitenlands voedsel uit. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
63 Ik denk dat de meeste mensen van je zullen profiteren als je dat toelaat. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
64 Ik verkwist een hoop tijd voordat ik aan het werk ga. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
65 Ik voel me zelden bang of angstig. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
66 Ik heb vaak het gevoel dat ik barst van de energie. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
67 Ik ben me zelden bewust van de stemmingen of gevoelens in mijn omgeving. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
68 De meeste mensen die ik ken, vinden mij aardig. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
69 Ik werk hard om mijn doelen te bereiken. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
70 Ik word vaak boos over de manier waarop mensen mij behandelen. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
71 Ik ben een opgewekt, levenslustig persoon. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
72 Ik vind dat we naar onze religieuze autoriteiten moeten kijken voor beslissingen over morele zaken. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
73 Sommige mensen vinden mij koud en berekenend. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
74 Wanneer ik een verplichting aanga, kan men er altijd op rekenen dat ik doorzet. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
75 Te vaak, wanneer dingen fout gaan, raak ik ontmoedigd en zou ik het liefst opgeven. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
76 Ik ben geen vrolijke optimist. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
77 Soms wanneer ik gedichten lees of naar een kunstwerk kijk, voel ik een rilling of golf van opwinding. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
78 Ik ben ongevoelig en onsentimenteel in mijn houding. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
79 Soms ben ik niet zo betrouwbaar en geloofwaardig als ik zou moeten zijn. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
80 Ik ben zelden verdrietig of depressief. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
81 Mijn leven voltrekt zich in een snel tempo. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
82 Ik heb weinig interesse om te speculeren over de aard van het heelal of de mensheid. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
83 Over het algemeen probeer ik attent en voorkomend te zijn. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
84 Ik ben een productief persoon die altijd de klus ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
Hiermee zijn we aan het einde gekomen van het onderzoek.

Als u een samenvatting wilt ontvangen van de belangrijkste uitkomsten van dit onderzoek én uw eigen scores, dan kunt u dat hier aangeven:

☐ Ja, ik ontvang graag een samenvatting van de belangrijkste resultaten
☐ Ja, ik ontvang graag zowel een samenvatting van de belangrijkste resultaten, als een (leerzaam) overzicht van mijn eigen scores

Zo ja, dan graag de volgende gegevens invullen:

Mijn naam: →
Mijn e-mail adres: →

Wilt u ingevulde vragenlijsten, eerst opslaan als worddocument en daarna per e-mail als bijlage verzenden naar:

**onderzoek_conflict@planet.nl**

Hierbij danken wij u hartelijk voor de genomen moeite.
Met vriendelijke groet,

Kees Gelderman
Beatrice van der Heijden
Johan de Jong
Onderzoekers van de Open Universiteit Nederland

Eventuele opmerkingen kunt u hier noteren:
→