

Conflict

1

Personality, Conflict, and Conflict Resolution

Elizabeth C. Hair

University Undergraduate Fellows, 1992-1993

Texas A&M University

Department of Psychology

APPROVED

Fellows Advisor

William G. Graziano

Honors Director

[Signature]

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Tina Adkins, Casey Cobb, Tim Downing, Pat Fogle, Anne Gurnee, Pejcharat Jane Harvey, Cole Humphreys, Michelle Hussey, April King, Katrina Kruger, Lori Lang, Alicia Leary, Alynda Ogle, Shari Plum, Marci Satsky, Lisa Schreindorfer, Gina Smith, Jacklin Vetkeotter, and Roger Whitaker for helping run the project and code the data. I am especially thankful to Lauri Jensen-Campbell for helping unselfishly with data analysis and any other "major" problem and Shaun Campbell for his expert advice on computers. And a special thank you to Dr. William Graziano, who's hard work and dedication to research made this project possible.

Abstract

This study probed the hypothesis that individual differences in agreeableness are related to patterns of interpersonal conflict. Participants ($N = 124$) were assigned partners, and then asked to solve jointly two social dilemma problems. The partners were videotaped and observers coded their behaviors. In addition, the participants completed ratings regarding perceived conflict, partner perception, and liking of their partner. Individual differences in agreeableness, sex of the participant, and the type of dyad partner were related to patterns of interpersonal conflict. As the number of agreeable people in the dyad increased (minimum 0, maximum 2), the perceived conflict decreased and liking increased. For the males, but not the females, as the individual's agreeableness scores decreased, their perceived conflict increased and liking of their partner decreased. As both the male and female subject's agreeableness scores decreased, the perception of their partner also decreased. These results were discussed in terms of personality and social influences on interpersonal conflict.

Personality, Conflict, and Conflict Resolution

In an emerging consensus, personality psychologists are assigning a top priority to the establishment of a language for describing the basic units of personality (Digman, 1990; Digman & Inouye, 1986; Goldberg, 1981; Hogan, 1983; John, 1990; McCrae & Costa, 1985). This consensus is derived from convergence in empirical work pointing toward a five-factor model (e.g., Digman, 1990; Digman & Takemoto-Chock, 1981; McCrae & Costa, 1987; McCrae & John, 1992). (There is still some debate about the proper construct labels for the five dimensions; here they will be called extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience.) Support for the consensus is also derived from theoretical analyses which offer explanations for the empirical regularities (e.g., Buss, 1991; Goldberg, 1981; Hogan, 1983; John, 1990; Wiggins, & Trapnell, in press).

Among these five dimensions, there are several reasons why agreeableness deserves special attention. First, an agreeableness-like dimension seems to be

pervasive in social perception and cognition. Previous research has been biased against the "discovery" of an agreeableness dimension, and the dimension still emerges (Graziano & Eisenberg, in press). When Digman and Takemoto-Chock (1981) reanalyzed data from six major, large-scale studies, the first factor to emerge was agreeableness. The dimension is almost certainly not an artifact of population sampling.

Second, an agreeableness-like dimension has special theoretical status in many different accounts of social behavior and personality structure. Digman and Takemoto-Chock explicitly link this dimension to theorizing about the tensions between individual motives of selfishness and a societal concern for altruism. Wiggins (1991) marshals evidence that two major (and apparently orthogonal) motivational systems, agency and communion, underlie interpersonal behavior. Communion, the striving for intimacy, union, and solidarity with others, can be mapped onto the Big Five dimension of agreeableness. Hogan (1983) argues that humans needed to evolve characteristics that allowed them to capitalize on the advantages of group living. If I add to this list

theorizing about the genetic origins of altruism, it is clear that an agreeableness-related dimension occupies an important theoretical niche in the analysis of interpersonal behavior and personality.

With few exceptions, empirical work on the five factor model (or "Big Five") has focused on structure, not on processes underlying behavioral differences. If individual differences could be linked to processes, then this would provide a stronger base for the structural model. In particular, if individual differences in agreeableness could be related to important social processes like conflict and conflict resolution, then this would suggest that agreeableness is something more than an artifact of social cognition. If theoretically meaningful social processes could be related to agreeableness, we could have more confidence that the Big Five model offers a general structural representation of a set of adaptive solutions (Buss, 1991).

One problem in the current research literature on agreeableness is its focus on individual behavior, rather than on the interpersonal context in which agreeable behavior emerges. That is, agreeableness is seen as a

as those of the focal respondent. Furthermore, conflict processes may be emergent, being largely unpredictable from characteristics of either individual alone.

This project was designed to probe patterns of conflict and conflict resolution in pairs of persons, who varied in levels of agreeableness. An interpersonal situation was constructed in which minimally-acquainted pairs were presented with two social dilemmas to resolve jointly. An observational methodology was used to assess frequency of naturally-occurring reactions during the course of interaction. Persons were given information that was different from their partner, to elicit conflict on the dilemmas.

Based on the previous literature, I predicted the following outcomes. Generally, I expected that pairs of high-agreeable people would differ from pairs of low-agreeable people in patterns of response to the conflict. More specifically, I predicted that the type of dyad that subjects participated in would be related to the perceived conflict in the interaction, the rated positivity of their partner, the reported liking of their

partner, the observed tension in the interaction, and the observed harmony in the interaction.

At the level of dyadic interaction, I predicted that as the number of agreeable people in the dyads increased, the perceived conflict and the observed tension would decrease. I also predicted that the reported perception of their partner, the reported liking of their partner, and the observed harmony in the interaction would increase as the number of agreeable people increased. I predicted that the patterns of behavior would be different for the high agreeable and low agreeable subjects during the interaction. More specifically, I expected high agreeable persons to be more willing to compromise with their partners, and to acquiesce to their partners, than would low agreeable persons. I expected that high agreeable people would modify their behavior in response to a partner than would low agreeable people.

Method

Subjects and Pretesting

The subjects were 62 male and 62 female undergraduates in introductory Psychology classes at Texas A&M University. They were drawn from a population of 1187 students (female = 744, males = 443) who had been assessed on Goldberg's (1992) self-report inventory. The inventory consisted of 100 adjectives that measured each of the dimensions of the five-factor model (McCrae & John, 1992). The inventory was administered with a 5-step Likert-type response format (from (1) "strongly agree" to (5) "strongly disagree").

From the distribution of scores, subjects who fell within the top quarter and bottom quarter of Factor II (agreeableness) were contacted by phone and asked to participate in the study. Males with scores above 30 were considered high in agreeableness and males with scores below 16 were considered low in agreeableness. Females with a score above 31 were considered high and scores below 19 were low.

Design

The design contrasted three different dyad types within the same sex. The three dyads that were constructed are: a) both partners high in agreeableness (H-H); b) both partners low in agreeableness (L-L); and c) one partner high and the other partner low in agreeableness (H-L). Same sex pairs were used to avoid confounding agreeableness with sex differences. Subjects were randomly assigned to dyads within the appropriate blocks (i.e., stratified random blocks). Thus, the design was a 3 (type of pair) X 2 (sex of pair) randomized block factorial design.

Setting and Equipment

The experimental rooms used had a video camera hidden in the ceiling. No subjects reported being aware of being videotaped, although some subjects did notice the camera.

Procedure

During the telephone solicitation, a research assistant, who was blind to the subject's pretest personality measures, instructed subjects to report to the psychology building for a study on social decision

making. The different pairs were placed in the experimental rooms and told that they would be discussing two different tasks. The tasks were the London (1970) Jury Paradigm and the UGLI orange (Lewicki, et al., 1988) management scenario. The pairs were given the tasks in random order. In the London Jury paradigm, the subjects were asked to reach a unanimous decision on a legal case, as though they were a two person jury. They were led to believe that the case was an actual court case. The case descriptions were developed by London in the 1960's. The partners were led to believe that they were reading identical description of the legal case. In reality, one person received a version that was biased toward the plaintiff, while the other received a version biased toward the defendant. The materials have been used in previous research to study processes of persuasion and social influence.

The UGLI orange management scenario deals with patterns of compromise in situations of competition. The individuals were asked to play the role of two scientists (Drs. Roland and Jones), who were competing for a scarce resource, the UGLI orange. The pairs were given

background information on the two scientist and asked to reach a joint decision on how the oranges were to be distributed. Objectively, a compromise could be reached. Dr. Jones needed the pulp and juice from the oranges only, while Dr. Roland needed the rind of the oranges only. Both could share the scare resource, but could only discover that fact from discussion.

After the research assistant left the room, the video camera was activated. The pairs were videotaped during both tasks. At the end of the second task, the experimenter re-entered the room and asked the subjects to fill out questionnaires on their perception of their partner and the interaction. The subjects were moved to opposite ends of the table and assured that their responses would be kept confidential.

When the subjects were finished with the ratings, the experimenter explained the purpose behind the research and told the participants that they had been videotaped from a hidden camera. They were asked to sign a video release form. The participants were then asked not to disclose any information about the study.

Dependent Measures

Two classes of dependent measures were used in the study: (1) Self-Report ratings of partners; (2) observational coding (Ickes & Barnes, 1978).

The Self-Report ratings dealt with the subjects' responses to three sets of items on the questionnaire. The first set of questions dealt with the amount of conflict felt within the interaction. The second set of questions dealt with their perception of their partner. The third set of questions dealt with whether the subjects liked their partners.

The observational coding was split into two categories: (1) individual analysis within the pair; (2) group interaction analysis. The video tapes were coded by independent judges who were blind to the subject's scores on the pretest personality measure and the make-up of the pairs.

The categories coded for on the individual level include body posture (leaning away or toward partner, and kinetic movement), non-verbal expressiveness (talking with hands, fidgeting with objects, crossing arms), and positive affect (facial and laughter).

Several group level processes were coded. These include the tension in the pair, the harmony in the pair, who in the dyad talked first, who talked most, who made the concessions, and who wrote down the information.

Results

Preliminary Analysis. Initially, analysis were performed to examine characteristics of the "Big 5" measure for agreeableness. The test-retest reliability, measured across an interval of approximately two months, was significant, ($r(123) = .82, p < .0001$). A t-test to check for differences in agreeableness levels between females (20.3, $SD = 15.6$) and males (21.0, $SD = 14.4$) in this study was not significant, $t(123) = .42$.

Self Report Data

Individual Level Analysis

Several different analysis were performed on the data. To overcome problems associated with the dyadic dependency in pair data (Mendoza & Graziano, 1982), I reported analyses primarily in terms of correlations. Correlations can be used to test hypothesis about main effects and interactions without violating assumptions

that errors of measurement are randomly and independently distributed (Cook & Campbell, 1979). Within-cell correlations and means for the individual measures by dyad type and sex are reported in Tables 1 and 2. Each measure is discussed separately.

Insert Tables 1 and 2 here

Perceived Conflict To evaluate the hypothesis that type of dyad was related to perceived conflict, the dyads were dummy coded (H-H pairs = 2, H-L pairs = 1, L-L pairs = 0). This dummy code was then correlated with each person's rating of perceived conflict. (For within cell correlations, see Table 3.) This correlation was significant, ($r(123) = -.25, p < .01$). More conflict was reported in the pair as the number of agreeable people in the pairs decreased. To test the hypothesis that perceived conflict was different in male and female pairs, a correlation was run on perceived conflict and group by sex. The male correlation was significant, ($r(61) = -.38, p < .01$). The female correlation was not significant, $r(61) = -.13, NS$.

Insert Table 3 here

Perceived conflict was also correlated with the individual's agreeableness score by sex and type of dyad. The overall correlation for men across type of dyad was significant, ($r(61) = -.36, p < .01$); for women the corresponding correlation was not significant, $r(61) = -.15$. Within these overall results, several patterns emerged. First, the perceived conflict for women in the L-L dyad was significant, ($r(19) = -.52, p < .01$) as reported in Table 1. Second, for men the corresponding correlation was nonsignificant, ($r(23) = .00, NS$).

Perception of Positivity of Partner I hypothesized that the positivity of the perception of the partner would depend on the type of dyad within which the individual worked. Again, correlations were run with the dummy coded group types and individual positivity scores. The correlation was significant, ($r(123) = .23, p < .01$) for perception of partner collapsed across sex (See Table 3). Perception of the positivity of partner increased as the number of agreeable people in the pairs increased.

The correlation among males regarding positivity of partner was significant, ($r(61) = .42, p < .01$). Perception of partner positivity increased in the male pairs as the number of agreeable people increased. This pattern did not appear in the female pairs, ($r(61) = .04, NS$).

When perception of positivity of partner was correlated with sex, a significant result was found, ($r(123) = .29, p < .01$). Within cell correlations are reported in Table 4. Regardless of their partner's agreeableness score, women rated their partners higher than did men.

Insert Table 4 here

Perception of partner positivity was also correlated with the individual's agreeableness scores by sex and type of dyad as reported in Table 1. Collapsed across dyads, the men's correlation, ($r(61) = .46, p < .01$), and the women's correlation, ($r(61) = .24, p < .05$) were both statistically significant. The H-H males correlation was significant, ($r(19) = .53, p < .01$).

The H-H female correlation, however, was not significant, ($r(15) = .39$, NS). The H-L female correlation was significant, ($r(25) = .39$, $p < .01$), but the H-L male correlation was not significant, ($r(17) = .23$, NS).

Liking of Partner To test the hypothesis that liking the partner is a function of the type of dyad the individual is a member of, correlations were run using the dummy coded group types. Collapsed across sex, the correlation was significant, ($r(123) = .25$, $p < .01$). (See Table 3.) The individuals liked their partners more as the number of agreeable people increased in the dyads. The correlation for males liking their partners was also significant, ($r(61) = .43$, $p < .01$) as reported in Table 3. The corresponding female correlation was not significant, ($r(61) = .06$, NS). As the number of agreeable people increased in the pair, the reported liking of partners in the male dyads also increased. When liking was correlated with sex (Table 4), the results were significant, ($r(123) = .21$, $p < .01$). Regardless of the type of dyad, women reported liking their partners more than did men.

Liking of partner was correlated with the

individual's agreeableness scores by sex and type of dyad. The overall male correlation across dyads was significant, ($r(61) = .37, p < .01$). That is, regardless of type of dyad, in men agreeableness was related to liking for their partners. The overall female correlation was not significant, ($r(61) = .22, NS$). This pattern suggests that in men, liking is more closely tied to individual differences than it is in females.

Observational Coding

Group Interaction Analysis The group level analysis is used as descriptions of the interactions. Analysis of variance, (ANOVA), was performed to look at the data of tension and harmony. The outcome of the decision processes and the group level behaviors are reported in frequencies.

Tension There was a sex X type of dyad interaction that was significant for tension, $F(2, 56) = 5.27, p < .01$). The means for tension by sex and type of dyad are reported in Table 5. There was no difference between the H-H and H-L pairs for men and women. The observed tension in the L-L male pair was greater than the other male dyads. The observed tension in the H-H and H-L

dyads was greater in the female pairs than in the male pairs. Although, the observed tension in L-L female dyad was lower than any female dyad and the corresponding male dyad. No evidence was found that tension differed in the dyads by sex, ($F(1, 56) = .05, \underline{NS}$), or by type, ($F(2, 56) = .65, \underline{NS}$).

Insert Table 5 here

Harmony There was no evidence that observed harmony differed among the dyads for sex, ($F(1, 56) = 1.54, \underline{NS}$). No evidence was found that observed harmony differed among the dyads for type, ($F(2, 56) = 1.27, \underline{NS}$). There was no evidence that observed harmony differed among the dyads for sex by type, ($F(2, 56) = 1.99, \underline{NS}$).

Outcome of decision processes Men and women differed in the responses to the tasks they were presented in the interaction. The results are reported in Tables 6 and 7. These results are presented for descriptive purposes.

Ugli Orange Task Most of the H-H males discovered that they could compromise and each receive the portion

of the orange that they needed. None of the H-L males discovered the compromise, but half of the L-L males did. The majority of the H-H females and the H-L females split the oranges between Dr. Roland and Dr. Jones. None of the male pairs decided to give Dr. Jones all of the oranges.

Insert Table 6 here

London Jury Paradigm Eight of the H-H male pairs found the airline guilty of the fire. None of the other male pairs had a significant difference in patterns of the decisions. None of the female pairs had a significant difference in patterns of decisions.

Insert Table 7 here

Group Level Behaviors The interactions were coded for the behaviors of who talked first, who talked most, who wrote down information, who made concessions. These descriptions are reported in Table 8. The high partner

in the H-L pair of females was observed to talk first more often. The low partner was observed to talk the most for both the male and female pairs. No difference was found for who wrote down the information. The high partner was observed to make more of the concessions regarding the jury paradigm and the UGLI orange tasks regardless of sex.

Insert Table 8 here

Individual Behavior Analysis The categories of body posture, non-verbal expressiveness, and positive affect are another approach to looking at the conflict within the dyads. These behaviors are important because they give insight into the individuals comfort with the interaction. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed on the data of the individual's behaviors. To avoid the dyadic dependency problem, the behaviors of the high agreeable person in the H-H dyads were compared to the behaviors of the high agreeable person in the H-L dyads. The low agreeable person in the L-L dyads were compared to the behaviors of the low agreeable person in the H-L

dyads. An ANOVA was also performed on the data by dyad types and sex.

Body Posture The three behaviors examined were leaning (i.e., Did the partner lean away from his/her partner?; Did the partner lean towards their partner?; Did the individual move during the interaction?).

When the behaviors were collapsed across sex, there was no significant change across the dyads (Table 9).

Insert Table 9 here

Sex differences were noted in the means, as reported in Tables 10 and 11. Overall, the men seem to lean away from the partner, ($F(1,118) = 10.06, p < .01$), and move around more during the interaction.

Insert Tables 10 and 11 here

When the high agreeable person from the H-H dyad and the H-L dyad are compared with the low agreeable person from the L-L dyad and the H-L dyad, patterns of differences emerge. (Means reported in Table 12.) The

high agreeable persons' behaviors in the H-L dyad are different from their counterpart in the H-H dyad for all three body posture behaviors. The low agreeable persons in the H-L dyads did not change their behavior in comparison with the low agreeable person in the L-L dyad.

Insert Table 12 here

When the high agreeable person from the H-H dyad was compared with the high agreeable person from the H-L dyad, there was a sex difference, $F(1,36) = 4.46$, $p < .05$, and a sex X dyad type interaction, $F(1,36) = 4.46$, $p < .05$. The high agreeable male in the H-L dyad moved away more often than the females. The high agreeable women in the H-L dyad did not move away from their partner and the high agreeable women in the H-H dyad did move away from their partners. Means are reported in Table 13.

Insert Table 13 here

No behavior differences were found between the low agreeable person in the L-L dyads and the low agreeable person in the H-L dyads.

Non-verbal expressiveness The three behaviors looked at were if the individual talked with their hands, fidgeted with objects, or crossed their arms.

When the behaviors were collapsed across sex, there was no significant difference in the means, as reported in Table 9.

A sex differences was found for the behavior of crossing their arms, $F(1,118) = 7.24, p < .01$. Overall the men crossed their arms more than the females (Tables 10 & 11).

When the high agreeable person from the H-H dyad and the H-L dyad are compared with the low agreeable person from the L-L dyad and the H-L dyad, patterns of differences emerge (Means reported in Table 12). The high agreeable persons' behaviors in the H-L dyad are different from their counterpart in the H-H dyad for all three body posture behaviors. The low agreeable persons in the H-L dyads did not change their behavior in comparison with the low agreeable person in the L-L dyad

except on fidgeting with objects. The low agreeable person in the H-L dyad did not fidget with the objects as much as the low agreeable person in the L-L dyad.

When the high agreeable person from the H-H dyad was compared with the high agreeable person from the H-L dyad, there was a sex by person interaction for crossing their arms, $F(1,36) = 6.68, p < .05$, and a sex by person interaction for talking with their hands, $F(1,36) = 3.61, p < .05$. The high agreeable women in the H-H dyads crossed their arms more and talked more with their hands than their female counterpart in the H-L dyad. The high agreeable men in the H-L dyads crossed their arms more and talked more with their hands than their counterpart in the H-L dyad (Table 13).

No behavior differences were found between the low agreeable person in the L-L dyads and the low agreeable person in the H-L dyads.

Positive Affect The behaviors measured to index positive affect were frequencies with which individuals smiled and laughed during the interaction. When the behaviors were collapsed across sex, there was no significant change across the dyads (Table 9).

A sex difference for laughing was found across the dyads, $F(1,118) = 7.24, p < .01$. The women were observed to smile more regardless of their agreeableness or the make-up of the dyad, as reported in tables 10 and 11. Similar results were found within specific dyads. For example, sex differences were found for laughter, $F(1,36) = 6.68, p < .05$, and smiling, $F(1,36) = 6.15, p < .05$, when the high agreeable person in the H-H was compared with the high agreeable person in the H-L dyad. The high agreeable females were observed to laugh and smile more than the high agreeable males (Table 13). By comparison, no behavior differences were found between the low agreeable person in the L-L dyads and the low agreeable person in the H-L dyads.

Discussion

Results from this study suggest that personality is an important aspect of conflict and conflict resolution. More specifically, the dimension of agreeableness from the five-factor model of personality appears to be an important element in the perception and resolution of interpersonal conflict. Perceived conflict in the interaction was related to the type of dyad that the subjects participated. More conflict was reported in the interaction as the number of agreeable people in the pair decreased. Agreeableness also effected the perception of partner's positivity and the reported liking of the partner. As the number of agreeable people in the dyads increased so did these measures.

Differences between females and males in this study may be interpreted as personality effects to the extent that they appeared consistently across contexts. The females in the study rated their partners more positively than men regardless of the dyad type in which they participated. Furthermore, the males in the study reported more conflict than the females. In retrospect, these patterns of results are not surprising, given that

the traditional feminine sex role contains elements of agreeableness (Wiggins, 1991). More social pressure is applied to females to maintain the delicate balance in relationships with strangers. This normative account could help explain the sex difference in perceived conflict. This account could also help explain why females rated their partners more positively than men.

Personality often exerts its influence interactively within social contexts (e.g., Ickes & Barnes, 1978), and this general pattern appears to be the case with agreeableness. That is, an individual's perception of his/her partner was influenced not only by the individual level of agreeableness, but also interactively by the sex and the type of dyad within which the subjects participated. The high agreeable women and men modified their behaviors, presumably to minimize the potential conflict within the H-L dyads. This pattern emerged even though the women reported less perceived conflict in the interactions. The high agreeable people also compromised more than the low agreeable person in the H-L dyads during the interaction regardless of sex.

Taken together, this study suggests that the five-

factor model, and agreeableness in particular, may be useful tools for understanding interpersonal conflict. Personality alone, however, provides only part of the picture. Interpersonal conflicts contain emergent elements, and may produce phenomena not easily predicted from characteristics of either partner in isolation (Buss, 1991). My study suggests that personality processes can be linked to dyadic conflict, especially for men, but also appear to operate differently within different social contexts. More interesting, perhaps, is the way that agreeableness differences are moderated by sex differences. It is for future research to specify precisely how agreeableness, sex differences, and situational context interact in producing social behavior.

References

- Buss, D. M. (1991). Evolutionary personality psychology. In M. R. Rosenzweig & L. W. Porter (Eds.), Annual Review of Psychology, 42, 459-491.
- Cohen, J. (1987). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences: Revised edition. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cook, T. D. & Campbell, D. T. (1979). Quasi-Experimentation: Design and Analysis Issues for Field Settings. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company.
- Digman, J. H. (1989). Five robust trait dimensions: Development, stability, and utility. Journal of Personality, 57, 195-214.
- Digman, J. H. (1990). Personality structure: The emergence of the five-factor model. In M. R. Rosenzweig & L. W. Porter (Eds.), Annual Review of Psychology, 41, 417-440.
- Digman, J. M., & Inouye, J. (1986). Further specification of the five robust factors of personality. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 50, 116-123.

- Digman, J. M., & Takemoto-Chock, N. K. (1981). Factors in the natural language of personality: Re-analysis, comparison, and interpretation of six major studies. Multivariate Behavioral Research, 16, 149-170.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1981). Language and individual differences: The search for universals in personality lexicons. In L. Wheeler (Ed.), Review of Personality & Social Psychology, 2, Beverley Hills, CA: Sage, 141-165.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development of markers for the Big-Five Factor Structure. Psychological Assessment, 4, 26-42.
- Graziano, W. G., & Eisenberg, N. H. (in press). Agreeableness: A dimension of personality. In S. Briggs, R. Hogan, & W. H. Jones (Eds.), Handbook of personality psychology, San Diego: Academic Press.
- Hogan, R. T. (1983). A socioanalytic theory of personality. In M. Page (Ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation: Personality - Current theory and research. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 58-89.

- Ickes, W. & Barnes, R. (1978). Boys and Girls Together- and Alienated: On Enacting Stereotyped Sex Roles in Mixed Sex Dyads. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, 669-683.
- John, O. P. (1990). The big five-factor taxonomy: Dimensions of personality in the natural language and in questionnaires. In L. A. Pervin (Ed.), Handbook of personality theory and research. New York: Guilford.
- Jones, E. E., & Gerard, H. B. (1967). Foundations of social psychology. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Kenny, D., Horner, C., Kashy, D., & Chu, L. (1992). Consensus at zero acquaintance: Replication, behavioral cues, and stability. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 62, 88-97.
- Lewicki, R., Bowen, D., Hall, D., & Hall, F. (1988). Experiences in Management and organizational Behavior (3rd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons, 104-108.
- London, H. (1973). Psychology of Persuader. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.
- London, H., Meldman, D. J., & Lanckton, A. V. C. (1970).

- The jury method: Some correlates of persuading. Human Relations, 23, 115-121.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1985). Updating Norman's "Adequate taxonomy": Intelligence and personality dimensions in the natural language and in questionnaires. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 49, 710-721.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 52, 81-90.
- McCrae, R. R., & John, O. J. (1992). An introduction to the five-factor model and its applications. Journal of Personality, 60, 175-216.
- Mendoza, J. & Graziano, W. (1982). The statistical analysis of dyadic social behavior: A multivariate approach. Psychological Bulletin, 92, 532-540.
- Morris, L. W. (1979). Extraversion and introversion: An interactional perspective. New York: Wiley.
- Snyder, M., & Ickes, W. (1985) Personality & social behavior. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.) Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. 2, pp. 883-

948). New York: Random House.

Weick, K. E. (1968). Systematic observational methods.

In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), Handbook of social psychology (2nd ed.), 2. New York: Reading, Maddison Wesley, 357-451.

Wiggins, J. S. (1991). Agency and communion as conceptual coordinates for the understanding and measurement of interpersonal behavior. In W. Grove & D. Cicchetti (Eds.), Thinking clearly about psychology: Essays in honor of Paul E. Meehl. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 89-113.

Wiggins, J. S., & Trapnell, P. (in press). Personality structures: The return of the Big Five. In S. R. Briggs, R. Hogan, & W. H. Jones (Eds.), Handbook of personality psychology. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Table 1

CORRELATIONS OF AGREEABLENESS BY SEX AND TYPE OF DYADS

		H-H	H-L	L-L	OVERALL
MALES	PERCEIVED CONFLICT	-.07	-.30	.00	-.36*
	PERCEPTION OF PARTNER	.53*	.23	.21	.46*
	LIKING OF PARTNER	.32	-.03	.04	.37*
		(N=20)	(N=18)	(N=24)	(N=62)
FEMALES	PERCEIVED CONFLICT	-.39	.02	-.52*	-.15
	PERCEPTION OF PARTNER	.39	.39*	.40	.24*
	LIKING OF PARTNER	.26	.38*	.21	.22
		(N=16)	(N=26)	(N=20)	(N=62)

Table 2
MEANS BY SEX AND TYPE OF DYADS

		H-H	H-L		L-L
MALES	PERCEIVED CONFLICT	15.85 (1.31)	14.77 (1.79)	15.56 (1.42)	15.33 (1.55)
	PERCEPTION OF PARTNER	82.80 (11.98)	78.30 (7.71)	76.11 (8.29)	71.60 (10.48)
	LIKING OF PARTNER	17.70 (2.74)	16.22 (1.48)	16.11 (1.62)	14.67 (3.42)
		(N=20)	(N=18)		(N=24)
FEMALES	PERCEIVED CONFLICT	14.69 (2.75)	15.15 (3.53)	15.23 (2.35)	15.45 (2.37)
	PERCEPTION OF PARTNER	83.80 (17.02)	85.90 (9.26)	82.60 (10.26)	82.65 (9.51)
	LIKING OF PARTNER	17.81 (4.08)	17.62 (2.33)	16.46 (2.50)	17.35 (2.23)
		(N=16)	(N=26)		(N=20)

Table 3

CORRELATIONS WITH GROUP COMPOSITION

	MALES	FEMALES	OVERALL
PERCEIVED CONFLICT IN DYAD	-.38*	-.13	-.25*
PERCEPTION OF PARTNER	.42*	.04	.23*
LIKING OF PARTNER	.43*	.06	.25*

Table 4

CORRELATIONS WITH SEX

	OVERALL
PERCEIVED CONFLICT IN DYAD	.05
PERCEPTION OF PARTNER	.29*
LIKING OF PARTNER	.21*

Table 5

MEANS OF RATED GROUP TENSION BY SEX AND TYPE OF DYADS

	H-H	H-L	L-L
MALES	1.78 (0.97)	1.67 (0.71)	3.00 (1.28)
FEMALES	2.22 (1.20)	2.62 (1.33)	1.80 (1.03)

Table 6

DECISIONS ON UGLI ORANGE TASK

		COMPROMISE	SPLIT	ROLAND	JONES
MALE	H-H	7	3	0	0
	H-L	0	5	4	0
	L-L	6	4	2	0
FEMALE	H-H	1	4	1	2
	H-L	3	7	2	1
	L-L	4	3	2	1

Table 7

DECISIONS ON THE LONDON JURY PARADIGM

		GUILTY	NOT GUILTY
MALE	H-H	8	2
	H-L	4	5
	L-L	5	7
FEMALE	H-H	5	3
	H-L	7	6
	L-L	6	4

Table 8

GROUP LEVEL ANALYSIS OF H-L DYADS

		HIGH	LOW	BOTH
MALES	TALKED FIRST	4	5	0
	TALKED MOST	3	5	1
	WROTE DOWN INFORMATION	2	4	3
	MADE CONCESSIONS	6	3	0
FEMALES	TALKED FIRST	9	4	0
	TALKED MOST	3	6	4
	WROTE DOWN INFORMATION	5	3	5
	MADE CONCESSIONS	7	3	3

Table 9

Means of Behaviors in each type of dyad collapsed across sex

Behaviors	H-H	H-L	L-L
<i>Body Posture</i>			
Leaning away from partner	4.06 (3.10)	4.16 (4.68)	4.39 (4.29)
Leaning toward partner	5.31 (3.58)	5.55 (4.93)	5.80 (4.67)
Kinetic movement	11.94 (9.14)	10.61 (9.70)	14.11 (27.96)
<i>Non-verbal expressiveness</i>			
Talking with hands	11.83 (7.85)	15.77 (16.31)	15.15 (14.05)
Fidgeting with objects	9.22 (9.82)	8.48 (7.31)	11.66 (10.85)
Arms crossed	4.53 (4.02)	3.48 (3.71)	4.48 (4.25)
<i>Positive Affect</i>			
Smiling	1.67 (2.41)	1.36 (2.36)	2.23 (4.34)
Laughter	3.97 (5.80)	3.86 (6.38)	3.25 (4.71)

Table 10

Means of Behaviors in each type of dyad for females

Behaviors	H-H	H-L	L-L
<i>Body Posture</i>			
Leaning away from partner	3.50 (3.44)	2.50 (4.41)	3.50 (3.30)
Leaning toward partner	5.63 (4.14)	5.04 (5.48)	5.75 (3.84)
Kinetic movement	9.94 (11.32)	10.31 (10.34)	10.05 (11.21)
<i>Non-verbal expressiveness</i>			
Talking with hands	12.75 (9.81)	14.11 (17.32)	14.05 (8.03)
Fidgeting with objects	10.94 (11.32)	8.42 (7.98)	11.65 (9.26)
Arms crossed	4.50 (4.69)	2.58 (2.58)	2.95 (2.99)
<i>Positive Affect</i>			
Smiling	1.86 (2.55)	1.58 (2.74)	3.15 (5.84)
Laughter	5.88 (7.44)	5.12 (7.60)	5.50 (5.85)

Table 11

Means of Behaviors in each type of dyad for males

Behaviors	H-H	H-L	L-L
<i>Body Posture</i>			
Leaning away from partner	4.50 (2.80)	6.56 (4.05)	5.13 (4.91)
Leaning toward partner	5.05 (3.15)	6.28 (4.04)	5.83 (5.35)
Kinetic movement	13.55 (10.25)	11.06 (8.97)	14.50 (12.48)
<i>Non-verbal expressiveness</i>			
Talking with hands	11.10 (6.02)	18.17 (14.88)	16.08 (17.72)
Fidgeting with objects	7.85 (8.49)	8.56 (6.44)	11.67 (12.22)
Arms crossed	4.55 (3.53)	4.78 (4.70)	5.75 (4.76)
<i>Positive Affect</i>			
Smiling	1.50 (2.33)	1.06 (1.70)	1.46 (2.40)
Laughter	2.45 (3.56)	2.06 (3.51)	1.38 (2.26)

Table 12

Comparing Means of Behaviors for the high and low agreeable people in the mixed dyads with the same type dyads

Behaviors	High-H	Mix-H	Low-L	Mix-L
<i>Body Posture</i>				
Leaning away from partner	4.05 (3.56)	3.22 (3.31)	5.23 (5.28)	5.09 (5.66)
Leaning toward partner	5.28 (4.11)	4.77 (3.70)	6.18 (5.30)	6.32 (5.90)
Kinetic movement	10.39 (8.63)	12.05 (10.37)	11.82 (13.11)	9.18 (9.00)
<i>Non-verbal expressiveness</i>				
Talking with hands	14.28 (9.35)	13.50 (12.49)	18.05 (17.73)	18.05 (19.44)
Fidgeting with objects	10.61 (10.69)	9.09 (7.67)	13.00 (12.85)	7.86 (7.05)
Arms crossed	4.44 (4.00)	2.45 (3.43)	5.23 (4.65)	4.50 (3.77)
<i>Positive Affect</i>				
Smiling	2.06 (2.44)	1.32 (2.59)	2.00 (2.79)	1.41 (2.17)
Laughter	4.67 (7.33)	5.45 (8.55)	3.09 (4.41)	2.27 (2.23)

Table 13

Comparing Means of Behaviors for the high and low agreeable people in the mixed dyads with the same type dyads by sex

Behaviors	Females		Males	
	High-H	Mix-H	High-H	Mix-H
<i>Body Posture</i>				
Leaning away from partner	4.38 (4.31)	1.46 (1.45)	3.80 (3.05)	5.77 (3.63)
Leaning toward partner	7.37 (4.86)	10.23 (6.57)	3.60 (2.55)	6.00 (4.92)
Kinetic movement	9.25 (8.84)	11.23 (10.23)	11.30 (8.82)	13.22 (11.06)
<i>Non-verbal expressiveness</i>				
Talking with hands	17.25 (11.59)	10.23 (6.57)	11.90 (6.82)	18.22 (17.38)
Fidgeting with objects	15.75 (13.91)	9.07 (9.12)	6.50 (4.84)	9.11 (5.46)
Arms crossed	6.00 (5.12)	1.23 (1.09)	3.20 (2.44)	4.22 (4.81)
<i>Positive Affect</i>				
Smiling	3.25 (2.91)	2.00 (3.19)	1.10 (1.52)	0.33 (0.70)
Laughter	8.50 (9.68)	7.62 (10.01)	1.60 (2.27)	2.33 (4.79)