ABSTRACT

LITTLE, SARA ELIZABETH. Social Goals and Strategies in Adolescent Peer Conflict Situations. (Under the direction of Mary Elizabeth Haskett).

Adolescence is a period of important physical, social, emotional, and cognitive changes. Peer relationships become more complex and diverse, and adolescents must learn to negotiate varying relationship dynamics, including conflict with their peers. Limited research has been conducted, however, to understand how adolescents manage peer conflict. In order to expand the focus of research regarding social goals and strategies in adolescent peer conflict, 230 college students in late adolescence (ages 18-21) responded to 15 hypothetical conflict scenarios. The goals late adolescents' endorsed for peer conflicts were meaningfully related to the strategies they chose to resolve such conflicts. One-third of the sample was found to have a distinct “goal orientation” in response to the peer conflict vignettes. As expected, adolescents in this study with different goal orientations were found to favor different strategies, and they endorsed strategies consistent with their specific goal orientation. In contrast to studies with children, few significant gender differences were found between men and women in their overall preferences for goals or strategies in peer conflicts situations. However, when males’ and females’ goal and strategy preferences were analyzed across different types of relationships (i.e., best friends, roommates, and romantic partners), significant gender differences were apparent. Late adolescent males showed little difference in their endorsement of conflict goals for a best friend or romantic partner; both were equally valued whereas roommates were viewed negatively. Women, in contrast, rated their best friends with a greater sense of priority than romantic partners or roommates. Implications of the results for understanding adolescents’ conflict resolution skills with peers are discussed.
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Social Goals and Strategies in Adolescent Peer Conflict Situations

Whether in formal theory or popular stereotypes, conflict has long been associated with the period of adolescence. Freud and G. Stanley Hall advanced the intrapsychic and "sturm and drang" notions of conflict, and modern culture has continued to perpetuate an image of adolescent strife and turmoil. At its most extreme, media images of school shootings and other destructive episodes have portrayed adolescents as unstable and even violent in their personal conflicts and relationships. To a lesser extreme, conflicts between peers in the forms of arguments or struggles over activities and possessions are also perceived by parents and teachers as a "sign of failed socialization" (Shantz & Hobart, 1989, p. 71) and as negative and undesirable events. However, conflict is not inherently destructive; it can make a potentially positive contribution to one's social and cognitive development (Deutsch, 1973; Shantz, 1987). For example, appropriate management of peer conflict has been found to reduce egocentrism, promote social understanding, and enhance discourse skills among children (Chung & Asher, 1996). Clearly, managing conflict with peers plays an important role in children's and adolescents' social development and warrants research efforts.

Researchers interested in the role of conflict in social development have primarily focused on behavioral outcomes of conflict, such as aggression, withdrawal, and submissiveness in children, particularly in relation to peer acceptance. Children with high levels of these behaviors tend to be poorly accepted by their peers. A negative trajectory including loneliness, social dissatisfaction, and academic difficulties frequently ensues from peer rejection. In contrast, children who are prosocial in their behavioral style (i.e., cooperate easily, are friendly and helpful, have a good sense of humor) tend to be well-accepted by their peers (see Coie, Dodge, & Kupersmidt, 1990, for a review). Thus, many successful
social skills intervention programs focus on changing the behavioral style of at-risk children (Erdley & Asher, 1999). However, researchers (Ladd & Mize, 1983; Renshaw & Asher, 1982) have speculated that, in addition to improving children's social skills, the efficacy of interventions may increase if efforts are directed towards children's social goals. Indeed, an intervention study by Oden and Asher (1977) found success in coaching children to pursue prosocial goals in games with peers (e.g., to just have fun) rather than maladaptive goals such as dominance or winning at all costs.

Important questions began to arise, then, regarding whether children who exhibit different behavioral styles in conflict situations also differ in their social goals. Such questions have prompted researchers to investigate the thought processes that underlie children's behavioral choices, such as understanding the social goals children have in relation to those used to resolve conflict situations. One theory suggested to explain children's cognition, including social goals and strategies, is social information processing. As part of their social information processing model developed to understand children's social behavior, Crick and Dodge (1994) described goals as "focused arousal states that function as orientations toward producing (or wanting to produce) particular outcomes" (p. 87). Thus, it is suggested that one's goal within a conflictual social situation can have motivational effects on subsequent behavior.

Social situations are often ambiguous and allow for various types of goals to be pursued (Parkhurst & Asher, 1985). Thus, a child has to decide what goals he or she wants to pursue in any given situation. Research on social information processing has supported a strong association between children's goals in social conflicts and the strategies they use to resolve the conflict (e.g., prosocial strategies relate to prosocial goals; aggressive strategies
relate to hostile, revenge, control, and instrumental goals) (Delveaux & Daniels, 2000). Therefore, a growing appreciation exists that in order to understand social behavior and peer relationship outcomes, it is necessary to examine one's social goals and their relationship to social strategies. This remains an unexplored topic within the adolescent peer conflict literature, however, and represents a significant gap in understanding peer relations of adolescents.

In addition to the gap in the literature regarding social goals and strategies within adolescent peer conflict, little research has been conducted in other fundamental areas of adolescence and conflict. Research focusing on peer conflict among preschool and elementary school-aged children has flourished, however, and will be briefly reviewed to serve as a point of reference. Conflicts in childhood have been found to be brief and focused around personal control issues, such as teasing and name calling, or disputes over possession of objects (see Shantz, 1987 for an extended review). Age and gender differences have been found among the strategies used by preschool and elementary-aged children to resolve conflicts. Specifically, boys have been found to be more likely to use threats and physical force in response to peer conflict whereas girls have been found to utilize more prosocial strategies to mitigate conflict or attempt to negotiate conflict with peers. With respect to age, younger children have been found to manage conflict less successfully (e.g., they use more hostile strategies) than older children (Canary, Cupach, & Messman, 1995; Renshaw & Asher, 1983).

Researchers should be hesitant to extrapolate findings from literature regarding young children's conflict because adolescence represents a unique period of development, with marked shifts in biological, social, and cognitive realms (Steinberg, 2002). These shifts and
changes influence the nature of peer relationships and friendships in a multitude of ways and affect how adolescents and those around them interact, in ways unique from childhood. During adolescence, peer relationships become increasingly intimate as evidenced by more frequent companionate exchanges, more personal disclosure, and greater provision of emotional support. Accompanying the level of increase in friendship intimacy is an increase in the importance of that intimacy to socioemotional functioning (Buhrmester, 1990). As adolescents’ relationships become more intimate and important, they also become more diversified. Best friendships solidify, romantic relationships develop and intensify, and new living situations evolve as many late adolescents move away from their parents and into college with roommates.

Not having intimate relationships can be a source of stress for an adolescent. Sullivan (1953) argued that the need for intimacy intensifies during early adolescence, and if this need is unmet through adolescent friendships, then loneliness, depression, and alienation can ensue. Subsequent research indicated that the ability to maintain close relationships with friends was consistently associated with positive adolescent mental health (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987; Creasey, Kershaw, & Boston, 1999) and self-esteem (Connolly & Konarski, 1994). Sullivan (1953) and Parker and Gottman (1989) suggested that adolescents have an increased desire for self-disclosure and self-exploration that is rooted in a need for "consensual validation" of personal worth. Those adolescents who miss out on such validating social interactions due to a lack of intimate friendships can feel "less secure, more anxious, and less worthy" (Buhrmester, 1990, p. 1102).

Intimate friends in adolescence are also particularly important as a source of social support and coping. Uniquely adolescent stressors such as bodily changes, dating, sexuality,
and changing family dynamics, may not be comfortably discussed with parents (Buhrmester, 1990; Buhrmester & Furman, 1987). Even in late adolescence (ages 18-21), youth still clearly value support received from their peer group (Creasey et al., 1999). Indeed, difficulties with peers such as friends, roommates, and romantic partners have been reported to be a chief reason for students seeking services at university counseling centers (Buhrmester, 1996).

In addition to an increase in the intensity and importance of peer relationships from childhood to adolescence, changes occur in the social competencies necessary for friendship. Childhood friendships center around group acceptance and play activities; therefore, being a competent friend entails knowing how to enter a group engaged in play, being an appropriate play partner (i.e., sharing, taking turns, being "nice" and fun), and not insulting or being aggressive with others (Asher, 1983). However, social contexts become increasingly complex and intense during adolescence (Selman, Beardslee, Schultz, Krupa, & Podorefsky, 1986), and thus, competencies in interpersonal relationships must also become more complex. Adolescents must be capable of the same skills as younger children, such as initiating conversation and relationships. But they also must learn skills necessary for intimacy, such as disclosing personal information and providing emotional support to others, as well as expressing honest opinions and dissatisfactions during conflicts. These interpersonal skills are more similar to those needed in adult relationships, but only partially overlap with those skills necessary as a playmate during early childhood (Buhrmester, 1990). Because of the importance of friendship and intimacy during adolescence, as well as the burgeoning types of peer relationships, conflict can be an especially salient factor in determining the viability of those relationships.
To this end, there were four specific research purposes. One specific purpose was to explore the degree to which adolescents' social goals were related to the strategies they use in peer conflict situations. Research (Rose & Asher, 1999) has shown that the social goals and strategies used by younger children are predictive of both acceptance (or rejection) by their peers and the quality of friendship in peer relationships. Given the particular importance of peers and friendships in adolescence, it is important to expand this knowledge base to an older age group. If social goals are indeed linked to strategies in peer conflict, intervention efforts can move beyond addressing social skills deficits to changing maladaptive social cognition, such as goal priorities in conflicts. A second purpose was to determine whether there were specific “goal orientations” that existed among adolescent participants in response to conflict situations, and if so, how ratings for conflict strategies varied by goal orientation. A third specific purpose of the research was to explore whether gender differences existed, as with younger children, between males and females in the goals and strategies utilized in peer conflicts. The final purpose was to determine whether goals and strategies varied in response to the context of the relationship. Previous research (Renshaw & Asher, 1983) suggested younger children engaged in social behaviors differently when engaged in conflict with close friends or those who are not friends. Adolescents, especially those in late adolescence, interact with peers who vary in their relationship to the adolescent; whether adolescents' goals and strategies for conflicts differed across those varying relationships remained unexplored. The available literature related to the goals of this study will be reviewed in order to provide a foundation for the hypotheses put forth by this author.
Review of the Literature

To provide a basis for the study of adolescent peer conflict and its relation to conflict goals and strategies, this literature review is divided into four sections. The first section will provide a brief review of the importance of adolescent relationships for social competency and three primary types of intimate peer relationships. In the second section, a specific definition of conflict is discussed. In the third section, theories relevant to understanding adolescent social cognition and information processing within the context of peer conflict are reviewed. These include Selman and colleagues' (1986) social perspective-taking theory and Crick and Dodge's (1994) social information processing theory. The final section provides a review of representative studies within Shantz's (1987) temporal (or sequential) framework of peer conflict. This framework includes the incidence and intensity of adolescent peer conflict, as well as the issues, strategies (and goals), and outcomes of conflict episodes.

The Importance and Types of Peer Relationships

As the peer group becomes more influential and takes on a special role in adolescence, the importance of peer relationships can not be understated. Indeed, Pombeni, Kirchler, and Palmonari (1990) described the establishment of relationships and social competency with peers as crucial for the adolescent years. Peer adolescent interactions provide opportunity to learn new social skills and generalize social skills learned in the family. In addition, features of adult social support are learned and mastered in close friendships of adolescence, such as emotional support and sharing, requesting and obtaining information and help from others, and companionship (Fullerton & Ursano, 1994). Despite the increased significance of peer relationships during adolescence, most research on social competency has focused exclusively on young and middle childhood.
Englund, Levy, Hyson, and Stroufe (2000) indicated social competency in adolescence is especially complex because of the number of unique issues involved in peer relationships. These issues include the novel challenge to form intimate relationships involving both friendships and sexual relationships; developing and maintaining deeper commitment to relationships, including greater self-disclosure and emotional vulnerability; learning to function within a network of relationships; and balancing the coordination of intimate relationships, within-group interactions, and a larger social network.

An important issue in adolescent social competency is functioning effectively within peer relationships, including tasks such as working cooperatively with and considering perspectives of others, collaboratively solving problems, and constructively negotiating conflict (Englund et al., 2000). Although research with children indicates conflict strategies vary according to the relationship with the other person in the conflict (Adalbjarnardottir & Selman, 1989), to date little research of adolescent peer conflict has examined important variables such as the relationships between peers (Weitzman, 2001). Therefore it is likely that conflict strategies differ in various relationships of adolescence. Three primary peer relationships of late adolescence will be briefly reviewed in order to establish a framework for examining peer conflict across relationships types. These primary intimate relationships include best friends, romantic partners, and roommates.

*Best friendships in adolescence.* Friendships in childhood and adolescence have important developmental functions that become more complex as a child matures. With maturation, a child or adolescent must gain more skills and build on previous development in addition to developing qualitatively different and more complex ways to manage behavior in a friendship. In early childhood, friendships tend to be based on common activities and
similarities such as age, sex, and race. Friendships are short-lived and “best friends” frequently change. As more sophisticated role-taking and perspective increases in middle adolescence, physical and behavioral similarities become less important as a basis for friendship; instead, mutual trust and loyalty become more important foundations for relationships. In adolescence, friendships become based on intimacy, self-disclosure, and similar psychological qualities (e.g., interests, values, attitudes) (Sigelman, 1999).

Best friendships or “chumships” develop during preadolescence (Sullivan, 1953), typically around third grade. These relationships become increasingly stable with each grade, and by tenth grade, have settled into the stability and mutuality of a best friendship. Gender differences in best friendships are noted, with females sharing greater intimacy with each other, as evidenced by greater sharing of thoughts and feelings, and at an earlier age than males. Teenage girls who are best friends often have great intensity to their friendships, with great attachment and inseparability. However, Douvan and Adelson (1966) noted as females become more autonomous, increase social-cognitive skills, and become involved in dating relationships, they become less emotionally dependent on their best friends. Only one study to date investigated the nature of conflict and gender in adolescent best friendships. During videotaped discussion sessions about unresolved problems in their friendships, females were rated lower in withdrawal and higher in communication skills and supportive validation than were males. Males rated their relationships with best friends higher in conflicts than females did (Black, 2002).

Although males rated their friendships higher in conflict than did females, adolescent male best friendships have been found to be less emotionally intense and less based on discussion of feelings and more activity-based than those of female best friends. The
prevalence of opposite sex friendships increases with maturity. Best friendships throughout development are typically of the same gender, although opposite-sex friendships do begin to attain a high level of intimacy in mid-high school (Seligman, 1999). The intimacy between best friends often serves as a preparation for skills necessary in romantic relationships, such as self-disclosure, communication, and sensitivity to others’ needs and desires (Savin-Williams & Berndt, 1990).

*Romantic relationships in adolescence.* In addition to identity development in adolescence, Feldman and Gowan (1998) identified two other developmental tasks of adolescence. These include building skills and developing intimacy with the opposite sex and managing developing sexual desires and impulses. These tasks are often played out in terms of romantic relationships, giving a great degree of salience to these relationships. As with best friendships, romantic relationships typically undergo a developmental sequence. In early adolescence, separate male and female “cliques” come together into a mixed-sex group. Relationships then often begin as the group divides into couples.

Feiring (1996) examined dating and romantic relationships in middle adolescence with a sample of 15 year-olds. Most participants had dating experience that occurred within the context of the larger group. Couples were typically short-lived (e.g., four months or less). Sexual experimentation often occurred, but rather than experiencing the feelings of love and security prevalent in more adult romantic relationships, the couplings were primarily sources of companionship for the teenagers. It is typically not until late adolescence or young adulthood that romantic relationships become based on love and emotional support (Laursen, 1996), and by late adolescence most young people have experienced a romantic relationship of some degree of intensity (Connolly, Furman, & Konarski, 2000).
Ultimately, late adolescents report that they are emotionally closer to and rely more on romantic partners than previous support systems such as family members and friends (Creasey et al., 1999). Consequently, the importance placed on these relationships is obvious. Although adolescents in romantic relationships have undoubtedly had experience dealing with conflict in close relationships (e.g., parents and friends), the interpersonal conflicts that frequently arise in romantic relationships are novel experiences. Adolescents rate negotiating conflict within a romantic relationship as a critical concern and source of angst (Grover & Nangle, 2003). Conflict in adolescent romantic relationships has been linked to mental health concerns such as anxiety and depression (Reese-Weber & Marchland, 2002). According to professional counselors in university counseling centers, difficulties with romantic partners are a chief reason this population seeks psychological services (Creasy et al., 1999).

**Roommate relationships in adolescence.** In addition to university students seeking counseling services due to conflict in romantic relationships, another reason for seeking psychological services and university administrative support is due to conflict with roommates. The transition to college and the university roommate-matching process is a situation potentially rife with difficulty and stressors. The student roommate relationship is a unique one in that a high level of contact with a relatively unfamiliar person occurs in small, closed quarters. College students are often away from home and established support systems such as family and friends for the first time. They are learning to manage increased academic demands, time pressures, and newly experienced personal independence in unfamiliar environs, creating an aura of stress and instability. Previous research (Degirmencioglu, Urberg, Tolson, & Richard, 1998) has indicated that less stability in a
relationship is more likely to result in conflict, thus suggesting that roommate relationships are likely to be challenging for many late adolescents.

The stress that can result from roommate conflict has important implications for the social and academic functioning of the late adolescent. Satisfaction with roommate relationships is associated with perceived high quality of the college experience, stronger academic performance, and better psychological adjustment (Lovejoy, Perkins, & Collins, 1995). In contrast, roommate conflict has been found to be linked with increased psychological distress among university students (e.g., anxiety, demoralization) (Lepore, 1992).

Little research has been conducted to examine gender differences in roommate conflict. Lepore’s (1992) study of roommate conflict revealed women to have lower levels of conflict with roommates than males. No gender differences were found in levels of psychological distress, despite the greater amount of conflict in male roommate relationships and lower levels of perceived support from both friends and roommates relative to women.

In addition to the psychological distress conflictual roommate relationships can have on the individuals, problematic roommate relationships are a serious concern for university housing officials. Requests for room transfers and dealing with roommate differences has caused many universities to expend additional funds on housing, better roommate matching procedures, extra staff (e.g., residential assistants, university counselors) to deal with problem situations, and the necessity to develop conflict resolution or mediation programs (Lovejoy et al., 1995). Clearly, understanding the nature of conflict in roommate relationships, in addition to other important close relationships, is important. In order to best
understand conflict in these relationships, a brief definition of conflict will be presented, followed by theoretical perspectives and temporal features of conflict.

A Definition of Conflict

Shantz (1987) posited that research about conflict had been slow to develop for two primary reasons. First, conflict has tended to be equated with aggression and other terms which are not well differentiated. Second, the individual has been focused upon as the "unit" of interest, rather than the dyad as the unit of interest. Each of these areas will be discussed and examined.

Overt behavioral opposition can be seen as a key distinguishing feature of conflict (Shantz & Hartup, 1992); however, the structure of conflict can be debated (Laursen & Collins, 1994). Some see conflict as requiring an incidence of opposition in which Person A influences Person B, and Person B opposes Person A (A-B). This would be a two-event or unilateral definition. Others see conflict as a state of mutual opposition involving at least three events such that Person A then counterprotests or resists Person B’s opposition (A-B-A). The unilateral definition is seen as more liberal and inclusive than the mutual definition. The unilateral definition encompasses more episodes of conflict, as approximately one in three initial oppositions do not meet the criteria of continued opposition required in the mutual definition (Lauren & Hartup, 1989, as cited in Laursen & Collins, 1994). Therefore, the unilateral view of conflict will be adopted for purposes of the proposed research, and opposition, despite the number of exchanges, will be the central feature of our definition. Conflict can thus be defined as a "dyadic, interpersonal behavioral event involving opposition" (Laursen & Collins, 1994, p. 198).
Laursen and Collins (1994) have outlined several advantages to researchers using a unilateral, oppositional definition of conflict. One advantage is that conflict episodes can be examined independently of negative affect, as negative affect may or not be present. An additional advantage of defining conflict in terms of opposition is that it can be distinguished from related concepts such as competition, aggression, influence, and dominance. Competition involves working against others to achieve a goal that only one or a few can attain (Johnson & Johnson, 1996) and does not necessarily involve conflict. Aggression can be defined as behavior aimed at hurting others, but likewise may not involve conflict. Such is the case of schoolyard bullies, who often encounter little conflict or resistance to their aggression (Perry, Perry, & Kennedy, 1992). Most conflict does not involve aggression but most aggression does involve conflict (Shantz, 1987). The distinction between conflict and aggression is an important one to make, but often has been overlooked by researchers.

Influence, dominance, and coercion also are important areas to distinguish from conflict. Johnson and Johnson (1996) posited that if conflict was confused with related issues of influence, coercion, and dominance, then conflict would be associated with extreme behavior present in only a small fraction of actual disputes among adolescent peers. Influence entails dealing with affecting others in a desired way, and dominance and coercion are examples of one-way influence such as from teacher to student or parent or child. Dominance or coercion entail negative affect, domineering resolutions, and unequal outcomes, and are influenced by relationship power. Because these relationships are typically asymmetrical, power is not distributed equally. The affiliation between parent and child or student and teacher is obligatory and stable, and thus the potential for dissolution of the
relationship is minimal and coercion is likely to occur and be successful (Adams & Laursen, 2001).

In contrast, the relationship between peers is symmetrical; the affiliation between adolescent peers is typically voluntary and power is shared. Thus, the relationship is potentially unstable, with adolescents less able to dictate the terms of the relationship. Therefore coercion is less likely to be a successful tactic during conflict and is less frequently utilized by adolescents in peer relationships (Adams & Laursen, 2001).

Finally, utilizing a definition of conflict based on unilateral opposition between two adolescents places emphasis on principles consistent with social science research traditions. Conflict theory has strong roots in social psychology and social learning theory, both of which traditionally emphasize readily observable and quantifiable events. In contrast, "imagined and intrapsychic conflicts, staples of psychoanalytic and cognitive-developmental research, do not qualify as overt disagreements" and ambiguity in the research regarding adolescent conflict can be eliminated by excluding those types of conflicts (Laursen & Collins, 1994, p. 198).

*Theoretical Perspectives of Conflict*

Although conflict has a powerful role in fostering social development, research regarding interpersonal conflict within adolescence has been hindered due to "theoretical neglect" (Laursen & Koplas, 1995). There are, however, several specific theories that can be examined in relation to adolescent peer conflict and that can contribute to reasonable hypotheses regarding adolescents' conflict resolution skills and social cognition. These include social-perspective taking and social information processing.
Social-perspective taking. As previously discussed, peer relationships and friendships become more intense and important during adolescence, and social demands become increasingly complex. The ability to meet the increasingly complex demands of social interactions during adolescence has been explained through various developmental theories. Selman et al. (1986) presented a structural-developmental approach to understanding social perspective taking and its relation to social competence. According to Selman's theory, the manner in which children and adolescents resolve peer conflicts changes over time as increased skills in social-perspective taking develop. Because of these developmental changes, adolescents' abilities should be examined separately from children's. Selman's approach, which focuses on a four-stage "vertical" level of social understanding in which one becomes increasingly sophisticated in social perspective-taking in interpersonal negotiation strategies (INS) (Johnson & Johnson, 1996; Selman et al., 1986), will be briefly reviewed.

Level 0 strategies are primarily impulsive, physical strategies in which conflicts are resolved through a "fight or flight" perspective. For example, a child might utilize a simplistic "out of sight, out of mind, here and now" solution such as exiting a conflict situation to go play with another toy or using physical force to solve a disagreement (Shantz, 1987, p. 295). Those strategies lack coordination of the perspective of the protagonist and the other person involved in the problem (Selman et al., 1986).

Level 1 strategies, however, involve recognition that the significant other and protagonist may have different perspectives within a particular context. Recognition of the subjective and psychological effects of conflict occur, but are seen as applying to only one party in the conflict (i.e., a unilateral orientation); conflict is not understood as a mutual
disagreement. Resolution strategies include one-way commands and assertions or accommodation to the significant other. Shantz (1987) elaborated that resolution with Level 1 strategies essentially involves one party stopping their action and compensating so that the other party will feel better. For example, prototypic strategies include negating or compensating to undo the conflict: "give him back what you took or take back what you called him," or whoever started the fight should "just say he's sorry" (p. 295).

Level 2 strategies involve a bilateral notion of conflict; a mutual perspective regarding conflict is still not present. Shantz (1987) described assessment protocols from children ages 8-14 that indicated children suggested both parties to the conflict must agree that the conflict is over, but do not appreciate that those agreements must be mutually satisfying. Children at this level of social perspective-taking see conflict as arising outside the relationship, and therefore solutions should make each person happy. Solutions used by children at this stage include taking turns, convincing a friend that one's own viewpoint is the correct one, or suggesting other behaviors that protect one's own interests (Selman et al., 1986). The advancement in understanding the effects of conflict at this stage over previous stages is a distinction between appearance (words) and reality (truth). That is, it is not enough to "take back" hurtful words; one must also be sincere (Shantz, 1987).

According to Selman et al.'s (1986) theory, Level 3 strategies are evidenced during adolescence and beyond. In this case, there is an awareness that certain conflicts may reside within the relationship itself; thus, the only real solutions would be those that are mutually satisfying (Shantz, 1987). Typical strategies at this stage involve dialogue, process analysis, compromise, and development of shared goals. Those strategies involve an understanding of concern for continuity of the relationship over time (Selman et al., 1986).
Selman et al.’s (1986) model of conflict resolution involves three underlying dimensions that change with development: (a) progression from a "here and now" perspective to one focusing on future interaction, (b) evolution from a focus on the conflict as a physical event to people as psychological beings and a focus on the relationship itself, and (c) conceptions of relations with others from unilateral, to bilateral, to mutual interactions (Shantz, 1987). Selman and his associates further proposed that the type of conflict behavior engaged in was correlated with age (i.e., adolescents age 16 and older use higher-level strategies more frequently than younger children). It was also proposed that children used higher-level strategies with those who were familiar to them and with other children, as compared to strategies used with adults or unfamiliar children. Finally, Selman and colleagues proposed that use of higher-level strategies was associated with a greater degree of adaptive functioning and social competence and higher social status with peers.

Selman's work provides a theoretical perspective with which to view social perspective-taking and its subsequent relationship to peer conflict. According to the model, conflict resolution strategies change with development; thus, despite the dearth of literature about adolescent peer conflict, the model indicates that researchers should conduct investigations of conflict issues specifically for adolescents rather than extrapolating from the children's conflict literature. Selman’s model also lends support for an examination of conflict behaviors across relationship contexts. Both of these are areas of interest for this study.

Selman’s social perspective-taking theory provides support for a developmental model of conflict resolution skills and for the need to study adolescent conflict relationships separately from children's. The second model to be presented herein, Crick and Dodge's
(1994) social information processing theory, provides support for studying variables specific to adolescent's social cognition, such as social goals and strategies.

**Social information processing.** According to the social information processing model (Crick & Dodge, 1994; Dodge, 1986), one processes external stimuli involved in social situations through a series of six steps that eventually lead to a behavioral response. Those steps include (a) encoding external cues, (b) interpretation of cues, (c) clarification of goals, (d) accessing potential responses, (e) deciding which response to employ, and (f) carrying out the chosen solution (i.e., "behavioral enactment"). Each of these steps will be briefly discussed. It should be noted that these steps are not strictly linear. Rather, Crick and Dodge believed that each step might influence the others through a series of feedback loops.

During the first two steps, children use social knowledge acquired through previous experience to initially attend to and interpret social cues. This previous knowledge influences attributions made by the child regarding the social interaction. For instance, a child who has been frequently victimized by peers may interpret a peer's ambiguous behavior (such as being bumped into) as being intentionally hostile, rather than accidental. After interpreting the situation, the child selects a goal or desired outcome for the situation. Crick and Dodge stated that children bring goal orientations or tendencies to every social situation, but they might also revise those goals and construct new goals. This step of the social information processing model is a particularly important aspect of this study, with an emphasis on understanding social goals in adolescents and the impact of goal orientation on behavioral strategies in conflict situations.

In the fourth step of processing, children search their long-term memory for possible behavioral strategies for that situation, or, if the situation is unfamiliar, construct new
behaviors if necessary. In the fifth step, the child evaluates the previously accessed responses and selects the most positively evaluated one. Several factors affect which response may be selected. Children will be more likely to enact responses if the child feels confident he or she can enact that response (self-efficacy), that the response will elicit the desired outcome (outcome expectation), and that the response is accessible based on that child's own moral code or values (response evaluation). In the final step, the child behaviorally enacts the chosen response. To date, only one small pilot study has examined relations between the social information components of goals and strategies of adolescents in peer conflict situations (Kaluk, Asher, & Parkhurst, 2001). Given the viability of social information processing theory to understanding social behavior and interactions with peers for children, it follows that an area ripe for future research is the social information processing of adolescents.

**Temporal Features of Conflict**

Conflict can be seen as a "time-distributed social episode" with several distinct features that form a temporal, or sequential, framework (Shantz, 1987, p. 285). Features include incidence and intensity (frequency and affective "heat" of a conflict), initiation (behaviors that start conflict), resolution (behaviors that conclude conflict), and outcome (the aftermath of a conflict). Much like a play or a novel, a conflict follows a plot or organized sequence, with a protagonist and antagonist (conflict participants), theme (conflict issue), complication (opposition), rising action, climax, crisis (conflict resolution), and denouement (outcome) (Laursen & Collins, 1994). According to Shantz (1987), this sequence provides a useful framework for understanding peer conflict, as it "provides (a) a means of answering some fundamental questions about conflicts (e.g., how they begin, what happens during the
episodes, and how they end); (b) a more dynamic, social-process understanding of interpersonal behavior than does a topical organization; and (c) importantly, a good match to the types of questions often asked by researchers” (p. 286). The final section of this review presents representative research of adolescent peer conflict within the framework of Shantz's temporal components of conflict. In reviewing the strategies component (including goals) of peer conflict, representative studies with children will be reviewed within the social information processing theory, as few such studies have been conducted to date with adolescents. These studies with children can serve as a basis for generating relevant hypotheses and directions for future research with adolescents.

**Incidence and intensity.** The incidence and intensity of adolescent conflicts refers to the frequency and affective "heat" present (Laursen & Collins, 1994). Reports of the frequency of conflict in adolescence have been difficult to measure, due to the variation in the definition of conflict, what relationship dyads are being reported, and who is reporting. In one of the few studies to examine adolescent conflict, Laursen and Koplas (1995) conducted a telephone survey of 212 10th and 11th graders randomly selected from their suburban high school. Adolescents were asked about conflicts that occurred the prior day, with conflict defined as "a difference in opinion." Most conflicts were with mothers and involved issues of autonomy, followed by conflicts with friends and romantic partners. Level of affect and resolution strategy may be better predictors of effects of conflict, such as friendship stability and individual social competence (Perry, Perry, & Kennedy, 1992). Negative affect has not been found to be characteristic of conflicts with friends and romantic partners, although it has with peers who are not friends (Laursen & Collins, 1994).
Initiation. Even less is known about conditions under which adolescents initiate conflicts. Conflict between female adolescents often begins when one party confronts another about a previous violation of trust or intimacy heard from second-hand sources. Ancillary disputes may arise over the accuracy of the second-hand information (Collins & Laursen, 1992). Adolescent males are more likely than females to immediately confront behavior that deviates from expectations, especially those that challenge "established patterns of dominance" (e.g., differing expectations about male-female romantic relationships) (Collins & Laursen, 1992). Johnson and Johnson (1996) have stated "helpful analysis of the triggering events that spark conflict and the barriers that prevent it from occurring have yet to be conducted" (p. 469) and research focused on those triggering events would be a valuable contribution.

Issues. Given its ubiquitous nature, surprising little documentation of the nature of conflicts in adolescence has taken place (Johnson, Johnson, Dudley, Ward, & Manguson, 1995). Data that have been collected suggest common types of conflict are verbal harassments (e.g., name calling, insults), verbal arguments, rumors and gossip, and physical fights. Documented physical violence rarely involves serious altercations or violations of the law, but rather, "scuffles, threats, and arguments" (Opotow, 1991, p. 418). In contrast to younger children, conflict over objects rarely occurs between adolescents (Hartup, 1992). Rather, conflict between adolescent friends is likely to involve interpersonal standards of friendship, such as trust and reliability. Additional conflict issues include differences in ideas and opinions, teasing and criticism, and annoying behaviors (Canary, Cupach, & Messman, 1995).
As previously noted, a problem with the data collected to date is that few researchers have distinguished the nature of conflicts with close friends and romantic partners versus other peers such as classmates or roommates (who may or may not be a friend). Conflicts with close friends and romantic partners tend to reflect long-standing, ongoing interpersonal concerns, "comprising a tangled skein of interchanges carried forward across time and settings" (Laursen, 1993, p. 51). Conflicts between roommates are typically issues of specifics, such as how often to clean or how loud the radio should be. Because the nature of the relationships and conflict issues are different between various types of close peer relationships, methods of conflict resolution strategies are also likely to be different, but few researchers have examined these variables.

__Strategies to resolve conflict__. Strategies used to resolve a conflict have been found to be the most salient predictor of resulting outcomes (Johnson & Johnson, 1996). However, very little documentation of the range of strategies used to resolve adolescent conflicts exists (Johnson et al., 1995), particularly for close peer relationships. Several descriptive studies will be reviewed. The most comprehensive study about conflict resolution strategies took place over 25 years ago by DeCecco and Richards (1974). Over 8,000 students and 500 faculty members were interviewed in more than 60 middle and high schools in New York, Philadelphia, and San Francisco. Greater than 90% of students' conflicts were reported to be either unresolved or resolved in destructive ways such as avoiding the conflict or overpowering the opposition. School authorities imposed decisions in 55% of the conflicts; only 17% of conflicts were resolved through the use of negotiation. Other research from naturalistic observations, experimental analogs, and self-reports has concurred that
adolescents' conflicts tend to be resolved with power assertion and disengagement, instead of negotiation (Collins & Laursen, 1992; Johnson & Johnson, 1996).

Studies by Johnson and Johnson (1996), as part of their research about the "Teaching Students to be Peacemakers" conflict resolution program, showed that inner-city students who were untrained in any type of peer mediation or conflict resolution skills invariably utilized a competitive approach that was often physical. Students in suburban settings likewise most frequently utilized a competitive approach, although often of a verbal nature. Avoidance was also used to a lesser extent. Collaborative, problem-solving strategies were almost never used by any of the students in Johnson and Johnson’s (1996) studies. Similar results were found in a naturalistic study of inner-city seventh graders (Opotow, 1991).

Laursen conducted a meta-analysis of 12 studies of adolescent conflict management styles and found, similar to Johnson and Johnson (1996), that adolescents rarely used problem-solving strategies. Instead, conflict resolution strategies used most often were avoidance or competition. An unpublished dissertation (Algert, 1998) was designed to compare conflict resolution strategies of adolescents in regular education, adolescents classified as emotionally disturbed in self-contained classrooms in public schools, and incarcerated adolescents. No differences were found between these youths in their conflict resolution strategies. The majority of all students utilized either a competitive or avoidant strategy to manage conflict.

Very few researchers have examined how adolescents negotiate conflict within their romantic relationships, which is surprising given the importance of these relationships in adolescence. Feldman and Gowan (1998) investigated this issue with high school students ages 14-19 who were experienced in romantic relationships. A conflict tactic scale was
administered, and a principal components analysis revealed six factors of strategies. In descending frequency, these strategies include Compromise, Distraction, Avoidance, Overt Anger, Seeking Social Support, and Violence. Older teens were found to use Compromise strategies significantly more often than younger teens; no other factors were found to vary by age. Gender and ethnic differences were found, however.

Females were found to use Compromise and Overt Anger (i.e., sarcasm, inducing guilt) more and Distraction less than did males. Contrary to hypotheses based on traditional gender roles, no gender differences were found for Violence, Avoidance, and Social Support strategies. Ethnic differences were found to be the most pervasive among the six conflict tactics. Results indicated African-American students were more likely than all other ethnicities to use Violence in romantic relationships and less likely to use Compromise than were European-Americans. Asian-Americans were more likely than European-Americans to use Distraction and Avoidance strategies.

As part of their research on attachment orientation relationship functioning in late adolescence, Creasy et al. (1999) examined how females managed affect and differences in conflict with their best friends and romantic partners. The 140 female respondents used more constructive conflict strategies with their romantic partners. However, they also indicated these relationships were more volatile than those with their best friends, as more escalation, negativity, and withdrawal occurred in romantic relationships. Overall, their findings suggested insecure attachment orientations in females were associated with deficits in conflict management skills with both romantic partners and best friends. The researchers suggested that those with ambivalent and avoidant attachment styles may suffer from fundamental social information processing deficits during conflicts with attachment figures,
particularly romantic partners. Significant association was found between attachment insecurity and feedback skills such as listening to a partner or validating their communication. This suggests those with insecure and avoidant attachment styles may have a breakdown in the social information processing skills during conflicts or problem-solving efforts (Creasy et al., 1999).

A final study that examined social cognition during late adolescent conflicts was conducted by Weitzman (2001). Weitzman examined conflict resolution strategies in relation to various relationship types (i.e., work-based, personal, impersonal) with female college students. Selman’s (1986) four-level model of interpersonal negotiation strategies was used to code results. Most participants described a work-related conflict that utilized a unilateral, Level 1 response (e.g., obeying or commanding). Collaborative, Level 3 strategies were only found to be utilized within personal relationships. Concern was expressed by Weitzman that most adolescents and young adults, especially females, graduate from high school and college with little practice at constructively resolving interpersonal conflicts.

The data from descriptive research studies (Collins & Laursen 1992; Johnson & Johnson, 1996; Opotow, 1991) support Weitzman’s (2001) concern that adolescents appear to have a very limited repertoire of possible responses to conflict, primarily engaging in either competition or avoidance strategies. Other strategies such as compromise, collaborative problem-solving, or accommodation rarely appear to be within the realm of responses to deal with their conflicts. Results clearly indicate these students need to be taught that other methods of conflict resolution exist and how to enact them. Results also point to a greater need to understand the motivation (i.e., goals) behind the strategies enacted.
Several studies utilizing Crick and Dodge's (1994) social information processing theory have examined children's behavioral strategies in response to peer conflict and related those strategies to the goals that had motivated such behavior. Five studies reviewed herein pertain to conflict with children and will be briefly reviewed (in chronological order) to provide a basis for the current study. The final study reviewed, an undergraduate honors thesis (Kaluk et al., 2001), was an exploratory pilot study with late adolescents in college and utilized a research questionnaire that was the basis for the questionnaire used in the current study.

Each of the six studies incorporated hypothetical vignettes to study responses to peer conflict. Measures that require participants to respond to hypothetical social situations have been widely used to study children's and adolescents’ responses to peer conflict (Dodge, 1980; Lochman, Wayland, & White, 1993; Slaby & Guerra, 1992; Wyatt & Haskett, 2001). This methodology has several features that make it attractive to researchers. It allows the researcher to specify and control the conditions under which the conflict situation occurs, the nature of the conflict protagonist, and the complexity of the task (Hopmeyer & Asher, 1997). Furthermore, research studies support external validity of hypothetical situations methodology, as children's responses to hypothetical situations are consistently found to be significantly related to their actual behavior in peer interactions and to peer acceptance, as measured by teacher and peer reports (e.g., Chung & Asher, 1996; Dodge & Frame, 1982; Eardly & Asher, 1996).

Goals and strategies in peer conflict research studies. In a seminal study of the relationship between social goals and strategies, Renshaw and Asher (1983) examined differences in social goals constructed by “popular” and “unpopular” children in various
social situations and whether changes occurred as a function of age. Participants were 121 students from grades three through six. Ages ranged from approximately 8 to 12 years, with an average age of 10 years, 3 months. The participants were shown four hypothetical vignettes representing various social situations, including one conflict situation. To assess strategies, children were read the hypothetical vignettes and then asked what they would say or do in that situation. They were then were questioned for their underlying goal by asking, "Why would you do (or say) those things?" Earlier pilot testing by the researchers had indicated children were unable to identify their goals for a situation prior to identifying their intended strategies. Instead, when questioned about their goals, children typically described strategies they would employ.

After being asked, "Why would you do (or say) those things?," the child was provided with four goal statements to rank in terms of which goals he or she would be most likely to pursue. Goals to rank order were either friendly-assertive (e.g., "Try to join in the games"), friendly-submissive (e.g., "Try and do what the other kids say"), unfriendly-assertive (e.g., "Try to disrupt the kid's game"), or unfriendly-submissive (e.g., "Try to keep to yourself") (Renshaw & Asher, 1983, p. 358).

Content analysis was used to categorize children's production responses. Positive-outgoing goals focused on wanting to be sociable, sympathetic, and outgoing (e.g., "be friends"). Positive-accommodating goals focused on wanting to be friends, but in a cautious and accommodating manner. Rule-oriented goals focused on rights and rules governing social behavior. Avoidance goals focused on avoiding unpleasant social experiences, and hostile goals focused on wanting to repay perceived slights and severing social relationships (Renshaw & Asher, 1983).
A similar pattern was found when strategies were categorized. Positive-outgoing strategies focused on direct and friendly ways to address the situation, whereas positive-accommodating strategies focused on being indirect but pleasant and polite (e.g., asking how a game is played). Rule-oriented strategies were persistent and forthright and often involved reference to social norms, but without being aversive. Avoidance strategies entailed nonsocial reactions or descriptions of unpleasant personal emotions (e.g., going to play elsewhere by oneself). Hostile strategies included threatening and verbally rebuking the other children in the situation (Renshaw & Asher, 1983).

Results were analyzed to determine whether differences existed in goals and strategies by age and sociometric status, as measured by peer nomination. Significant age differences were found across all situations, but most particularly in the conflict situation. Age differences were found in both goals and strategies. Specifically, older children saw their goal as making friends with a new child in the conflict situation, whereas younger children were more concerned with defending their rights. These differing goals were reflected in the strategies children proposed. The researchers (Renshaw & Asher, 1983) suggested that the older children perceived the situation from the new child's perspective (e.g., needing help to settle in and make new friends), whereas younger children were cognitively unable to take the other person's perspective. Results involving differences in goals and strategies based on sociometric status were more subtle. The only significant finding was that lower-status children were less positive-outgoing in both their goals and strategies, and they suggested avoidance strategies almost exclusively.

Renshaw and Asher (1983) concluded that investigating children's social goals distinctly from their strategies would help conceptualize the effects of social skills
intervention with children, especially those who lacked friends. Unpopular children may be coached to improve their social skills not only by focusing on the strategies they utilize, but also the goals they have for social interactions. Renshaw and Asher’s (1983) study has significant value for the current research. It provides support for social information processing theories relating social goals to strategies and has implications for developing interventions to improve peer relationships. It also provides support for Selman's social perspective-taking theory, as it suggests older children are better able, when compared to younger children, to take another person's perspective in a conflict situation.

Additional support for the viability of examining social information processing variables of goals and strategies in relation to Selman's developmental model is provided by Carlson (1987). She investigated whether children with a diagnosed learning disability (LD) differed in goals and strategies when compared to a matched sample of non-LD children and whether possible differences in LD and non-LD children's goals and strategies were developmentally related, based on Selman’s levels of interpersonal negotiation strategies.

Participants were 48 Caucasian males in grades two through five. Social goals and strategies were assessed using the same measure and procedure described in Renshaw and Asher's (1983) study. Data were also coded to reflect Selman's (1986) levels of interpersonal negotiation strategies. Selman's Level 0 strategies (those that are undifferentiated, egocentric) were determined to be those hostile or egocentric-demanding goals and strategies produced by the children in Carlson's (1987) study. Level 1 strategies (differentiated-subjective) were rule-oriented, avoidance, or accommodating goals and strategies. Level 2 strategies (self-reflective, reciprocal) were positive-outgoing-assertive or compromise goals and strategies. No goals or strategies were considered to be of Level 3. This was not an unexpected finding;
it was foreseen that children of this age would not have the developmental maturity to engage in Level 3 exchanges.

Chi-square analysis did not indicate significant differences in the goals proposed by LD and non-LD children. However, when social goals for the groups were compared using Selman's (1986) INS levels, significant differences were found for the vignette involving conflict. Children with LD provided fewer Level 2 responses than did non-LD children (4% versus 25%). When social strategies for the conflict vignette were examined, significant differences were found between LD and non-LD children. Specifically, LD children were more likely to suggest unilateral approaches in which only one person could “win” within that conflict (Carlson, 1987). However, a weakness of Carlson’s (1987) study is that she did not relate the use of goals and strategies to any aspect of actual peer acceptance or friendship. In the next study reviewed, Chung and Asher expanded the database to include that information.

Chung and Asher (1996) explored a number of issues regarding social goals and strategies within a social information processing perspective. A major focus of the study was to investigate the relation between children’s social goals in peer conflict situations and the strategies children suggested in response to that conflict. An additional research purpose was to investigate possible gender differences in children’s goals and strategies. Previous research (Shantz & Shantz, 1985) had suggested that boys and girls differed in their goals in social conflicts with boys being more concerned with pursuing their own agendas and girls being more concerned with maintaining social relationships. As previously mentioned, the relationship between children’s peer conflict strategies and peer acceptance was investigated. Previous research (Asher & Renshaw, 1981, as cited in Chung and Asher, 1996; Coie,
Dodge, & Kupersmidt, 1990) suggested children who were not well-accepted by peers were less prosocial and more likely to seek adult assistance in conflict situations than were accepted children. However, children’s behavior in response to peer conflict and its subsequent relationship to peer acceptance had not been yet been investigated at that time. A final question of interest was whether the association between peer conflict management strategies and peer acceptance would be different for boys and girls, as social norms for response to conflict differ between genders. For example, Chung and Asher (1996) hypothesized that girls who responded to conflict aggressively or in a hostile manner would be more disliked than boys who responded in the same manner, as aggressive behavior is seen as more consistent with masculinity. In contrast, seeking help from adults may be seen as more acceptable for females than males, as males are expected by society to be more independent than females.

To address their research questions, Chung and Asher (1996) created the Children's Conflict Resolution Measure (CCRM). The CCRM consisted of 12 conflict scenarios (and 5 "filler" items) that described situations involving overt incompatibility between two children's needs or interests. The CCRM was group administered in the classroom to 142 children in grades four, five, and six. Children were asked to imagine they were in the scenario with a same-sex classmate. After reading each vignette, children were asked what they would say or do in that situation and were given five options to select from, each representing a different strategy. Children were then asked about their goals (e.g., "Why are you doing or saying that?") by selecting one of four goal options, each also representing a different type of goal. Questions about strategies were asked before questions about goals, following Renshaw and Asher's (1983) suggestion that children were better able to reflect
upon goals after they had described the strategy they would utilize (Chung & Asher, 1996, p. 132). The goals and strategies presented were generated on the basis of responses to open-ended questions presented in a pilot study that involved the same vignettes.

There were five strategies from which children could choose. *Prosocial* strategies involved accommodating the needs of both parties in the scenario. *Hostile/coercive* strategies entailed directly counteracting the other party's action in an unfamiliar way (e.g., grabbing a puzzle piece you wanted). *Adult-seeking* strategies utilized seeking help from an adult. Finally, *assertive* strategies involved directly asking for what one wanted, and *passive* strategies involved giving in or forfeiting one's own interests. There were four response options for goals. *Relationship* goals involved concern with maintaining a good relationship with the other party. *Control* goals involved concern with maintaining control over one's activities, possessions, and personal space. *Self-interest* goals concerned pursuing one's own needs, accomplishing personal tasks, or protecting one's interests. *Avoidance* goals focused on avoiding trouble. Goals and strategies were presented in random order for each vignette.

Chung and Asher's (1996) study concerned whether children's goals in peer conflict situations were related to strategies endorsed in response to the conflict situations. This was investigated in two ways. First, linkages were examined by calculating correlations between goals and strategies for the entire sample, providing insight about the entire distribution. Then, data were examined to determine whether children who had different goal orientations selected different types of strategies. According to the researchers, this “extreme group” analysis provided a stronger test of the linkages between conflict goals and strategies, as it was possible that linkages were salient only for children with clearly distinct goal orientations.
Correlational analysis using the full sample revealed a number of significant and meaningful relations between goals and strategies. Children who endorsed more relationship goals selected more prosocial and passive strategies and less hostile/coercive strategies. Those children who selected more control goals selected more hostile/coercive strategies and fewer prosocial, passive, and adult-seeking strategies. Finally, children who endorsed more avoidance goals selected more prosocial, passive, and adult-seeking strategies (Chung & Asher, 1996).

Three groups of children with distinct goal orientations were identified for the extreme-group analysis. Of the 142 children in the study, 25 percent were classified into one of three orientation groups. Eight children (five boys, three girls) were identified as relationship oriented. Those children selected significantly more prosocial strategies, such as accommodating the needs of both parties or giving in, than did children who were identified as control-oriented. These strategies presumably maintain or improve relationships. Twenty children (18 boys, 2 girls) were identified as control-oriented in their goal orientation and were found to select significantly more hostile/coercive strategies than other types of strategies (i.e., prosocial, passive, and adult-seeking). Eight children (three boys, five girls) were identified as avoidance-oriented. Those children selected hostile/coercive strategies significantly less often than they selected passive or prosocial strategies. Unlike relationship-oriented children, however, this group of children selected assistance from adults, perhaps as a way to avoid trouble or harm from their peers during conflicts.

Chung and Asher (1996) also investigated possible gender differences in children's goals and strategies. Previous research (Shantz & Shantz, 1985) had suggested that boys and girls differed in their goals in social conflicts, with boys being more concerned with pursuing
their own agendas and girls being more concerned with maintaining social relationships. Chung and Asher (1996) likewise found differences between males and females in the goals they had in peer conflict situations. Males were found to select more control goals and hostile/coercive strategies and significantly fewer avoidance goals and passive strategies compared to goals selected by females. In addition to having greater avoidance goals than males, females were found to select more prosocial and passive strategies than males. Contrary to previous research (Sheldon, 1990) in which females were more relationship oriented than were males, boys and girls in Chung and Asher’s sample did not differ in the extent to which they endorsed relationship goals.

For both males and females, the endorsement of prosocial strategies was positively related to peer acceptance (as measured by peer ratings). However, the relation between peer acceptance and other types of strategies was found to vary according to gender. For males, endorsement of hostile/coercive strategies had no affect on their acceptance by peers. For females, however, endorsement of hostile/coercive strategies was negatively related to peer acceptance. Seeking adult help was not a common strategy for either males or females in this sample. For those children who did select this strategy, however, it appeared to be more costly for males than females in terms of their acceptance by peers.

Chung and Asher's (1996) study provided strong empirical support for the hypothesized linkage between goals and strategies, and findings had important implications for social skill interventions. Because of the strong relationship between children's social goals and strategies, successful intervention might require attention to both goals and strategies in helping children with peer relationship problems. This study also provided a
basis for pursuing additional areas of study with other populations (e.g., adolescents) and for examining gender differences in goals and strategies.

Rose and Asher (1999) examined the relation between social goals and strategies in the context of friendship relationships, and subsequent friendship adjustment, among 696 fourth- and fifth-grade students. Their measure was comprised of 30 hypothetical vignettes involving conflict in friendship situations. Although conflicts can occur in a variety of contexts within a friendship, five specific contexts were selected for the questionnaire. Those included maintaining reciprocity, helping a friend who is in need, being reliable or dependable, managing disagreements over resources, and dealing with issues of exclusivity. Six hypothetical vignettes were presented for each of the five context areas. The vignettes were designed to be relatively benign examples of conflict-of-interest situations that could arise within close friendships. All 30 vignettes pertained to a conflict with a close friend.

Following each vignette, children were asked "What would your goal be?" They were then presented with six response options and asked to indicate, on a five-point Likert scale, how much they agreed that that goal would be their goal. To assess behavioral strategies, children were then asked "What would you say or do?" and were presented with six response options to rate on a five-point Likert scale to indicate how likely they would be to engage in that behavior.

Goal and strategy options were based on previous research (Chung & Asher, 1996; Eardley & Asher, 1996). Goal options included maintaining relationships, maintaining morality (e.g., "try to be fair"), reducing tension, meeting one's own needs ("instrumental goal"), maintaining control from being "pushed around," or getting revenge. Strategies included accommodation, compromise, self-interest, verbal aggression, leaving, and threat to
terminate the friendship. Because very strong correlations were found among the goal and strategy ratings, hierarchical cluster analysis was conducted to determine which goals and strategies were most similar, and thus, clustered together. Three goal clusters were found. The *Relationship Maintenance* cluster included the maintaining relationship, maintaining morality, and reducing tension goals. Those goals contained the common element of serving to maintain the relationship rather than prevail in the conflict. The *Instrumental-Control* cluster included the instrumental and control goals, which have in common maintaining one's own needs or dominance. The *Revenge* cluster included only the revenge goal. Three clusters of strategies were also found using hierarchical cluster analysis. The *Accommodation-Compromise* cluster included the accommodation and compromise strategies, and the *Hostile* cluster contained the verbal aggression, leaving, and threatening termination of friendship strategies. The *Self-Interest Assertion* cluster included only the self-interest assertion strategy.

Consistent with previous research, strong correlations in expected directions were found between goals and strategies (e.g., scores on the *Relationship Maintenance* goals cluster correlated significantly and positively with scores on the *Accommodation-Compromise* strategy cluster, but not with *Self-Interest* or *Hostile* clusters). Significant gender differences were also found. Females more strongly endorsed prosocial goals and strategies than did males, and they endorsed antisocial goals and strategies less strongly than did males. In terms of the relation of goals and strategies to quality of friendships, results showed that endorsing revenge goals or strategies was associated with lacking friends or having poor-quality friendships, as measured by the Friendship Quality Questionnaire (Rose & Asher, 1999).
The measure developed by Rose and Asher (1999) is of particular relevance to the current study as their measure, with its use of the Likert rating scale, provided a clear, valid method with which to assess and cluster various goals and strategies. Goal and strategy options used in Rose and Asher's (1999) study are based on previous research (Chung & Asher, 1995, 1996; Erdley & Asher, 1996; Rabiner & Gordon, 1992) and a small pilot study in which responses from open-ended questions with a group of elementary school students were analyzed. Asher reported that use of rating scales to assess goals and strategies provided a richer source of information than did open-ended responses sorted by content analysis (personal communication, March 12, 2002).

Providing the goals and strategies to be rated has other advantages as well (Eardly & Asher, 1996). First, providing the response options eliminates difficulties (e.g., poor verbal skills, inability to spontaneously generate responses) associated with asking participants to verbalize their goals and strategies. Second, use of the Likert rating scale provides more detailed (i.e., quantitative) information about the extent to which a goal or strategy is applicable. Third, the reliability of each score may be increased as responses are evaluated across several vignette scenarios. Importantly, the measure created by Rose and Asher (1999) for use with children was adapted to assess goals and strategies with late adolescents for a subsequent study by Kaluk et al. (2001) and the present study.

Delveaux and Daniels (2000) investigated the relation between social goals and strategies for peer conflict situations among 273 Canadian students in grades four through six. The researchers noted that recent research regarding aggressive social strategies had primarily focused on physical aggression, such as physical fighting, which had been found most commonly in boys. However, Delveaux and Daniels asserted that girls might engage in
more relational or social forms of aggression, which involves damage to relationships through manipulation or exclusion. Relational aggression as a behavioral strategy had previously not been examined in relation to social goals and was therefore a primary focus of Delveaux and Daniels.

Chung and Asher's (1996) Children's Conflict Resolution Measure was adapted for the study. Eight conflict vignettes were presented, and following each vignette children used a five-point scale to indicate the degree to which they endorsed six strategies and seven goals. Goals and strategies were based on those in Chung and Asher's (1996) study and those created by the authors to pertain to relational aggression. The goals presented were pursuing self-interest, maintaining personal control, revenge, avoiding trouble, maintaining equality, maintaining a relationship with the peer in the scenario, and maintaining relationships among the entire peer group. Strategies presented were extreme physical aggression, mild physical aggression, compromise, polite request, threat to terminate the relationship with the peer in the scenario, and threat to exclude the peer from his peer group as a whole (i.e., relational aggression).

Results confirmed previous research (Chung & Asher, 1996; Erdley & Asher, 1996) in that the use of prosocial strategies was positively associated with prosocial goals and overall aggressive strategies were not correlated with prosocial goals. In addition to replicating prior research, this study contributed to the literature by relating different types of aggressive strategies with social goals. Specifically, both physical and relational aggressions were positively correlated with several of the same goals, including self-interest, control, and revenge goals. Both types of aggression were negatively correlated with the desire to maintain equality and relationships with the peer group.
Relationally aggressive strategies were highly correlated with a desire to avoid trouble and maintain relationships with the peer group. The authors suggested that perhaps children believed that relationally aggressive strategies would meet their self-interest, control, and revenge goals, yet keep them out of trouble with teachers and allow them to maintain positive relationships with the rest of their peer group. Indeed, previous research (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995) indicated that adults do not detect relational aggression as well as more overt types of physical aggression. In addition, if an adult observes relational aggression, it is perceived to be a less severe type of aggression and less likely to be punished (Delveaux & Daniels, 2000). Thus, the child who suggests relationally aggressive strategies may not be interested in maintaining a relationship with the focal peer in the conflict, but is interested in maintaining a relationship with the larger peer group (Delveaux & Daniels, 2000).

Results regarding gender differences supported previous research. Females in Delveaux and Daniel's (2000) sample were more likely than males to endorse prosocial goals, equity goals, and relationship goals; in contrast, males endorsed higher use of physically aggressive strategies as well as self-interest and revenge goals than did females. Contrary to expectations, no differences were found between males and females in relational aggression. The authors suggested relationally aggressive females might have been hesitant to report this behavior since aggression is generally considered socially unacceptable for females.

As with the previous studies reviewed, Delveaux and Daniels' (2000) study provided support for the linkage between social goals and strategies in children's conflict. It also supported the relevance of examining gender differences. Across all five studies reviewed, a
pattern is evident in which, for children, goals are clearly linked with strategies used in peer conflict situations. Gender differences also appear to be common, with females more likely than males to pursue prosocial and relationship goals and less likely to pursue hostile or revenge goals. However, little published research to date has examined whether these trends continue into adolescence. Given the association demonstrated in these studies between social goals and strategies and peer acceptance and friendship, continued research expanding into the adolescent years is clearly needed.

Kaluk et al. (2001) conducted a pilot study for an undergraduate research thesis with 60 university students and adapted Rose and Asher’s (1999) conflict measure for use with late adolescents. The study was conducted in order to examine the relation between goals, strategies, and beliefs endorsed by late adolescents in relatively benign conflicts with close peers, including best friends, roommates, and romantic partners. These three relationship types were represented within 15 hypothetical vignettes. Five of the hypothetical situations pertained to each of the three relationship types. Five different types of conflict contexts included maintaining reciprocity, helping a peer in need, reliability, exclusivity, and managing disagreements over resources. After reading each hypothetical situation, the participant was asked to respond on a 7-point Likert scale to indicate how much he or she would endorse specific goals, strategies, and beliefs for each situation. Six different goals and eight different strategies were evaluated. Goals included maintaining the relationship, being fair, seeking revenge, reducing tension, maintaining personal control, and pursuing self-interest. The eight strategies were accommodation, compromise, verbal aggression, self-interest assertion, withdrawal from the situation, emotional manipulation, threat of termination of the relationship, and termination of the relationship.
The four beliefs assessed in Kaluk et al.’s (2001) measure were the solvability of the conflict, the consequences of the conflict, the participant’s perception of worthiness to the other person in the conflict, and the morality of the transgression. Presentation of the order of the vignettes in the measure was created by a random number order table with the stipulation that no two situations of the same context type or relationship type could appear one after the other. However, the goals, strategies, and belief statements to be rated were listed in the same order for each hypothetical vignette.

A score was obtained for each participant by averaging the ratings for goals, strategies, and beliefs across situations with each of the three different relationship types. Thus, each participant had three different scores for each goal, strategy, and belief for each relationship type. Coefficient alphas were not obtained for the goals, strategies, and beliefs, and analyses of variance were not conducted in order to evaluate any differences in responses. Limited correlational analyses between goals, strategies, and beliefs by relationship type were examined.

The threatening to terminate the relationship and terminating the relationship strategies were rarely endorsed by the adolescents in Kaluk et al.’s (2001) study. Kaluk et al. suggested that although those two strategies were endorsed by younger children in Rose and Asher’s (1999) study, older adolescents may have a greater level of maturity towards their relationships. Therefore, the relatively benign conflict situations were not seen by the adolescents as serious enough to warrant ending a relationship.

Factor analysis was utilized to determine similarities among strategies. Coldness and Verbal Aggression strategies were highly related and thus combined in further analyses as a Hostile composite score. Accommodation and Self-interest strategies were found to be highly
correlated and combined in a composite score for Self-Interest. Compromise and Withdrawal strategies were not significantly related with other strategies and were thus independent strategies. Maintaining the Relationship and Maintaining Morality goals were linked and were therefore combined in further analyses as a Prosocial goal. The Revenge goal did not correlate with any other goals and was thus utilized independently in further analyses. Reducing Tension, Maintaining Personal Control, and Pursuing Self-interest goals were highly correlated and were therefore combined into a goal cluster called Self-Protection.

Overall results were similar to those of Rose and Asher (1999), from whom the measure was adapted. Moderate correlations were found between the Revenge goal and Hostile strategy for Best Friend and Roommate relationships. However, no significant correlation was found between the Revenge goal and Hostile strategy in Romantic Partner relationships. The researchers stressed further research was needed to better investigate differences between relationship types for goals and strategies. Results of Kaluk et al.’s (2001) study also indicated that the beliefs a participant holds are useful to predict goals and strategies of late adolescents. Holding maladaptive beliefs about relationships was linked to Revenge goals and Hostile strategies for all relationship types.

Although Kaluk et al.’s (2001) pilot study was limited in statistical analyses and utilized a small sample size, thus minimizing the generalizability of its results, the study does serve as an impetus for future research in this area. The researchers advocated for future study to investigate the validity of the survey instrument with adolescents, as well as the relation between goals and strategies in young adult peer conflicts in varying relationships. Kaluk et al.’s thesis is an important foundation for the present study to advance the understanding of social-cognitive goals and strategies in late adolescent peer conflict, as the
present study examined the validity of the conflict measure with adolescents and the relation between goals and strategies for that sample.

**Outcomes.** The final feature in the sequential conflict framework is the outcome of a conflict, which is largely determined by the strategies used to resolve that conflict. Although outcomes are not assessed as part of the current study but are strongly related to goals and strategies, the literature regarding the outcomes of adolescent peer conflict will be briefly reviewed in order to gain a complete perspective of the conflict sequence as outlined by Shantz (1987). Simply put, strategies used to resolve a conflict shape the outcome of the conflict (Laursen & Collins, 1994). Deutsch (1973) was among the first of the theorists to suggest that conflict can have two potential outcomes: destructive or constructive. Conflicts with destructive outcomes escalate beyond the initial issue, and participants in the conflict may use negative tactics and strategies, such as threats and coercion. Conflicts with constructive outcomes remain focused on the issue, and those conflicts might even foster cognitive growth, positive adaptation, and strengthen a relationship. Whether a conflict becomes constructive or destructive depends on (a) whether the conflict takes place in a competitive or cooperative environment, and (b) whether the strategies used are congruent or incongruent with the context of the conflict. Deutsch predicted, and indeed found, that negotiation and problem-solving strategies led to constructive outcomes, and forcing or competitive tactics led to destructive outcomes (Jenson-Campbell, Graziano, & Hair, 1996).

Limited research has been conducted specifically to investigate outcomes of adolescent conflict. Research that has been conducted indicates that the effect of conflict varies depending on the type of interpersonal relationship in which it takes place (Laursen & Collins, 1994). For instance, among close peers and romantic partners, social interaction was
likely to continue after conflicts, and more positive feelings were reported after the conflict. In contrast, following conflicts with family members or others such as classmates or teachers, social interaction was likely to be discontinued and more negative affect was reported. Although single episodes of conflict rarely have a significant effect on close peer relationships, on-going conflict has a cumulative effect in which the relationship bond weakens (Collins and Laursen, 1992). Opotow (1991) indicated that because two-thirds of the inner-city seventh graders she interviewed had conflicts with close friends or classmates, significant unpleasant effects of conflict could last for days, weeks, or months. Because those youths rarely engaged in discussions related to feelings or concerns, unresolved disagreements festered and lingered, which created escalating hostilities and "choosing sides" among classmates. This pattern, in turn, led to school attendance becoming stressful which affected attendance and academic performance and undermined self-esteem and self-confidence.

Outcomes of conflicts, especially destructive ones, can have a broad impact on adolescents’ social functioning. Clearly, it is of critical importance for researchers to pay greater attention to the components that entail conflict situations for adolescents within important peer relationships, as little research has been conducted to date. Shantz’s (1987) sequential framework provides a useful framework to examine these components and suggests particular areas that are of dire need for future research. Social goals and strategies, because of their impact on adolescents’ social competency outcomes and their viability for social skills intervention, represent a particularly salient area for future research, including this study.
Statement of the Problem

Based on the review of the literature, it is apparent that conflict plays a significant role in social relationships during adolescence. During this stage of rapid physical and cognitive change, the peer group develops greater importance in adolescents' lives. As adult control diminishes and the peer group assumes greater importance, new social dilemmas are created and adolescents actively explore interpersonal influence, negotiate power imbalances, and learn how to cope with social success and disappointment (Opotow, 1991). Understanding the dynamics of adolescent peer conflict is an area ripe for research, but one that has been hindered due to methodological variability (e.g., defining conflict) and theoretical neglect (Collins & Laursen, 1992). This study is a critical step in overcoming the lack of information regarding social-cognitive variables that contribute to the role of conflict in peer relationships among older adolescents.

In particular, a focus on understanding the relation between social goals and strategies in adolescent peer conflict is of importance. Social information processing theory has provided a framework to examine how the behavioral strategies enacted in a conflict are influenced by internal motivation or goals for that specific situation. Research in this area with children has shown that goals are indeed associated with strategies. In addition, goals and strategies are linked to peer acceptance and quality of friendship among children. This suggests an important point of intervention for social skills development, as positive peer relationships are essential in several ways to the healthy development of children and adolescents. Specifically, childhood and adolescent peer relations are associated with social and emotional development and adjustment (Bukowski & Hoza, 1989; Hartup, 1983), and children learn social perspective taking and social problem-solving skills (Stocker, 1989).
through peer relationships. Through development of these skills, children and adolescents learn the competencies necessary to make and maintain friendships, as well as the appropriate social skills necessary for other social interactions. By focusing on the specific goals that are pursued in social situations, researchers may help improve assessment and intervention strategies for children who are at risk for negative peer interactions and peer rejection as well as long-term emotional and behavioral disorders (Erdley & Asher, 1999).

Although there is limited extant research in the area of adolescent peer conflict, particularly in varying relationships, several research questions and hypotheses were generated on theoretical grounds and on the basis of studies involving younger children. Four general areas were investigated. First, the relation between goals and strategies for the entire sample was assessed. Second, whether there were unique "goal orientations" for individual participants was determined, and then, for those with a specific goal orientation, the degree to which ratings for conflict strategies varied by such goal orientations was examined. Third, differences between males and females in the goals and strategies they selected were explored. Finally, whether adolescent’s goals and strategies varied across different types of relationships (i.e., best friends, romantic partners, and roommates) was investigated.

Research Area: Is there a relation between ratings of goals and ratings of strategies?

Hypothesis 1: Ratings for Relationship goals will be significantly positively associated with ratings on use of Prosocial strategies and negatively associated with ratings on use of Hostile and Self-Interest strategies.

Hypothesis 2: Ratings for Revenge goals will be significantly positively associated with ratings on use of Hostile strategies and negatively associated with Prosocial strategies.
Hypothesis 3: Ratings for Defensive goals will be significantly positively associated with Hostile and Self-Interest strategies.

Research Area: Do the strategies of individuals with specific goal orientations differ, and are there differences in ratings on strategies for individuals with specific goal orientations?

Within goal orientation groups:

Hypothesis 4: Individuals with a Relationship goal orientation will rate Prosocial strategies significantly higher than they will rate all other strategies.

Hypothesis 5: Individuals with a Revenge goal orientation will rate Hostile strategies significantly higher than they will rate all other strategies.

Hypothesis 6: Individuals with a Defensive goal orientation will rate Hostile and Self-Interest strategies significantly higher than they will rate all other strategies.

Between goal orientation groups:

Hypothesis 7: Individuals with a Relationship goal orientation will rate Prosocial strategies significantly higher than will individuals with a Revenge orientation.

Hypothesis 8: Individuals with a Revenge goal orientation will rate Hostile strategies significantly higher than will individuals with a Relationship or Defensive orientation.

Research area: Are there gender differences in ratings of goals and strategies?

Research question 1: What goals and strategies do males and females rate the highest? Lowest?

Hypothesis 9: Compared to males, females will rate Relationship goals significantly higher than will males and they will rate Hostile strategies and Revenge goals significantly lower than will males.
Research Area: Are there differences in ratings for goals and strategies across varying relationship types? Do goal and strategy ratings vary across relationship type by gender?

Research question 2: Are there differences in ratings for the three goal composite areas (e.g., Relationship, Revenge, Defensive) across the three relationship types (e.g., best friends, romantic partners, and roommates)? Do goal ratings across the three relationship types vary by gender?

Research question 3: Are there differences in ratings for the three strategy composite areas (e.g., Prosocial, Hostile, Self-Interest) across the three relationship types? Do strategy ratings across the three relationship types vary by gender?
Method

Participants

Participants were 230 (125 males, 103 females, 2 students of unspecified gender) undergraduate student volunteers enrolled in Introduction to Psychology classes during the Fall 2002 semester at a large southeastern university. As part of requirements for the class, students were required to complete either six hours as a research participant or write a three-page review of a published journal article. Participants who chose to participate in this research study earned two research credits for the time involved in the project. The majority of participants were freshmen (63%) and sophomores (27%) representing a variety of majors within the university (see Table 1). Students were required to be between 18-21 years of age in order to participate; most students were 18 or 19 (84%). The majority of participants were Caucasian (76%), although there were 21 African-American students (9%), 10 Asian students (4%), three Hispanic students (1%), and two American Indian students (1%). Nineteen participants (8%) indicated they were of more than one race.

Most students were not currently dating (44%) or were dating one person exclusively (43%). Eleven percent of students were dating more than one person, and 2% of students reported being engaged. Although not excluded in the recruitment procedures, no married students participated in the study. The majority of the participants lived in an on-campus dorm room with a roommate (77%). A much smaller percentage lived off-campus in a house or apartment with roommates (10%) or with family members (7%). Few students lived alone (4%) or in fraternity or sorority housing (1%). The vast majority (83%) of study participants had never received any type of peer mediation or conflict resolution training.
Table 1. *Demographic Information from Survey Participants (N = 230)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>230</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special student/other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>230</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>230</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African-American</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>230</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not dating</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusively dating one person</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating several people</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>230</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Situation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single dorm</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roommate in dorm</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus alone</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus with roommate</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek housing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With family member(s)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Received peer mediation training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical science/engineering</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>27.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life science</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal arts</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>42.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Procedure

Participants were recruited from the Introduction to Psychology classes by placing a description of the study and requirements to participate on a campus website designated to recruit participants for psychology research projects. This website listed numerous experiments available for participation and allows various times to be scheduled by the experimenter. Participants registered electronically through the website.
Participants in this study were scheduled for data collection sessions in small groups of up to 12 participants in rooms reserved in an academic building on campus. Small, frequent data collection sessions were preferred in order to enhance the comfort level of the participants and to best accommodate a variety of undergraduate course and work schedules. Consistent with departmental regulations for undergraduate research participation, if a participant did not attend a scheduled data collection session, or canceled without 24-hour notice, one credit hour was deducted from their total accrued research credits. To minimize the possibility of participants forgetting their appointment time, a reminder notice was sent via email 48 hours before the scheduled data collection session.

After participants were comfortably seated in the test room, a trained undergraduate research assistant introduced himself or herself and distributed and reviewed a written informed consent form that was signed by each participant (see Appendix A). The informed consent form briefly outlined the study and explained the process of awarding research credits for participation in the study. The informed consent form assured participants that their responses would remain confidential and that they could skip any items or stop participating at any time without penalization to their research credits or grade in their psychology course. Upon reviewing, signing, and returning the informed consent form, participants were handed the questionnaire protocol and a computer-coded Scantron form. Participants coded all responses directly on the Scantron sheet.

The research assistant began administration of the measure with a practice vignette; directions were read aloud and participants practiced marking their responses on the Scantron form. Upon completion of the practice vignette, participants were asked if they had any questions about completing the remainder of the questionnaire. Once all questions were
answered, the participants were asked to complete the remainder of the questionnaire, including a section regarding demographic information. Demographic information collected included gender, roommate status, relationship status, age, length of time in college, major area of study, and ethnicity. Once all participants completed the questionnaire, the research assistant read aloud a debriefing statement (see Appendix B) that explained the nature of the study and some details of the purpose of the study. Participants were given a copy of the debriefing statement to take with them. The data collection session lasted approximately 45 minutes. All data were coded by participant number and stored in a locked filing cabinet accessible only to research team members.

Measure

Description. Goals and strategies in conflict-of-interest situations were assessed with a measure adapted from Rose and Asher (1999) by Kaluk et al. (2001) for an exploratory pilot study for an undergraduate honors thesis. The Conflict Resolution - Adolescent Measure (CRAM) consists of 15 vignettes designed to assess adolescents’ goals and strategies in hypothetical conflict situations with peers (i.e., best friends, romantic partners, and roommates). The hypothetical vignettes represent interpersonal conflicts in social situations between two adolescents' needs or interests. Following the presentation of each vignette, participants rate the degree to which they endorse six different strategies and six different goals.

Development. The hypothetical vignettes in the CRAM were originally adapted by Kaluk et al. (2001) to reflect issues pertinent to late adolescence. Sample vignettes for each of the five context areas are presented in Table 2. The CRAM includes vignettes involving
Table 2. *Sample Hypothetical Conflicts Representing Each of the Five Contexts*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Sample Hypothetical Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining reciprocity</td>
<td>You and your roommate always go to a club on Friday nights. This week, your roommate gets an invitation to do something else and wants to skip going to a club this week. You still want to stick to the plan, though, and wish your roommate would come with you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping a Friend/Partner in Need</td>
<td>After classes one day, you ask your roommate to take you to pick up your car from the garage before it closes for the night. Your roommate is watching a video for a class and tells you that you he/she really needs to finish watching it, but you still need your roommate to help you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a Reliable Partner</td>
<td>You and your roommate usually take turns washing the dishes after dinner. Recently, however, your roommate has not been taking his/her turn, leaving you to do the dishes every night.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Disagreements over Resources</td>
<td>It is the cheap time to call long-distance and you really want to call your friend in another state. As you are about to call him/her, your roommate tells you that he/she really wants to call his/her mother right then. You tell your roommate that you want to call your friend right now, but he/she still tells you that he/she wants to use the phone right now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusivity</td>
<td>You and your roommate have made a special ritual of watching a favorite show together every Sunday night. The two of you always watch it alone, but this week, your roommate invites someone else to come and watch it with you without asking you if it is okay first.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
best friends, romantic partners, and roommates. Five vignettes pertain to best friends (one for each of the five contexts). Five vignettes (one for each context) also pertain to roommates and five vignettes (one for each context) pertain to romantic partners. Therefore, the measure contains a total of 15 vignettes. The order of the vignettes was determined by using a random order table, under the condition that no two context areas or relationships of the same type could appear after one another.

Although Kaluk et al. (2001) utilized a random order table to create the order of the vignettes in their study, goals and strategies were listed in the same order for every vignette. In order to minimize a practice or fatigue effect for the survey participants in the current study, this author used a random order table to distribute the goals and strategies in a different order for each vignette. A group of six strategies were presented in random order after each vignette, followed by a group of six goals in random order for each vignette. See Appendix C for the CRAM measure in its entirety.

A pilot study was conducted by this author with a group of 10 school psychology graduate students for several purposes. One purpose was to estimate the length of time to complete the measure. Additional purposes were to obtain feedback about the readability of the measure and applicability of the vignettes, goals, and strategies for this sample. Results supported Kaluk et al.’s (2001) findings that few adolescent participants utilized the strategies of threatening to terminate the relationship or terminating the relationship. None of the participants in the pilot study indicated that they would use either of those strategies. Therefore, the strategies of threatening to terminate the relationship and terminating the relationship were omitted from the current questionnaire.
Administration. Based on the procedures of Rose and Asher (1999) and Kaluk et al. (2001), participants completing the CRAM read each vignette and then are asked, "what would you do in this situation?" To respond to that question, participants are presented with a series of six statements representing a variety of possible strategies and are asked to rate, on a 7-point Likert scale, the extent to which they agree or disagree with each statement. A rating of “0” indicates “very strongly disagree” and a rating of “6” indicates “very strongly agree.” Strategies include those of Accommodation, Compromise, Verbal Aggression, Self-Interest, Withdrawal, and Emotional Manipulations. See Table 3 for examples of all strategies.

After rating the six strategies, participants are then asked to rate, on a 7-point Likert scale, the extent to which they agree or disagree with each of six different goal statements that are presented. Relationship maintenance goals are concerned with maintaining a good relationship with the other person; Moral goals are concerned with making sure things are fair. Personal control goals are concerned with having control over one's activities, personal space, and possessions. Self-Interest goals involve making sure one's own needs are met. Revenge and Reducing Tension are the final two goals. See Table 3 for examples of all goals.

Scoring. A participant’s strategy score was the mean of his or her ratings for that strategy across all 15 vignettes. Thus, as there are six strategies being assessed, each participant obtained a mean score for each of those six strategies. Mean strategy scores ranged from 0 through 6. Based on previous research (Kaluk et al., 2001; Rose & Asher, 1999) several strategies were expected to be highly correlated with one another. Those strategies that were clustered together (based on hierarchical cluster analyses described in the
Table 3. *Sample Strategy and Goal Statements for a Hypothetical Situation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Strategy</th>
<th>Sample Strategy Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>“I would let my roommate call his/her mother.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromise</td>
<td>“I would suggest that I talk to my friend briefly and then my roommate could call his/her mother.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Aggression</td>
<td>“I would say something insulting to my roommate.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Interest</td>
<td>“I would tell my roommate I was calling my friend.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal</td>
<td>“I would just not call my friend.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Manipulation</td>
<td>“I would act cold and distant towards my roommate.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Goal</th>
<th>Sample Goal Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Maintenance</td>
<td>“I would be trying to be friends.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>“I would be trying to make sure things were done fairly.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Control</td>
<td>“I would be trying to keep my roommate from pushing me around.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Interest</td>
<td>“I would be trying to call my friend.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenge</td>
<td>“I would be trying to get back at my roommate.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing Tension</td>
<td>“I would be trying to keep myself from getting upset.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Managing Disagreements over Resources situation: (“It is the cheap time to call long-distance and you really want to call your friend in another state. As you are about to call him/her, your roommate tells you that he/she really wants to call his/her mother right then. You tell your roommate that you want to call your friend right now, but he/she still tells you that he/she wants to use the phone right now.”)
data analysis section) were combined into a composite score. For example, Compromise and Accommodation were clustered together into a factor called *Prosocial*. Withdrawal, Emotional Manipulation, and Verbal Aggression clustered together into a factor called *Hostile*. *Self-Interest* did not cluster with any other variables.

Participants’ goal scores were the mean of his or her ratings for each goal across all 15 vignettes. Because there are six goals being assessed, each participant obtained a score for each of the six goals. Mean goal scores ranged from 0 through 6. As with strategies, previous research (Kaluk et al., 2001; Rose & Asher, 1999) suggested certain goals should cluster together. For those goals that clustered together, mean rating scores were averaged into a composite score. Three composite goal areas were found (based on analyses described in the data analysis section), including *Relationship* goals (comprised of the Relationship Maintenance goal) and *Defensive* goals (comprised of Reducing Tension, Personal Control, Moral, and Self-Interest goals). Scores for the *Revenge* goal did not significantly correlate with any scores for other goals.

Goal composite scores were initially used as the basis to determine whether participants had a distinct “goal orientation.” To determine whether one had a distinct goal orientation, a participant would have a mean composite rating score of greater than 5.0 for one composite area and mean composite rating scores of less than 3.0 for both the other areas. This was done to ensure that a participant was not classified into more than one goal orientation group. Scores are based on the Likert rating scale in the questionnaire. A mean rating score of 5.0 would indicate the participant strongly agreed or very strongly agreed with those goals; a mean rating score of less than 3.0 would indicate the participant strongly disagreed or very strongly disagreed with those goal statements. Specifically, those with a
Defensive goal orientation would have a mean composite rating score of 5.0 for Defensive goals, and mean composite rating scores of less than 3.0 for both Prosocial and Revenge goal areas. Revenge goal orientation would be determined by a mean score of 5.0 in that composite area and mean composite scores of 3.0 or less for the Prosocial and Defensive goal composite areas. Finally, the Prosocial goal orientation would be determined by a mean composite score of 5.0 for the Prosocial composite area and mean composite scores of 3.0 or less for the Revenge and Defensive goal composite area.

*Psychometric properties.*  Cronbach’s alpha for goal and strategy scores were reported to be "satisfactory" by Kaluk et al. (2001) although no specific coefficients were provided. Coefficient alphas for goals and strategies were reported for the measure used in Rose and Asher’s (1999) study with younger children, from which the CRAM was adapted. Those coefficients ranged from .92 to .98, providing strong support for the internal consistency of that similar measure. Goals and strategies endorsed in the conflict situations were predictive of how many best friends children had, as well as the quality of their friendships (as measured by friendship nominations and peer acceptance ratings by classmates, as well as a self-report friendship questionnaire). This suggests additional support for the validity of their measure. Coefficient alphas were calculated for each goal and strategy in the CRAM in the current study. Coefficient alphas ranged from .77 to .96, indicating adequate internal consistency of the measure. Coefficient alphas were higher for strategies (.93-.96) than for goals (.77-.92).
Results

Descriptive Analyses and Data Reduction.

Following a review of the means, standard deviations, and ranges for each of the six strategies across the 15 situations, analyses were undertaken to verify that strategy ratings correlated in the same manner as in Kaluk et al.’s (2001) and Rose and Asher’s (1999) studies, which provided the basis for specific hypotheses for the proposed study.

The relations among strategies were initially examined using Pearson correlations. However, as in Rose and Asher’s (1999) study, high correlations were found among strategy scores, which made it difficult to identify clearly distinct clusters within the strategies. Therefore, hierarchical cluster analysis (HCA) was used to determine strategies that grouped together. With HCA, each of the six strategies was placed alone in a cluster. Then, the two strategies that were most similar were combined into a cluster, and the process continued until all strategies were combined into a single cluster. The resulting dendogram (see Appendix D) that displays the order in which strategies were combined and the distance between clusters was used to decide the number of clusters that best represented the data. A three cluster solution was chosen because these appeared to be three concepts that were conceptually distinct. These included a Prosocial cluster comprised of Compromise and Accommodation strategies; a Hostile cluster comprised of Emotional Manipulation, Withdrawal, and Verbal Aggression strategies; and the Self-Interest cluster comprised of only the Self-Interest strategy. See Table 4 for a comparison of Rose and Asher’s (1999), Kaluk et al.’s (2001), and the present study’s clustering of strategies.
Table 4. *Comparison of Data Reduction Results for Strategies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hierarchical Cluster Analysis</td>
<td>Factor Analysis</td>
<td>Hierarchical Cluster Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial (COM, ACC)</td>
<td>Compromise (COM)</td>
<td>Prosocial (COM, ACC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile (W, EM, VA)</td>
<td>Hostile (EM, VA)</td>
<td>Hostile (W, EM, VA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Interest (SI)</td>
<td>Self-Interest (ACC, SI)</td>
<td>Self-Interest (SI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Withdrawal (W)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Compromise (COM), Withdrawal (W), Emotional Manipulation (EM), Verbal Aggression (VA), Accommodation (ACC), Self-Interest (SI)

Results of this study were identical to Rose and Asher’s when using HCA. Kaluk et al. found slightly different clusters when utilizing factor analysis.

A similar process occurred for data reduction of goal scores. Because there were strong correlations among goal ratings, HCA was used to identify clusters of like goals (see Appendix E). *Revenge*, as in previous studies, was an independent cluster. However, in this study the Relationship Maintenance goal did not cluster with other variables and became an independent cluster called *Relationship*. The remaining goals, Reduce Tension, Self-Interest, Personal Control, and Moral, were linked together in the HCA and formed a composite called *Defensive*. See Table 5 for a comparison of goal clusters across the three different studies.

Table 5. *Comparison of Data Reduction Results for Goals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hierarchical Cluster Analysis</td>
<td>Factor Analysis</td>
<td>Hierarchical Cluster Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Maintenance (MR, M, RT)</td>
<td>Prosocial (MR, M)</td>
<td>Relationship Maintenance (MR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental-Control (PC, S)</td>
<td>Self-Protection (RT, S, PC)</td>
<td>Defensive (RT, S, PC, M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenge (R)</td>
<td>Revenge (R)</td>
<td>Revenge (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Relationship Maintenance (MR), Moral (M), Reduce Tension (RT), Self-Interest (S), Personal Control (PC), Revenge (R)
Relations between Goals and Strategies

In order to test the strength of the relations between ratings of goals and ratings of strategies, a 3 x 3 correlation matrix (see Table 6) was constructed using Pearson product moment correlations. It was hypothesized that Relationship goals would be significantly associated with Prosocial strategies and negatively associated with ratings on use of Hostile and Self-Interest strategies. Relationship goals were indeed found to be significantly positively associated with Prosocial strategies ($r = .23, p = .003$). However, Relationship goals were not significantly negatively correlated with either Hostile strategies ($r = -.09, p = .15$) or Self-Interest strategies ($r = .06, p = .41$).

Consistent with expectations, ratings for Revenge goals were significantly positively associated with ratings on use of Hostile strategies ($r = .80, p < .001$) and negatively associated with ratings for Prosocial strategies ($r = -.17, p = .01$). A directional hypothesis was not stated for the relationship between Revenge goals and Self-Interest strategies;

Table 6. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations Among Goals and Strategies ($N = 230$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defensive</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenge</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Interest</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .01, ** p < .001, *** p < .0001
however, a strong significant positive relationship was found between them \((r = .42, p < .0001)\). As expected, Defensive goals were found to be significantly positively associated with Hostile strategies \((r = .16, p = .01)\) and Self-Interest strategies \((r = .44, p < .001)\).

**Strategies of Goal Orientation Groups**

*Creation of goal orientation groups.* Goal orientation groups could not be created by using the scoring method utilized by Kaluk et al. (2001). Participants in this study generally rated Revenge goals low and both Relationship and Defensive goals high (see Table 7), such that sufficient numbers of participants did not meet the initial criteria to be classified into a specific goal orientation group. Only eight participants met the Relationship goal orientation using this system, and no participants met criterion to be classified as having a Revenge or Defensive goal orientation. An alternative strategy to create goal orientation groups was developed. This entailed using nonparametric mean rank scores rather than mean rating scores to determine goal orientation groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>F (2, 79)</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial</td>
<td>15.86****</td>
<td>.67(^a) (.24)</td>
<td>.53(^a) (.30)</td>
<td>.34(^b) (.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile</td>
<td>51.86****</td>
<td>.25(^b) (.20)</td>
<td>.43(^a) (.18)</td>
<td>.71(^b) (.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Interest</td>
<td>7.5***</td>
<td>.31(^b) (.25)</td>
<td>.55(^a) (.25)</td>
<td>.52(^c) (.24)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001, ****p < .0001

Note. Means sharing the same superscript in the same column are not significantly different from each other at \(p < .05\).
Using a two-step process, ranks were formatted to have values between 0 and 1, representing low to high scores.

To obtain the rank scores, each participant’s mean rating score for each goal and strategy was ranked from lowest to highest and then divided by the sample size (i.e., 230). The PROC RANK procedure in SAS statistical analyses was then utilized to convert mean rating scales into ranks from 0 to 1. Thus, the scores from the group were compared and converted into ranks to indicate each participant’s relative standing within the group (Huck, 2000). If one of a participant’s goals composite was ranked at greater than or equal to .50 and the other two goal composite scores were ranked less than .50, a goal orientation was designated for that participant. For example, if the goal ranks for a participant were Relationship = .75, Defensive = .42, and Revenge = .23, that subject was placed in the Relationship goal orientation group. Using this method, 36% of the sample was identified in a goal orientation group. Thirty-one participants were classified as having a Relationship goal orientation. Thirteen participants were classified as having a Defensive orientation, and 38 had a Revenge goal orientation.

Strategies within goal orientation groups. In order to evaluate differences between mean ranks, the ranked strategies for each goal orientation group were analyzed using one-way repeated-measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) followed by paired t tests conducted within each goal orientation group. The t tests had an overall Type I error rate set at .05 (i.e., .0167 for each test). Mean ranks and standard deviations are presented in Table 7.

Participants with a Relationship goal orientation indicated a significant difference between strategy mean ranks $[F(2,60) = 30.66, \ p < .0001]$. Within the Relationship goal
orientation, the Prosocial strategy had a mean rank of .67, which was significantly greater
than those for both the Hostile strategy [mean rank = .25, \( t(30) = 7.62, p < .0001 \)] and the
Self-Interest strategy [mean rank = .31, \( t(30) = 5.57, p < .0001 \)]. Mean ranks for the Hostile
strategy did not differ from Self-Interest, \( t(30) = 1.20, p = .2404 \).

In contrast to expectations, no significant difference was found between strategy
mean ranks for those with a Defense goal orientation [\( F(2,24) = 0.76, p = .48 \)]. The Self-
Interest strategy did have the highest mean rank at .55, but this did not significantly differ
from the Prosocial strategy [mean rank = .53, \( t(12) = 0.36, p = .72 \)] or Hostile strategy [mean
rank = .43, \( t(12) = 1.42, p = .18 \)]. In addition, the Prosocial mean rank did not significantly
differ from Hostile within the Defensive goal orientation [\( t(12) = 0.84, p = .42 \)].

As expected, participants with a Revenge goal orientation indicated a significant
difference between the strategy mean ranks [\( F(2, 74) = 345.21, p < .0001 \)]. Specifically, the
Hostile strategy had a mean rank of .71, which was significantly greater than the Prosocial
[mean rank = .34, \( t(37) = 8.26, p < .0001 \)] and Self-Interest strategies [mean rank = .52, \( t(37)
= 4.60, p < .0001 \)]. The Self-Interest strategy was also ranked significantly greater than was
the Prosocial strategy, \( t(37) = 3.90, p = .0004 \).

*Strategies between goal orientation groups.* A one-way MANOVA was conducted to
determine a multivariate test of the group effect, followed by univariate testing (one-way
ANOVAs) and post hoc comparison of means with the Tukey method. A significant goal
orientation group effect was found [\( F (6, 154) =18.62, p < .0001 \); univariate results are
shown in Table 8.

Those with a Relationship goal orientation rated Prosocial strategies significantly
greater than did those with a Revenge goal orientation group (3.99 vs. 3.44, \( p < .0001 \)).
Table 8. *Strategy Ratings and Standard Deviations between Goal Orientations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Goal Orientation</th>
<th>Relationship (n = 31)</th>
<th>Defensive (n = 13)</th>
<th>Revenge (n = 38)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F (2, 79)</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial</td>
<td>13.7****</td>
<td>3.99&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; 0.38</td>
<td>3.72&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt; 0.46</td>
<td>3.44&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; 0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile</td>
<td>41.3****</td>
<td>0.70&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; 0.48</td>
<td>1.05&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; 0.39</td>
<td>1.81&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; 0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Interest</td>
<td>9.5***</td>
<td>2.31&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; 0.83</td>
<td>3.04&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; 0.56</td>
<td>2.95&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; 0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*<p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001, **** p < .0001
Note. Means sharing the same superscript in the same row are not significantly different from each other at p < .05 (based on Tukey post hoc comparisons of means).

No difference was found for Prosocial strategies between the Relationship and Defensive goal orientation groups.

Revenge goal orientation participants rated Hostile strategies significantly greater than did those in the Relationship goal orientation (1.81 vs. 0.70, <i>p</i> < .0001) and the Defensive goal orientation groups (1.81 vs. 1.05, <i>p</i> < .0001). Although no directional hypothesis was suggested for the Self-Interest strategy, examination of the means in Table 8 indicates that those in the Relationship goal orientation group had a significantly lower mean score for Self-Interest than did both the Defense and Revenge groups.

*Overall Gender Differences in Ratings of Goals and Strategies.*

Within gender comparisons of goals and strategies. Three paired <i>t</i> tests were conducted within each gender to evaluate differences between means for goals and strategies. These tests had an overall Type I error rate set at .05 (i.e., .0167 for each test). Across all goals and strategies, there were 15 paired <i>t</i> tests within each gender, so that the overall Type I error rate of .05 was divided by fifteen instead of three.
Results of paired t tests on mean ratings for goals for both males and females indicated the Relationship goal was rated higher than the Revenge goal [males $t(124) = 23.88, p < .0001$; females $t(102) = 23.18, p < .0001$] and the Defensive goal [males $t(124) = 8.10, p < .0001$; females $t(102) = 6.80, p < .0001$]. Revenge was the lowest rated goal for both males and females [males $t(124) = 26.27, p < .0001$; females $t(102) = 25.73, p < .0001$].

Similarly, in paired t tests on rating scores for strategies, both males and females rated the Prosocial strategy higher than the Hostile strategy [males $t(124) = 26.52, p < .0001$; females $t(102) = 25.14, p < .0001$] and Self-Interest strategies [males $t(124) = 9.33, p < .0001$; females $t(102) = 8.79, p < .0001$]. The Hostile strategy was the lowest rated strategy for both males and females, as the Hostile strategy mean scores were lower than Self-Interest [males $t(124) = 21.74, p < .0001$; females $t(102) = 21.56, p < .0001$] and Prosocial strategies. Ratings therefore indicated very positive endorsement of constructive responses such as the Prosocial strategy and Relationship goal for both males and females. Therefore, both genders strongly endorsed Relationship goals and Prosocial strategies and showed little endorsement of destructive responses such as Revenge goals and Hostile strategies.

**Between gender comparisons of goals and strategies.** Although it was expected that females would rate Relationship goals significantly higher and Hostile strategies and Revenge goals significantly lower than would men, results of a one-way MANOVA did not indicate a significant main effect of gender for strategies [$F(3, 224) = 0.43, p = .7344$]. However, a significant gender group effect was found for ratings of goals using a one-way MANOVA [$F(3, 224) = 2.76, p = .0432$]. Univariate results are shown in Table 9.
Table 9. *Goal and Strategy Ratings of Males and Females*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Male (n=125)</th>
<th>Female (n=103)</th>
<th>F(1, 226)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hostile</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.34\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>(0.72)</td>
<td>1.27\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>(0.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial</td>
<td>3.69\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>(0.52)</td>
<td>3.75\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self- Interest</td>
<td>2.92\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>(0.79)</td>
<td>2.87\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>(0.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenge</td>
<td>1.09\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>(0.89)</td>
<td>0.94\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>(0.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>4.48\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>(1.31)</td>
<td>4.65\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>(1.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense</td>
<td>3.63\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>(0.92)</td>
<td>3.89\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>(0.85)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Females did rate Relationship goals slightly higher than did males (4.65 vs. 4.48), but this was not statistically significant ($p = .29$). Females also had slightly lower mean Hostile strategy ratings than males (1.27 vs. 1.34, $p = .50$) and lower Revenge goal ratings than males (0.94 vs. 1.09, $p = .21$), although differences were not statistically significant. Women rated the Defense goal significantly higher than did men, however.

*Gender Differences in Goals and Strategies in Varying Relationship Types*

*Gender differences in goals across relationship types.* One-way repeated measures MANOVAs were performed to examine differences in goals across varying relationship types, including roommates, best friends, and romantic partners. These were followed by one-way repeated measures ANOVAs with gender as an independent variable and then separately for males and females for each goal or strategy (using paired $t$ tests on means, with a Tukey adjustment for multiple comparisons), in order to investigate significant interactions. A one-way repeated measures MANOVA was first conducted with genders combined in order to investigate differences between the means for relationship types for each goal.
All of the contrasts were significant at alpha = .05 (see Table 10), except for the case of Best Friends vs. Romantic Partner under the Relationship goal (p = .1375). A one-way repeated measures MANOVA indicated the Gender by Relationship Type interaction term was significant \[ F(6, 221) = 4.92, p < .0001 \]. The Gender \[ F(3, 224) = 2.75, p = .0437 \] and Relationship Type \[ F(6,221) = 21.69, p < .0001 \] main effects were also significant.

Further testing with one-way repeated measures ANOVAs was performed in order to examine interaction results in greater detail (see Table 11). The Gender by Relationship

### Table 10. Differences between Means for Relationship Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revenge</th>
<th>Defense</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roommate vs. Best Friend</td>
<td>p &lt; .0001</td>
<td>p &lt; .0001</td>
<td>p &lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roommate vs. Romantic</td>
<td>p &lt; .0001</td>
<td>p &lt; .0001</td>
<td>p &lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Friend vs. Romantic</td>
<td>p = .0504</td>
<td>p = .0470</td>
<td>p = .1375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means sharing the same superscript in the same row within each gender are not significantly different from each other at p < .05 (based on paired t tests with a Tukey adjustment for multiple comparisons).

Note. P-value is for the Gender by Relationship Type interaction and is based on an F test in the repeated measures ANOVA.

### Table 11. Mean Ratings and Standard Deviations for Goals by Gender and Relationship Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Interaction p-value</th>
<th>Roommate</th>
<th>Best Friend</th>
<th>Romantic Partner</th>
<th>Roommate</th>
<th>Best Friend</th>
<th>Romantic Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenge</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>1.42⁵</td>
<td>.92⁵</td>
<td>.92⁵</td>
<td>1.07⁵</td>
<td>.77⁵</td>
<td>.96⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>.0363</td>
<td>4.17⁵</td>
<td>4.62⁵</td>
<td>4.64⁵</td>
<td>4.46⁵</td>
<td>4.83⁵</td>
<td>4.67⁵</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. P-value is for the Gender by Relationship Type interaction and is based on an F test in the repeated measures ANOVA.
Type interaction was found to be significant for each goal ($p = .0001$ for Revenge; $p = .0014$ for Defense; $p = .04$ for Relationship). For males, significant differences at $p < .0001$ (from Tukey adjusted paired $t$ tests) were found between Roommates and the other two relationship types for all goals. However, no differences were found between Best Friends and Romantic Partners within any goals for men (for Revenge, $p = .99$; Defense, $p = .56$; Relationship, $p = .93$).

This was not the case for females. Females generally rated Best Friends differently than other relationship types for all goals ($p = .02$), except for the case of Best Friends vs. Romantic Partners within the Relationship goal ($p = .09$). Females showed little difference in ratings between Roommates and Romantic Partners other than for the Relationship goal (Revenge, $p = .27$; Defense, $p = .46$; Relationship, $p = .01$). Best Friends appeared to be a priority relationship for females, as females’ mean scores for their Best Friends were lowest for both Revenge and Defense goals, yet highest for the Relationship goal.

Gender differences in strategies across relationship types. A one-way repeated measures MANOVA was performed with genders combined, and differences between strategy mean ratings across relationship types were tested for each strategy. All the contrasts were found to be significant at alpha $= .05$, except for the case of Best Friends vs. Romantic Partner under the Prosocial strategy ($p = .79$). Gender was then added to the model, and MANOVA testing was again performed. The Gender by Relationship interaction term proved to be significant [$F(6, 221) = 10.65$, $p < .0001$]. The Gender main effect was not significant [$F(3, 224) = 0.42$, $p = .7375$], although Relationship Type was [$F(6, 221) = 74.94$, $p < .0001$].
Table 12.  **Mean Ratings and Standard Deviations for Strategies by Gender and Relationship Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Interaction p-value</th>
<th>Roommate</th>
<th>Best Friend</th>
<th>Romantic Partner</th>
<th>Roommate</th>
<th>Best Friend</th>
<th>Romantic Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hostile</strong></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
<td>1.70(^a)</td>
<td>1.36(^b)</td>
<td>.95(^c)</td>
<td>1.46(^a)</td>
<td>1.13(^b)</td>
<td>1.22(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td>(.70)</td>
<td>(.82)</td>
<td>(.72)</td>
<td>(.72)</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro-Social</strong></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>.1358</td>
<td>3.37(^a)</td>
<td>3.83(^b)</td>
<td>3.86(^b)</td>
<td>3.52(^a)</td>
<td>3.90(^b)</td>
<td>3.85(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>(.72)</td>
<td>(.58)</td>
<td>(.55)</td>
<td>(.66)</td>
<td>(.640)</td>
<td>(.640)</td>
<td>(.510)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Interest</strong></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>&lt; .0001</td>
<td>3.39(^a)</td>
<td>2.59(^b)</td>
<td>2.80(^c)</td>
<td>3.21(^a)</td>
<td>2.36(^b)</td>
<td>3.03(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td>(.96)</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
<td>(.95)</td>
<td>(.97)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means sharing the same superscript in the same row within each gender are not significantly different from each other at p<.05 (based on paired t tests with a Tukey adjustment for multiple comparisons).

Note. P-value is for the Gender by Relationship Type interaction and is based on an F test in the repeated measures ANOVA.

Further testing was conducted with one-way repeated measures ANOVAs in order to examine the interaction results in more detail (see Table 12). The Gender by Relationship Type interaction was found to be significant for the Hostile and Self-Interest strategies \( p < .0001 \), but not the Prosocial strategy \( p = .14 \). However, males and females appeared to have similar patterns of means across Relationship Type for the Self-Interest strategy (high for Roommates; low for Best Friends) and Prosocial strategy (low for Roommates; high and nearly equal means for Best Friends and Romantic). Therefore, the Gender by Relationship Type interaction from the initial MANOVA seemed to be largely explained by the results for the Hostile strategy. Both males and females had their highest Hostile ratings for Roommates. However, males rated the Hostile strategy lowest for Romantic Partners, while females rated their lowest Hostile strategy for Best Friends (although this was not
significantly different from their mean for Romantic Partner, with Tukey adjusted $p = .23$ from the paired $t$ test). Males had significant differences in comparisons of Hostile means for each of the three relationship types (all $p < .0001$). The Self-Interest interaction findings appeared because males rated each of the three relationship types significantly different from each other (all $p < .01$), whereas Self-Interest ratings by females did not differ between Roommates and Romantic Partners ($p = .11$).
Discussion

The overall purpose of this study was to expand the focus of research regarding peer conflict from an exclusive focus on children into the developmental stage of adolescence. Adolescence is a unique period of development; peers take on a heightened importance during this stage of life (Steinberg, 2002), and difficulties in peer relationships have been found to have significant negative consequences, such as depression, peer rejection, alienation, and anxiety (Shantz, 1987; Sullivan, 1953). Adolescents have an increased need for social support from their peers during this time of rapidly changing social, emotional, cognitive, and biological changes, and difficulties with peer relationships can compromise this need. In addition, social contexts become increasingly complex as children age, and the skills needed for appropriate social interactions also become more complex. Accordingly, understanding adolescent's social cognition within conflict situations can be an important factor in facilitating optimal peer relationships and social and cognitive growth and development.

In addition to the overall goal of expanding the literature on peer conflict into adolescence, four specific research purposes existed. One specific purpose was to examine the degree to which adolescents’ social goals were related to the strategies they endorsed in peer conflict situations. The second purpose was to determine whether adolescents had distinct “goal orientations” in response to conflict situations, and if so, how conflict strategies varied by goal orientation. The third purpose was to examine whether gender differences existed between adolescent males and females in responses to conflict scenarios. The final purpose was to explore whether adolescents’ goals and strategies varied across different relationships, including a best friend, roommate, and a romantic partner. Findings from each
of these research areas will be discussed in turn, followed by limitations, directions for future research, and implications of the study.

Relations between Conflict Goals and Strategies

Consistent with findings in the literature on children’s responses to conflict, results from this study indicated that the goals late adolescents’ had for peer conflicts were significantly related to strategies chosen to resolve such conflicts. Constructive goals were associated with constructive strategies, and destructive goals were associated with destructive strategies. More specifically, goals pertaining to the maintenance of a relationship were found to be significantly associated with use of prosocial strategies in a conflict, such as compromising or accommodating the needs of the other person. Relationship-oriented goals were not associated with destructive strategies, such as withdrawal from the relationship, emotional manipulation, verbal aggression towards the other person, or maintenance of one’s own self-serving interests in the conflict. As expected, goals directed towards seeking revenge against a peer were positively associated with hostile and self-interest strategies and negatively associated with prosocial strategies. Goals that were focused on meeting one’s own needs, such as maintaining a personal sense of control over the conflict (i.e., not being “pushed around”), reducing tension, and maintaining a sense of morality, were also associated with hostile and self-interest strategies. Thus, examination of the overall goals and strategies in adolescent peer conflicts indicates, as expected based on research with younger children, that the goals adolescents chose were meaningfully related to the strategies they chose for resolving a peer conflict. Although goals and strategies were indeed significantly related in this study with adolescents, the size of some correlations, albeit similar in size to correlations in studies in younger children, were somewhat modest. Therefore, statistically
significant results regarding the association between goals and strategies should be interpreted with some caution, as other variables may thus account for the remaining variance in the correlations. Further research will be necessary to further investigate the relation between goals, strategies, and other variables that account for the variance in the correlations between goals and strategies in conflict situations.

Although the relations between conflict goals and strategies are consistently found in research with children and now with adolescents, the manner in which goals affect strategies in peer conflicts, as hypothesized in Crick and Dodge’s (1994) model of social information processing, is less clear. Chung and Asher (1996) purported that goals may directly and indirectly influence strategies within a conflict. Goals may indirectly influence conflict strategies through other social information processing variables, such as one’s attributions towards others’ actions and what social cues are attended to in a peer interaction. One’s interpretation of these variables would thereby affect the consideration and selection of certain strategies. Goals may directly influence conflict strategies if one is pursuing a particular type of goal. Determining whether adolescents pursue particular goals in conflict scenarios, and subsequent differences in strategy selection, was the second specific area of research for this study.

**Strategies of Goal Orientation Groups**

The linkage between goals and strategies was initially not supported using mean ratings to identify adolescents who had distinct goal preferences or “orientations.” Because of the lack of variance in mean rating scores, nonparametric mean rankings were employed to examine possible differences in scores. Conover and Iman (1981) indicated that nonparametric statistics should not be considered a limitation to data analyses. According to
these researchers, when a sampled population deviates from parametric assumptions (e.g., normality and homogeneity of variance) (Huck, 2000), nonparametric tests provide more robust results, and therefore may detect differences that may not be significant under parametric analysis. The rank-transformations utilized for the data provide a useful option for applying analyses such as ANOVAs to “nonconformist” data sets (Conover and Iman, 1981), such as those found in the present study that sought to examine group differences regarding conflict goals and strategies in hypothetical peer conflict situations. Future research will be necessary to better understand the distribution of rating scores, in addition to the most appropriate use of parametric and nonparametric analyses in order to examine goal orientation groups.

Goal orientation groups were identified by examining how each participant ranked the various goals in the hypothetical conflict scenarios, and thus determining if a preference was indicated for one of the three goals over the other two. Using this method, approximately one-third of the sample was identified as having a preference for one of the three goal areas (i.e., relationship orientation, defensive orientation, revenge orientation). The remaining two-thirds of the sample did not have a distinct preference for one of the goal orientations, but rather utilized a variety of goals for peer conflicts.

Strategy comparisons within goal orientation groups. As expected, groups with differing goal orientations reported preferences for use of different conflict strategies, and strategies they selected were consistent with their goal orientation. For instance, adolescents whose goals were consistently oriented towards maintaining a good relationship with their peers (13% of the total sample) selected prosocial strategies that would serve to enhance relationships more often than hostile or self-interest strategies, which would presumably be
detrimental to the maintenance of a relationship. Because outcomes (e.g., friendship adjustment) were not assessed as part of this study, it is presently unclear what impact the preference for maintaining a relationship has on peer interactions. Although emphasis towards maintenance of a relationship is likely to be intended as a constructive approach towards peer conflicts, it is possible one might be focused on maintaining a relationship at the expense of personal needs or rights. An adolescent who is overly oriented towards maintaining peer relationships may be at risk for being exploited by others who are more motivated by destructive goals or strategies.

Interestingly, despite the overall positive endorsement of constructive goals and strategies, the greatest proportion of participants (17%) was identified within the revenge goal orientation. This group of adolescents preferred the use of hostile, self-serving strategies more than prosocial strategies, indicating that their need for vengefulness or coercion in the conflict vignette was of greatest importance to them. The smallest proportion of participants (6%) was identified as having a “defensive” orientation in which they were predominantly motivated to pursue goals that were self-focused in nature and that would enable them to maintain a sense of personal interest in the conflict, such as control, morality, or reduction of tension. This group did not differ in the strategies they selected to resolve a conflict. Thus, they were equally likely to choose a constructive as destructive strategy to resolve a conflict. Because this group is concerned with maintaining a sense of personal interest in the conflict, they may be flexible enough to adapt the use of various strategies to whichever will best serve their desired outcome. If a constructive strategy can be used, these participants will do so. But they will also utilize a destructive strategy if needed in order to obtain a desired result.
Strategy comparisons between goal orientation groups. Participants in the three goal orientation groups clearly preferred different strategies. Relationship oriented participants rated strategies that would facilitate compromise or accommodation between both parties’ needs greater than those who had a revenge or defensive orientation. Relationship oriented participants also endorsed self-interest strategies (i.e., those that focused more on the individual rather than the relationship) less than did revenge or defensive oriented participants. As expected, those with a revenge goal orientation endorsed hostile and self-serving strategies. Overall, results with adolescents are similar to findings with children (Chung & Asher, 1996; Rose & Asher, 1999) in that strategies used by individuals with specific goal orientations further support the linkage between goals and strategies in peer conflicts. Adolescents in this study with different goal orientations were found to favor different strategies, and they selected strategies consistent with their specific goal orientation.

Given the generally high ratings for prosocial, relationship-oriented goals and strategies and low ratings for destructive goals and strategies, it was surprising to find the greatest proportion of late adolescents were classified as having a strong revenge orientation. Rose and Asher (1999) found only 6% of their overall sample of children strongly endorsed revenge oriented goals in peer conflict of interest situations. They expressed serious concern about the role that revenge plays in children’s relationships. Children in their study with a revenge orientation were found to have exceptionally poor friendship adjustment with peers (e.g., less likely to have a best friend, friendships were more conflictual). Hence, the desire for revenge in these relatively benign conflict situations was apparently damaging to the child’s relationships. The link between a revenge orientation and subsequent relationship adjustment among adolescents is currently unexplored and will be an important area for
future research. The desire for revenge could be problematic for late adolescents as the
desire for revenge has been found to underlie various deviant behaviors in adulthood (Rose
and Asher, 1999). Thus, identification and intervention with this specific group of
adolescents who approached conflict situations with the goal of revenge could be a useful
approach to help prevent such deviance. Future research will be needed to replicate these
findings and further explore goal orientation differences among adolescents.

Overall Gender Differences in Conflict Goals and Strategies

Because previous studies with children (Chung & Asher, 1996; Delveaux & Daniels,
2000; Rose & Asher, 1999) have suggested significant differences between males and
females in goal and strategy selections, gender differences were expected to be found among
adolescents in the current study. These studies with children are consistent in finding
females are more relationship oriented and prosocial than males are in peer conflicts, whereas
males have been found to be more hostile and control-oriented than females in peer conflicts.
In contrast, males and females in the current study did not differ in their goals or strategies
preferences. Thus, in this sample of older adolescents, male and female participants were
consistent in giving equally positive ratings to prosocial goals and strategies and little
endorsement of antisocial goals and strategies. The only gender difference found was that
women rated self-focused goals significantly higher than males. This is particularly
interesting when considered in light of most conflict literature that indicates girls are more
relationship oriented, meaning they focus more on maintaining relationships than on their
own needs in a conflict. Results from the present study suggest that a shift towards the
awareness of self-focused goals may occur during adolescence for females. It is unclear what
would cause this shift towards greater interest in self-focused goals; perhaps past
experiences focusing on relationship oriented goals yielded personally unsatisfactory or negative outcomes for females, thus they realized it was necessary to focus more on one’s own interests than those of others. Further research is needed to determine whether this finding is robust across samples.

**Gender Differences in Goals and Strategies in Varying Relationship Types**

**Gender differences in goals across relationship types.** Relationships during adolescence become increasingly diverse and complex, and an adolescent must therefore become increasingly skilled in managing different types of relationships. For example, not only does a late adolescent typically have a long-standing best friend to negotiate differences with, but a romantic partner with a novel set of complex relationship needs and demands becomes important as well. Additionally, the transition from leaving one’s family of origin to live with a roommate has its own inherent set of demands and conflicts. Because of the increased demand in social competencies across various relationships, gender differences were further analyzed by examining males’ and females’ goal preferences within different types of peer relationships in late adolescence, including best friends, roommates, and romantic partners.

Men endorsed different goals for their roommate relationships and the other two types of relationships; no differences were found between how males endorsed best friends and romantic partners for any goals. Thus, when examining responses to hypothetical conflict scenarios, males tended to rate roommates differently than a best friend or romantic partner, but goals for a conflict with a best friend and romantic partner were seen as similar. Males in this study tended to rate a roommate relationship greater negativity than they rated relationships with a best friend or romantic partner. Specifically, when rating conflict
scenarios about a roommate, they are less likely to be concerned with maintaining that relationship, but were instead more likely to be concerned with “face-saving” self-focused or vengeful goals. Late adolescent males in this study rated little difference in goals for a best friend or romantic partner. Both of these types of relationships seemed to be rated equally. Perhaps the difference between the goals males have in these varying types of relationships is that males are more socialized to have constructive relationships with a best friend or a romantic partner, who are most likely a source of enjoyment, fun, and social support.

Roommate relationships in a college setting are likely to be marked by territorial issues such as allocation of space in a dorm room (Fuller & Hall, 1996). Because males are more socialized than women to defend their perceived rights (Chung & Asher, 1996), conflicts with roommates may be more salient to men.

However, this was not the case for women. When examining goals in peer conflicts, females rated their best friends with a greater sense of priority than the other two relationships. Despite the increasing value placed on a relationship with a romantic partner during adolescence (often at the expense of previously valued best friends) (Seligman, 1999), relationship goals appeared to be valued equally for the best friend and romantic partner by females. Best friends appeared to be a priority relationship for females, as women in this study rated maintaining their relationship with a best friend significantly greater than their need to maintain a relationship with a roommate or romantic partner. Conversely, females indicated they would be less likely to be concerned with self-focused or vengeful goals in a hypothetical conflict with a best friend than they would be with a roommate or a romantic partner. The importance of best friend relationships in adolescent peer conflicts speaks to the importance of same sex friendships for women. These are typically long-standing
relationships with the same person over time, as opposed to roommates or romantic partners who may come and go in their lives. This finding is consistent with existing data that indicate women aspire to maintain a greater sense of connection in their friendships than men do (Fehr, 2004).

Gender differences in strategies across relationship types. Gender differences were also analyzed by examining whether males and females differed in the strategies selected for peer conflicts across different types of relationships. For males and females, their roommates were most likely to endorse conflict strategies that involved some degree of hostility (e.g., withdrawal, emotional manipulation, or verbal aggression). Females rated hostile strategies as likely to occur during conflicts with their romantic partner as with their best friend in the vignettes. However, males’ ratings indicated their best friend (most likely of the same sex) was more likely to encounter hostile conflict strategies in a conflict vignette than was their romantic partner (presumably of the opposite sex). The comfort level of males using hostile strategies with same sex versus opposite sex peers may play an important role in explaining this finding.

Both males’ and females’ ratings indicated that roommates in the hypothetical vignettes would be most the likely to experience other destructive types of strategies – those that are focused exclusively on one’s own needs in the conflict. Men rated their best friends as the least likely to experience these types of destructive strategies in the vignettes. Females, however, did not make a distinction between their best friends or romantic partner in their ratings; each was equally likely to experience these strategies in the conflict scenarios.

Males and females both indicated that roommates were least likely to encounter constructive,
prosocial strategies in conflict situations. Prosocial strategies were equally likely to be endorsed for best friends or romantic partners for both males and females.

Little previous research has been conducted to determine whether there are gender differences in peer conflicts across different types of relationships. A meta-analysis conducted by Laursen, Finkelstein, and Betts (2001) found that young adults aged 19-25 uniformly preferred the conflict strategy of negotiation in all examined relationships, including acquaintances, friends, romantic partners, and siblings. Low levels of the strategies of coercion and disengagement were found across all relationships. The current study expands the knowledge base of research for adolescent peer conflict, as it not only examined conflict strategies but goals of conflicts as well. In addition, examination of the differences between males and females’ goals and strategies in varying relationship types revealed gender differences that otherwise would have been obscured.

Limitations of the Study

Despite its contributions, several limitations of the study exist. Participants were a convenience sample of university psychology students characterized by a limited range of ethnic diversity. Therefore, results of the study may not be generalizable to late adolescents of different background and education. Further research would be necessary to replicate findings with other samples of adolescents, including those who are not college-educated, as well as more culturally and ethnically diverse participants across a wider geographic area.

The present study was limited in scope such that only a small aspect of the temporal framework of conflict, as outlined in the literature review, was examined. Features within the framework include the incidence and intensity of conflict, initiation of the conflict, conflict resolution, and the outcome of the conflict (Shantz, 1987). The social goals and strategies in
this study are only one part of the complex dynamics of conflict. Research entailing all aspects of this temporal framework for adolescent peer conflict has been slow to progress and continues to be necessary in order to gain a more integrated picture of the conflict sequence.

Although the CRAM measure showed adequate internal consistency with this population, discrepancies were noted in the goal and strategy coefficient alphas in the study. The Prosocial and Self-Interest goals were noted to be less internally consistent than the Hostile goal. Coefficient alphas for the Prosocial and Self-Interest goals were also lower than those found in studies with younger children. The current study with adolescents utilized a random order table to minimize response effects for the participants when rating goals and strategies in the measure, whereas studies with younger children did not. Perhaps this change in order in the survey affected the internal consistency of the goals with this population. Additional data about the effect of the random order table on adolescents’ survey responses are needed. If the Prosocial and Self-Interest goals are indeed less internally consistent than the Hostile goal and all strategies in the survey, reexamination of the conflict vignettes and response items on the CRAM measure may be necessary.

Although the use of the hypothetical situations methodology has been found to be linked with behavior in actual conflicts, responses to hypothetical situations should be validated with other types of methodologies. These could include third-party observations of conflict strategies in naturalistic settings, experimental designs, and self-reports of actual conflict situations. Conflict, by definition in this study, is a dyadic interaction. Thus, a self-report measure as utilized in this study is limited in that it only assesses one side of a dyadic exchange.
More limitations apply specifically to the CRAM measure used in this study. Although gender differences are explored in the conflict situations, the genders of the antagonists in the hypothetical vignettes are not specified. Although research (Seligman, 1999) suggests that best friends are typically of the same gender, it unknown whether opposite-sex friendships would reveal different patterns of conflict goals and strategies. Sexual orientation may be an additional factor when considering gender differences in the study. Although the conflict vignettes in this study did not specify the gender of the antagonist in the conflict, most survey participants probably assumed the romantic partner was of the opposite sex. A small percentage of the participants were likely gay or lesbian, and thus interpreted the romantic partner to be of the same sex. Because demographic information collected in the survey did not include sexual preference, it is unknown whether sexual preference contributed towards possible gender differences in this study. No known research to date has examined whether goals and strategies of heterosexual’s differ in conflicts with a romantic partner from those who are gay or lesbian. Because specific definitions of the relationships were not provided in the CRAM measure, other aspects of relationships may be subject to individual interpretation as well (e.g., who is considered a “best friend?”).

It is an assumption that the peers in the hypothetical conflict situations of the CRAM are “horizontal” relationships of shared power. However, it is possible that peer relationships are not always equal, as one participant may have a greater sense of power in the relationship than the other. This may especially be the case in situations with a romantic partner, where one person in the dyad may be less emotionally invested in the relationship than the other and therefore has more social power.
The peer conflicts in the CRAM were relatively benign conflict of interest situations. Conflicts involving more extreme stress or tension may be likely to elicit different ratings of goals and strategies. Future research will be necessary to determine whether the results from this study are similar across conflict situations of varying intensity. For instance, conflicts with romantic partners about sexual fidelity might elicit responses different from those elicited in benign conflicts of interest (Feldman & Cauffman, 1999). These limitations point to the need for future research to expand upon the initial findings of this study.

**Directions for Future Research**

This study was exploratory, and many other avenues for future research are possible. As previously mentioned, one expansion would be additional research to explore the nature of social goals and strategies in adolescent peer conflicts and their connection to other features of the temporal sequence of conflict (Shantz, 1987). The theoretical models that were described in the review of the literature as a basis for generating hypotheses for adolescent conflict resolution skills continue to serve as a framework for understanding social cognition of adolescents. These models include social information processing (Crick & Dodge, 1994) and Selman’s (1986) model of social-perspective taking. Directions for future research based on results from this study will be briefly considered for each of these areas.

The impact of goals and strategies on peer conflict outcomes. One key aspect for future research regarding the temporal framework of conflict is the impact that goals and strategies ultimately have on outcomes. Research with children and adolescents indicates that strategies utilized in a conflict have direct implications for the outcome of the interaction for an individual and the peer relationship (Laursen & Collins, 1994). Specifically, prosocial and
constructive strategies tend to promote continued social interaction, particularly among friends or romantic partners. When conflict occurs between friends or romantic partners, there appear to be factors within the relationship that mitigate the disruptive potential of the conflict. In fact, some degree of conflict has been found increase the satisfaction of the adolescents in the relationship. However, conflict has been found to worsen other types of relationships, particularly those who are not close friends or a romantic partner (Laursen & Collins, 1994). Given the negative view presented by males towards roommates in a conflict, it would be valuable to determine what outcome this view has on the roommate relationship. Conflict resolution between roommates is a significant concern for university housing officials, as satisfaction with roommate relationships in college residence halls is associated with perceived quality of the college experience, student academic performance, and better psychological adjustment (Lovejoy, Perkins, & Collins, 1995).

Outcome information would also be valuable for determining the impact of a specific goal preference within conflict situations. Approximately one-third of this sample was found to have a specific goal preference in response to the conflict scenarios; the greatest proportion of participants preferred the revenge goal. If this revenge orientation was indeed found to be linked to deviant social outcomes, as hypothesized by some researchers (Chung & Asher, 1996), identification and intervention efforts could be directed specifically towards these individuals in order to modify these preferences. In addition, the outcome for participants with a preference to maintain a relationship in the face of conflict is not known. Although it is possible to assume these adolescents have satisfying peer relationships, it is also possible to theorize negative implications from such a relationship oriented perspective may occur (e.g., being taken advantage of by less socially motivated peers). Finally, the
impact of those adolescents with predominantly self-focused social goals is also unknown. These adolescents appeared quite flexible in their use of goals in peer conflicts. It is possible this is a constructive and adaptable approach to conflicts; however, it could be likely these adolescents are actually manipulative in the conflict situations, and this type of interaction could have an adverse effect on their peer relationships. Future research linking conflict goals and strategies to subsequent outcomes on peer and individual adjustment is needed to better understand these relationships.

Social information processing and future research. In Crick and Dodge’s (1994) model of social information processing, children select certain goals prior to the selection of a behavioral strategy, but these goals may be modified due to the interplay between social goals and many other social-cognitive variables (Erdley & Asher, 1999). The present study was limited in that only a portion of this model was examined; integrating other social cognitive variables that influence the selection of goals and strategies would build upon current findings to determine a more accurate overall model of adolescent peer conflict. Although goals and strategies were clearly linked in the present study, future research will help delineate more specific understanding of this association. Aspects of the social information processing model that may influence goal and strategy selections in peer conflicts will be briefly outlined as a guide for future research.

The first two steps of Crick and Dodge’s (1994) social information processing model suggest that social knowledge acquired through previous experience is used to attend to and interpret social cues. The present study did not investigate whether a participant’s attributions impact interpretation of social cues in the conflict situation. Those participants with a preference for certain goals may have corresponding attributions for social behaviors. For
instance, research could investigate if those with a preference for revenge base their preference on negative attributions (e.g., perceived hostility) towards their peers.

The third step of the social information processing model (clarification of goals) has particular significance for the present study. Crick and Dodge (1994) have suggested that individuals bring a certain goal orientation to every social situation. Future research with adolescents would need to further clarify the proportion of those who have a certain goal preference. Only one-third of the sample in this study had such a preference, and in contrast to findings with children (Rose & Asher, 1999), the greatest proportion of those preferred revenge oriented goals. Future research is needed to verify whether other samples of adolescents have similar distributions of goal preferences. The original parametric method proposed to compare mean rating scores for goals (based on similar research with children) was not able to be utilized because the generally similar ratings given to the goals by this sample of adolescents did not allow for distinct preferences to be identified. The nonparametric ranking procedure that was utilized is clearly of value to ascertain data that might be otherwise obscured by parametric analysis; therefore, future research should investigate the most appropriate methods to identify specific goal preferences.

Several other variables influence the steps of social information processing but were outside the scope of the current study, such as the self-efficacy needed to achieve a desired goal or strategy. In addition, the expectation that an individual perceives, based on past experience, for a particular outcome in a conflict situation influences the likelihood that a goal or strategy will be selected (Erdley & Asher, 1999). Conflict research with children (Crick & Ladd, 1990) has indicated that children who have experienced rejection by their peers may anticipate, based on past experience, a negative reaction from peers to their
attempts at prosocial or relationship-oriented goals or strategies. Therefore, they might avoid repetition of these previously unsuccessful attempts and instead utilize a different type of solution, believing that it may be more successful. Children who have experienced social success and acceptance, however, are more likely to continue engaging in relationship-oriented goals and strategies in order to continue previous success. This may explain the difference that was seen between the young girls in previous studies who were predominantly motivated to maintain relationships and female adolescents in the present study who utilized self-focused goals rather than relationship maintenance goals. Future research is necessary to test the hypothesis that a shift may occur during adolescence for females towards greater focus on the self in conflicts rather than the maintenance of the relationship.

Several other factors are known to be significant influences on the goals and strategies that adolescents enact in peer conflicts but were outside the scope of this study to investigate. One such factor is the role of the family system in shaping the goals and strategies an adolescent formulates in a conflict. Path analyses conducted by Reese-Weber and Bertle-Haring (1998) indicated that the conflict resolution strategies within a late adolescent’s family of origin predicted conflict resolution strategies that adolescents’ employed in romantic relationship. Attachment and mood regulation have also been linked to adolescents’ conflict management style and relationship functioning with best friends and romantic partners (Creasy et al., 1999). These are valid areas of exploration to investigate some of the gender differences found across varying types of relationships in the present study. For instance, it is likely females feel more securely attached to a long-standing best friend than a relatively new romantic partner, which could account for the importance placed on friendships between females that was not apparent between males.
This theory is supported by research by Reese-Weber and Marchand (2002) that explored the impact of familial and individual attributes on gender differences in late adolescents’ romantic relationships. Conflict resolution strategies with both parents were significant predictors of adolescent-romantic partner conflict resolution behaviors for females. For males, however, only conflict resolution behaviors with fathers affected their adolescent romantic relationships. Attachment anxiety towards a romantic partner (i.e., anxiety about anticipating rejection or abandonment by the partner) was predictive of positive and negative conflict resolution behaviors for females, as those who reported more attachment anxiety used more negative and fewer positive conflict resolutions strategies. The researchers indicated this finding may support previous data that suggested females are more relationship oriented than males. However, gender differences are clearly an area for future research to investigate, as the present study found males rated female romantic partners much more positively than the females rated their male romantic partners.

*Social perspective-taking and future research.* Selman’s (1986) model of social perspective-taking was not explicitly assessed in this study, but was used as a rational for envisioning adolescent conflict strategies differently from children’s conflict strategies. Selman’s model posits that the manner in which children and adolescents resolve peer conflicts changes over time as skills in social perspective-taking develop. According to his theory, adolescents should make use of the Level 3 strategies of collaboration and negotiation, which are the most advanced strategies in his model. However, data from Weitzman (2001) from a sample of female college undergraduates who described recent conflicts indicated that the use of Selman’s conflict strategies varied as a function of differing relationship types, not necessarily developmental age. The majority of conflict strategies
utilized by the adolescent females were submissive, Level 1 strategies characteristic of children of a much younger age, such as giving in or going behind a person’s back to achieve a goal. Weitzman indicated women tended to rely on lower-level strategies, particularly in relationships with someone other than with a best friend. Although best friend relationships were clearly valued by women in the present study, overall results seems to contradict Weitzman’s findings, as women’s strategies (and goals) across all relationships were constructive and empowering rather than submissive to others. Men, in contrast, showed greater indication of problematic conflict resolutions skills, especially with a roommate. Further research with the use of Selman’s model of social perspective taking would be useful to clarify gender differences found across varying relationships, as it appears Level 3 strategies are not uniformly applied in conflict situations, as expected in the adolescent stage of development.
Implications and Conclusions

The specific findings of this study have several implications. This study, in addition to studies with younger children, clearly shows the relation between goals and strategies in conflict situations with peers. Goals that adolescents chose in this study were meaningfully related to the strategies they chose for resolving a conflict with a peer. In addition, this study supported previous findings (Chung & Asher, 1996; Rose & Asher, 1999) that some individuals have a particular preference for certain social goals, including those that are constructive and destructive. Because maladaptive goals have been linked with negative outcomes for children and adolescents, identifying and changing the goal priorities of these individuals may enhance the effectiveness of many current social skills intervention programs and conflict resolution programs primarily focused on changing behavioral strategies (Erdley & Asher, 1995).

The gender differences found in relationship types are also important findings for intervention purposes. For instance, university housing officials, who are increasingly developing residential conflict resolution programs for undergraduates (Lovejoy, Perkins, & Collins, 1995), could target intervention efforts differently for males, as their goals and strategies towards roommates are much more negative than females. Thus, they may need a different type of intervention than females to address appropriate goal and strategy selections in roommate conflicts.

Because of the importance of peer relationships in adolescence, every effort needs to be undertaken to gain an increased understanding of the social cognitive variables that comprise appropriate social interactions, including conflict with peers. The present study advances the study of the relation of social goals and conflict resolution strategies in
adolescent peer conflict situations. By examining the social cognitive processes of those with specific goal orientations and investigating gender differences in varying relationship types, the study is an initial step towards understanding the complex nature of conflict among adolescent peers.
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Appendix A

Carolina State University

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Title of Study: Social Goals and Strategies in Adolescent Peer Conflict Situations

Principal Investigator: Sara E. Little, M.S.
Faculty Sponsor: Mary E. Haskett, Ph.D.

You are invited to participate in a research study. The purpose of this study is to understand conflicts that could arise in relationships with your best friends, roommates, and romantic partners. You will be asked to complete a survey involving hypothetical situations and to rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with a series of statements.

INFORMATION

1. After reviewing the informed consent form, a research assistant will then read directions for the survey and review a practice item. Study participants will then be asked to complete a brief survey. Participants will be asked to stay until everyone has completed the survey, at which time the research assistant will review additional information.
2. Participation in this study is expected to last approximately 30-45 minutes.

RISKS

No risks are foreseen by participating in this study.

BENEFITS

Study participants will gain a better knowledge of how psychological research is conducted.

CONFIDENTIALITY

The information in the study records will be kept strictly confidential. Data will be stored securely and will be made available only to persons conducting the study unless you specifically give permission in writing to do otherwise. No reference will be made in oral or written reports which could link you to the study.

COMPENSATION

For participating in this study you will receive two hours of credit towards your research requirement. Other ways to earn the same amount of credit are writing a three-page review of a published journal article. If you withdraw from the study prior to its completion, you will still receive two hours of credit towards your research requirement.
CONTACT

If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, you may contact the principal researcher, Sara Little, at 817-871-2486, or the faculty sponsor, Dr. Mary Haskett, at 919-515-1710. If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact Dr. Matthew Zingraff, Chair of the NCSU IRB for the Use of Human Subjects in Research Committee, Box 7514, NCSU Campus (919/515-1834) or Mr. Matthew Ronning, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Research Administration, Box 7514, NCSU Campus (919/513-2148).

PARTICIPATION

Your participation in this study is voluntary; you may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty and without loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you withdraw from the study before data collection is completed, your data will be returned to you or destroyed.

CONSENT

I have read and understand the above information. I have received a copy of this form. I agree to participate in this study.

Subject’s signature: ______________________________  Date ________________

Investigator’s signature: ___________________________ Date ________________
Appendix B

Debriefing Statement

This study is examining whether certain goals and strategies in young adults’ peer relationships are related to each other. Previous research with children has shown that specific goals tend to be correlated with specific strategies when participants are confronted with fairly benign conflict situations. This study is examining whether the same types of correlations are found. It is also investigating whether there are gender differences in which goals and strategies are endorsed or are found across relationship types, including best friends, romantic partners, and roommates.

The questionnaire you just completed assessed six different strategies in young adults’ peer conflicts, including accommodation, compromise, verbal aggression, self-interest assertion, withdrawal from the situation, and emotional manipulation goals. It also assessed six different goals, including maintaining the relationship, being fair, seeking revenge, maintaining personal control, pursuing self-interest, and reducing tension. By participating in this study, we hope that you have gained a better understanding of how psychological research is conducted. If you have any questions, please feel free to ask them now or to call the numbers below. Thank you for participating.

Sara Little: 515 - 3416
Dr. Mary Haskett: 515 - 1710
Appendix C
Conflict Resolution – Adolescent Measure (CRAM)

Instructions

This questionnaire contains 15 hypothetical conflicts involving you and another person. After reading each situation, please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with a series of statements regarding what you would do in that situation and what your goals would be for that situation. You will rate each statement on a 0-6 point scale, with 0 indicating you very strongly disagree with the statement and 6 indicating you very strongly agree with that statement.

Please rate each statement without thinking about your ratings for other statements. For instance, when you are asked about your goals, you can give more than one statement a high (or low) rating if you wish. You will be asked to imagine hypothetical conflicts with three different people, including a best friend, a romantic partner, and a roommate. Please imagine these as three separate people (i.e., your best friend is not also your roommate).

If there is a statement that you do not want to rate, you may skip it. If at any time you want to stop filling out the questionnaire or stop participating in this study, you may do so without any penalty to your research credits or class grade. Please read carefully and take your time, as you will be asked to stay until everyone in the room is finished with the questionnaire. When you are finished, please go back and make sure that you did not accidentally skip any items. Please do not write or make any marks on this questionnaire. Please let me know if you have any questions. Thank you.
SAMPLE: It is your roommate’s turn to clean the apartment you share. You have company on the way over and would like the apartment to be clean by the time they get there. Your roommate is studying for a big test right now, however, and says he/she can’t clean it right now.

Please use the following 0-6 scale to rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement:

0 = disagree very strongly
1 = disagree strongly
2 = disagree somewhat
3 = neither agree nor disagree
4 = agree somewhat
5 = agree strongly
6 = agree very strongly

Using the 0-6 scale above, please rate what you would do in this situation.

1. I would tell my roommate to clean the apartment.
2. I would act cold and distant towards my roommate.
3. I would suggest that my roommate finish studying and clean after he/she finishes studying.
4. I would say something insulting to my roommate.
5. I would just not have the apartment cleaned.
6. I would tell my roommate to finish studying, and I will clean the apartment.

Using the 0-6 scale above, please rate what your goals would be in this situation.

7. I would be trying to keep myself from getting upset.
8. I would be trying to get my roommate to clean the apartment.
9. I would be trying to make sure things were done fairly.
10. I would be trying to get back at my roommate.
11. I would be trying to keep my roommate from pushing me around.
12. I would be trying to stay friends.

PLEASE STOP UNTIL THE RESEARCH ASSISTANT CONTINUES WITH FURTHER INSTRUCTIONS.
A. You and your best friend are planning to organize a dinner outing for a bunch of your friends. You want everyone to go out for Italian food, but your best friend tells you that he/she wants to have Mexican food. You tell your best friend that you really want to have Italian food, but he/she insists on having Mexican food.

Please use the following 0-6 scale to rate the extent to which to you agree or disagree with each statement:

0 = disagree very strongly
1 = disagree strongly
2 = disagree somewhat
3 = neither agree nor disagree
4 = agree somewhat
5 = agree strongly
6 = agree very strongly

Using the 0-6 scale above, please rate what you would do in this situation.

13. I would tell my best friend that we could go out for Mexican food.

14. I would tell my best friend we could have Mexican food this time if next time we could have Italian food.

15. I would say something insulting to my best friend.

16. I would tell my best friend that we would go out for Italian food.

17. I would just not make arrangements for the outing.

18. I would act cold and distant towards my best friend.

Using the 0-6 scale above, please rate what your goals would be in this situation.

19. I would be trying to stay friends.

20. I would be trying to make sure things were done fairly.

21. I would be trying to get back at my best friend.

22. I would be trying to keep myself from getting upset.

23. I would be trying to keep my best friend from pushing me around.

24. I would be trying to go out for Italian food.
B. Every Friday night, you and your boyfriend/girlfriend take turns picking a restaurant to eat at and making the reservations for dinner. This Friday is his/her turn and he/she calls you an hour ahead and tells you he’s/she’s had a really busy day and was not able to make the arrangements. He/she asks you to decide on a restaurant and make the reservations.

Please use the following 0-6 scale to rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement:

0 = disagree very strongly  
1 = disagree strongly  
2 = disagree somewhat  
3 = neither agree nor disagree  
4 = agree somewhat  
5 = agree strongly  
6 = agree very strongly

Using the 0-6 scale above, please rate what you would do in this situation.

25. I would tell my boyfriend/girlfriend to make the reservations himself/herself.

26. I would make the reservations for my boyfriend/girlfriend.

27. I would say something insulting to my boyfriend/girlfriend.

28. I would act cold and distant towards my boyfriend/girlfriend.

29. I would tell my boyfriend/girlfriend that I would make the arrangements this time, but next time was his/her turn.

30. I would just not go to dinner.

Using the 0-6 rating scale above, please rate what your goals would be in this situation.

31. I would be trying to keep myself from getting upset.

32. I would be trying to stay together.

33. I would be trying to get back at my boyfriend/girlfriend.

34. I would be trying to have my boyfriend/girlfriend make the arrangements.

35. I would be trying to make sure things were done fairly.

36. I would be trying to keep my boyfriend/girlfriend from pushing me around.
C. You and your **best friend** always go bowling together on Monday nights. One week, your best friend gets an invitation to do something else and wants to accept the invitation and not go bowling with you. You still want to go bowling, though, and wish your best friend would refuse the other invitation.

Please use the following 0-6 scale to rate the extent to which to you agree or disagree with each statement:

- 0 = disagree very strongly
- 1 = disagree strongly
- 2 = disagree somewhat
- 3 = neither agree nor disagree
- 4 = agree somewhat
- 5 = agree strongly
- 6 = agree very strongly

Using the 0-6 scale above, please rate what you would do in this situation.

37. I would act cold and distant towards my best friend.
38. I would just not go bowling.
39. I would tell my best friend to refuse the other invitation.
40. I would suggest that we all go bowling together.
41. I would tell my best friend to accept the other invitation.
42. I would say something insulting to my best friend.

Using the 0-6 scale above, please rate what your **goals** would be in this situation.

43. I would be trying to go bowling with my best friend.
44. I would be trying to keep my best friend from pushing me around.
45. I would be trying to keep myself from getting upset.
46. I would be trying to make sure things were done fairly.
47. I would be trying to stay friends.
48. I would be trying to get back at my best friend.
D. It is the cheap time to call long-distance and you really want to call your friend in another state. As you are about to call him/her, your roommate tells you that he/she really wants to call his/her mother right then. You tell your roommate that you want to call your friend right now, but he/she tells you that he/she wants to use the phone now too.

Please use the following 0-6 scale to rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement:

- 0 = disagree very strongly
- 1 = disagree strongly
- 2 = disagree somewhat
- 3 = neither agree nor disagree
- 4 = agree somewhat
- 5 = agree strongly
- 6 = agree very strongly

Using the 0-6 scale above, please rate what you would do in this situation.

49. I would act cold and distant towards my roommate.

50. I would tell my roommate I was calling my friend.

51. I would just not call my friend.

52. I would suggest that I talk to my friend briefly and then my roommate could call his/her mother.

53. I would say something insulting to my roommate.

54. I would let my roommate call his/her mother.

Using the 0-6 scale above, please rate what your goals would be in this situation.

55. I would be trying to call my friend right then.

56. I would be trying to keep myself from getting upset.

57. I would be trying to keep my roommate from pushing me around.

58. I would be trying to make sure things were done fairly.

59. I would be trying to get back at my roommate.

60. I would be trying to stay friends.
E. You have an important test to study for and need your boyfriend’s/girlfriend’s help because he/she is very familiar with the material that you need to know. When you ask for help, your boyfriend/girlfriend tells you he/she really needs to go to the gym for physical therapy. You tell your boyfriend/girlfriend that you really need his/her help, but he/she still tells you that he/she needs to go to the gym.

Please use the following 0-6 scale to rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement:

0 = disagree very strongly
1 = disagree strongly
2 = disagree somewhat
3 = neither agree nor disagree
4 = agree somewhat
5 = agree strongly
6 = agree very strongly

Using the 0-6 scale above, please rate what you would do in this situation.

61. I would suggest that my boyfriend/girlfriend go to the gym after he/she helped me.

62. I would just not study.

63. I would act cold and distant towards my boyfriend/girlfriend.

64. I would say something insulting to my boyfriend/girlfriend.

65. I would tell my boyfriend/girlfriend to go to the gym.

66. I would tell my boyfriend/girlfriend to help me.

Using the 0-6 scale above, please rate what your goals would be in this situation.

67. I would be trying to make sure things were done fairly.

68. I would be trying to keep my boyfriend/girlfriend from pushing me around.

69. I would be trying to get my boyfriend/girlfriend to help me study.

70. I would be trying to get back at my boyfriend/girlfriend.

71. I would be trying to stay together.

72. I would be trying to keep myself from getting upset.
F. You and your **best friend** are planning to go to his/her grandparents’ beach house this weekend. You want to visit his/her grandparents’ just with your best friend, but he/she asks another friend to come with you without asking you if it is okay first.

Please use the following 0-6 scale to rate the extent to which to you agree or disagree with each statement:

- 0 = disagree very strongly
- 1 = disagree strongly
- 2 = disagree somewhat
- 3 = neither agree nor disagree
- 4 = agree somewhat
- 5 = agree strongly
- 6 = agree very strongly

Using the 0-6 scale above, please rate **what you would do in this situation**.

73. I would just not go.

74. I would tell my best friend that we should just go alone.

75. I would suggest that we go alone this time, but bring someone else with us the next time if he/she wanted to.

76. I would act cold and distant towards my best friend.

77. I would say something insulting to my best friend.

78. I would tell my best friend it was okay if someone else came with us.

Using the 0-6 scale above, please rate **what your goals would be in this situation**.

79. I would be trying to keep my best friend from pushing me around.

80. I would be trying to keep myself from getting upset.

81. I would be trying to make sure things were done fairly.

82. I would be trying to go to my best friend’s grandparents’ just with my best friend.

83. I would be trying to get back at my best friend.

84. I would be trying to stay friends.
G. You and your roommate always go to a club on Friday nights. This week, your roommate gets an invitation to do something else and wants to skip going to a club this week. You still want to stick to the plan, though, and wish your roommate would come with you.

Please use the following 0-6 scale to rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement:

0 = disagree very strongly
1 = disagree strongly
2 = disagree somewhat
3 = neither agree nor disagree
4 = agree somewhat
5 = agree strongly
6 = agree very strongly

Using the 0-6 scale above, please rate what you would do in this situation.

85. I would tell my roommate to accept the other invitation.
86. I would act cold and distant towards my roommate.
87. I would just not go to a club.
88. I would say something insulting to my roommate.
89. I would tell my roommate that we should all go to a club together.
90. I would tell my roommate to come to a club with me.

Using the 0-6 scale above, please rate what your goals would be in this situation.

91. I would be trying to stay friends.
92. I would be trying to go to a club with my roommate.
93. I would be trying to keep my roommate from pushing me around.
94. I would be trying to get back at my roommate.
95. I would be trying to make sure things were done fairly.
96. I would be trying to keep myself from getting upset.
H. You and your **boyfriend/girlfriend** are renting a movie and there is one you really want to see. Your boyfriend/girlfriend, however, tells you that he/she wants to see another movie. When you tell him/her that you had your heart set on your choice, he/she continues to insist on renting his/her choice.

Please use the following 0-6 scale to rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement:

- 0 = disagree very strongly
- 1 = disagree strongly
- 2 = disagree somewhat
- 3 = neither agree nor disagree
- 4 = agree somewhat
- 5 = agree strongly
- 6 = agree very strongly

Using the 0-6 scale above, please rate **what you would do** in this situation:

97. I would just not rent a movie.

98. I would tell my boyfriend/girlfriend that he/she could pick the movie.

99. I would tell my boyfriend/girlfriend we would rent my choice.

100. I would tell my boyfriend/girlfriend that he/she could pick this time if I could pick the next time.

101. I would say something insulting to my boyfriend/girlfriend.

102. I would act cold and distant towards my boyfriend/girlfriend.

Using the 0-6 scale above, please rate **what your goals would be** in this situation:

103. I would be trying to keep my boyfriend/girlfriend from pushing me around.

104. I would be trying to stay together.

105. I would be trying to keep myself from getting upset.

106. I would be trying to make sure things were done fairly.

107. I would be trying to get back at my boyfriend/girlfriend.

108. I would be trying to rent my movie choice.
I. You and your **best friend** take turns making a fun breakfast on Saturday mornings. This week is his/her turn and he/she calls you an hour before your usual meeting time and tells you that he/she does not have anything to prepare and could you run to the store and get something and make it because he/she just got up and still needs to take a shower.

Please use the following 0-6 scale to rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement:

- 0 = disagree very strongly
- 1 = disagree strongly
- 2 = disagree somewhat
- 3 = neither agree nor disagree
- 4 = agree somewhat
- 5 = agree strongly
- 6 = agree very strongly

Using the 0-6 scale above, please rate what you would **do** in this situation.

109. I would get something to prepare for my best friend.

110. I would just not have breakfast with my best friend.

111. I would tell my best friend to go and get something for breakfast.

112. I would tell my best friend I would get breakfast this week, but that next week was his/her turn.

113. I would act cold and distant towards my best friend.

114. I would say something insulting to my best friend.

Using the 0-6 scale above, please rate what your **goals** would be in this situation.

115. I would be trying to stay friends.

116. I would be trying to keep my best friend from pushing me around.

117. I would be trying to keep myself from getting upset.

118. I would be trying to make sure things were done fairly.

119. I would be trying to have my best friend make me breakfast.

120. I would be trying to get back at my best friend.
J. You and your roommate have made a special ritual of watching a favorite show together every Sunday night. The two of you always watch it alone, but this week, your roommate invites someone else to come and watch it with you without asking you if it is okay first.

Please use the following 0-6 scale to rate the extent to which to you agree or disagree with each statement:

0 = disagree very strongly
1 = disagree strongly
2 = disagree somewhat
3 = neither agree nor disagree
4 = agree somewhat
5 = agree strongly
6 = agree very strongly

Using the 0-6 scale above, please rate what you would do in this situation.

121. I would act cold and distant towards my roommate.
122. I would watch the show with my roommate and his/her friend.
123. I would say something insulting to my roommate.
124. I would tell my roommate that we could watch the show all together, but to please ask me first the next time.
125. I would just not watch the show.
126. I would tell my roommate that we would watch it alone.

Using the 0-6 scale above, please rate what your goals would be in this situation.

127. I would be trying to watch the show just with my roommate.
128. I would be trying to stay friends.
129. I would be trying to get back at my roommate.
130. I would be trying to make sure things were done fairly.
131. I would be trying to keep my roommate from pushing me around.
132. I would be trying to keep myself from getting upset.
K. You are really sick in bed with a cold and ask your best friend to get you some medicine before he/she goes to class. Your best friend tells you that he/she doesn’t have time because he/she can’t be late for class, but you really need the medicine.

Please use the following 0-6 scale to rate the extent to which to you agree or disagree with each statement:

0 = disagree very strongly  
1 = disagree strongly  
2 = disagree somewhat  
3 = neither agree nor disagree  
4 = agree somewhat  
5 = agree strongly  
6 = agree very strongly

Using the 0-6 scale above, please rate what you would do in this situation.

133. I would ask my best friend if he/she would get the medicine after class.
134. I would just not get the medicine.
135. I would say something insulting to my best friend.
136. I would get the medicine myself.
137. I would act cold and distant towards my best friend.
138. I would tell my best friend to get my medicine before class.

Using the 0-6 scale above, please rate what your goals would be in this situation.

139. I would be trying to make sure things were done fairly.
140. I would be trying to keep my best friend from pushing me around.
141. I would be trying to get back at my best friend.
142. I would be trying to stay friends.
143. I would be trying to have my best friend get my medicine.
144. I would be trying to keep myself from getting upset.
L. You and your boyfriend/girlfriend usually go to concerts alone and you are looking forward to spending time alone with him/her tonight at a concert. At the last minute, though, he/she invites another friend to come with you without asking if it is okay first.

Please use the following 0-6 scale to rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement:

0 = disagree very strongly
1 = disagree strongly
2 = disagree somewhat
3 = neither agree nor disagree
4 = agree somewhat
5 = agree strongly
6 = agree very strongly

Using the 0-6 scale above, please rate what you would do in this situation.

145. I would just not go to the concert.
146. I would act cold and distant towards my boyfriend/girlfriend.
147. I would tell my boyfriend/girlfriend we should go to the concert alone.
148. I would say something insulting to my boyfriend/girlfriend.
149. I would go to the concert with my boyfriend/girlfriend and his/her other friend.
150. I would tell my boyfriend/girlfriend that we should go alone this time and bring someone else with us next time if he/she wanted to.

Using the 0-6 above, please rate what your goals would be in this situation.

151. I would be trying to keep my boyfriend/girlfriend from pushing me around.
152. I would be trying to go to the concert just with my boyfriend/girlfriend.
153. I would be trying to keep myself from getting upset.
154. I would be trying to get back at my boyfriend/girlfriend.
155. I would be trying to stay together.
156. I would be trying to make sure things were done fairly.
M. You and your roommate usually take turns washing the dishes after dinner. Recently, however, your roommate has not been taking his/her turn, leaving you to do all the dishes every night.

Please use the following 0-6 scale to rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement:

0 = disagree very strongly
1 = disagree strongly
2 = disagree somewhat
3 = neither agree nor disagree
4 = agree somewhat
5 = agree strongly
6 = agree very strongly

Using the 0-6 scale above, please rate what you would do in this situation.

157. I would say something insulting to my roommate.

158. I would tell my roommate to wash the dishes.

159. I would just not wash the dishes.

160. I would act cold and distant towards my roommate.

161. I would tell my roommate that I would do the dishes that night if he/she would do them the next night.

162. I would do the dishes for my roommate.

Using the 0-6 scale above, please rate what your goals would be in this situation.

163. I would be trying to get back at my roommate.

164. I would be trying to keep myself from getting upset.

165. I would be trying to keep my roommate from pushing me around.

166. I would be trying to have my roommate wash the dishes.

167. I would be trying to make sure things were done fairly.

168. I would be trying to stay friends.
N. Your **boyfriend/girlfriend** goes to a different university and the two of you always meet for breaks and holidays so that you can spend time together. This year, your boyfriend/girlfriend tells you that he/she wants to spend Thanksgiving with his/her university friends, but you still want to be with him/her.

Please use the following 0-6 scale to rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement:

0 = disagree very strongly
1 = disagree strongly
2 = disagree somewhat
3 = neither agree nor disagree
4 = agree somewhat
5 = agree strongly
6 = agree very strongly

Using the 0-6 scale above, please rate what you would **do** in this situation.

169. I would say something insulting to my boyfriend/girlfriend.
170. I would suggest that we spend Thanksgiving together with his/her friends.
171. I would act cold and distant towards my boyfriend/girlfriend.
172. I would tell my boyfriend/girlfriend to spend Thanksgiving with me.
173. I would just not spend Thanksgiving with my boyfriend/girlfriend.
174. I would tell my boyfriend/girlfriend it was okay if we didn’t see each other.

Using the 0-6 scale above, please rate what your **goals** would be in this situation.

175. I would be trying to get back at my boyfriend/girlfriend.
176. I would be trying to make sure things were done fairly.
177. I would be trying to spend Thanksgiving with my boyfriend/girlfriend.
178. I would be trying to keep myself from getting upset.
179. I would be trying to keep my boyfriend/girlfriend from pushing me around.
180. I would be trying to stay together.
O. After classes one day, you ask your roommate to take you to pick up your car from the garage before it closes for the night. Your roommate is watching a video for a class and tells you that he/she really needs to finish watching it, but you still need your roommate to help you.

Please use the following 0-6 scale to rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement:

- 0 = disagree very strongly
- 1 = disagree strongly
- 2 = disagree somewhat
- 3 = neither agree nor disagree
- 4 = agree somewhat
- 5 = agree strongly
- 6 = agree very strongly

Using the 0-6 scale above, please rate what you would do in this situation.

181. I would tell my roommate to take me to get my car.
182. I would act cold and distant towards my roommate.
183. I would suggest that my roommate finish watching the video and take me to get my car first thing in the morning.
184. I would say something insulting to my roommate.
185. I would just not get my car.
186. I would tell my roommate to finish watching the video and I would take a bus to get my car.

Using the 0-6 scale above, please rate what your goals would be in this situation.

187. I would be trying to keep myself from getting upset.
188. I would be trying to get my roommate to take me to get my car.
189. I would be trying to make sure things were done fairly.
190. I would be trying to get back at my roommate.
191. I would be trying to keep my roommate from pushing me around.
192. I would be trying to stay friends.
Please describe yourself:

193. What is your gender?
   a. male
   b. female

194. How old are you?
   a. 18
   b. 19
   c. 20
   d. 21

195. What year are you in school?
   a. freshman
   b. sophomore
   c. junior
   d. senior
   e. graduate student, special student, or other

196. Your major is best described as?
   a. Psychology
   b. Physical Science or Engineering
   c. Life science
   d. Liberal Arts
   e. Other

197. How would you best describe your relationship status?
   a. not currently dating
   b. dating one person exclusively
   c. dating several people
   d. engaged
   e. married

198. What is your housing situation?
   a. in a single dorm room
   b. in a dorm room with a roommate
   c. in an apartment/house alone
   d. in an apartment/house with roommates
   e. in fraternity/sorority housing
   f. living with family member(s)
   g. other
199. What best describes your racial/ethnic identity?
   a. American Indian or Alaska Native
   b. Asian
   c. Black or African American
   d. Hispanic or Latino
   e. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   f. White
   g. More than one race

200. Have you ever received any type of peer mediation or conflict resolution training?
   a. yes
   b. no
Appendix D
Hierarchical Clustering Report for Conflict Strategies

Page/Date/Time  2  02-26-2003 03:34:51
Database
Variables  X_1 to X_230
Clustering Method  Group Average (Unweighted Pair-Group)
Distance Type  Euclidean
Scale Type  Standard Deviation

Dendrogram Section

Dendrogram

X_NAME_

W_ALL

VA_ALL

EM_ALL

SI_ALL

COM_ALL

ACC_ALL

Dissimilarity

2.00  1.50  1.00  0.50  0.00
Appendix E
Hierarchical Clustering Report for Conflict Goals

Page/Date/Time  2   02-26-2003 03:40:58
Database       C:\Program Files\NCSS97\Report\tr_goal.S0
Variables      X_1 to X_230
Clustering Method Group Average (Unweighted Pair-Group)
Distance Type  Euclidean
Scale Type     Standard Deviation

Dendrogram Section

Dendrogram

X_NAME

R_ALL
PC_ALL
S_ALL
RT_ALL
M_ALL
MR_ALL

Dissimilarity

2.00  1.50  1.00  0.50  0.00