The Survey of Relationship of Attachment Styles and Self-Efficacy to Conflict Resolution Styles of Sport Coaches

[1]M. Narimani, [2]H.R. Agamohammadian and [2]M. Ghaffari
[1]Department of Psychology, University of Mohaghegh Ardabili, Ardabil, Iran
[2]Department of Psychology, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran

Abstract: The main aim of this study is to evaluate relationship of attachment styles and self-efficacy to conflict resolution styles among sport coaches. Statistical sample include 120 of coaches of sport centers of Ardabil province at 2006. Research method was correlation. For data collection Rahim's conflict resolution styles questionnaire, revised adults attachment scale of Collins and Read and Bandura's self-efficacy questionnaire were used. For data analysis Pierson correlation and multivariate regression in enter method were used and obtained results showed negative significant relationship of dominant conflict resolution style to self-efficacy and secure attachment styles of coaches ($p<0.05$). There is negative relationship between avoidant conflict resolution style with self-efficacy and secure attachment style. There is negative relationship between avoidant conflict resolution style and secure attachment style among coaches ($p<0.05$) and there is positive significant relationship between avoidant conflict resolution style with insecure and avoidant insecure attachment style of coaches ($p<0.05$). Multivariate regression coefficient in enter method showed that secure, insecure, avoidant insecure and self-efficacy attachment style are as predictor variables of dominant, avoidant and cooperative conflict resolution styles.

Key words: Conflict resolution style, coaches, attachment styles, self-efficacy

INTRODUCTION

Conflict term means competition, incompatibility, non-adjustment, inconsistency, disapproval, strife and dispute (Amidi, 2002). Slabbert (2004) know conflict as a expression that disrupt function of one and organization. Conflict is of concepts that different meanings are derived of it Slabbert (2004). Psychologist were more tending to its psychological aspects as internal conflict and sociologist were more tending to social aspect of conflict means conflicts between persons and groups (Ghasemi, 2003). In sport societies since athletics and coaches are interacting, differences and strains are natural events, because athletics are different in social, cultural and economical aspects, even there is difference between their needs, expects and behaviors that all cause conflict (Robbins, 1998). Cross believe that conflict is destructive and inevitable and believe that most of conflicts are manifold appearing in centers. In contrast Maye (1995) believe that conflict in organizations and groups is a social disease (Mayseless, 1996). Evan (1965) reports in an article that conflict shouldn't contradicted one-sided and shouldn't regarded harmful. Being advantageous or harmful depend on conflict resolution styles. Several variables are related to conflict resolution styles of coaches among these variables are personality characteristics like attachment styles of coaches. Attachment style is one of most important factors in interpersonal interactions that is formed in the childhood and continue according to environment which in the one has evolved (Sarafraz, 2006). Different styles of interaction between child and who care forms three styles of attachment; secure, avoidant-insecure and anxious-insecure (Sarafraz, 2006). Secure persons rely on world and have tendency to having intimate and positive relation with others (Engels *et al.*, 2001). Avoidant insecure persons avoid establishing intimate relation with others because they fear to be ostracized by others (Ciechanowski *et al.*, 2003). Avoidant-ambivalence insecure persons are dependent and monopolist in their emotional relation with others and worry about ostracism and dislodging by others and try to decrease separation anxiety by severe dependency to others (Delavar, 1995). Different studies have done about effect of attachment on conflict resolution style of coaches, for example Banerjee believed that attachment styles of coaches has a significant effect on their tutelage (Banerjee, 2006). Also, Pistole (1989) found out that role of attachment styles in conflict decrease is significant.

Corresponding Author: M. Narimani, Department of Psychology, University of Mohaghegh Ardabili, Ardabil, Iran

Attachment styles of persons specify conflict resolution style usage way (Cohn *et al.*, 1992; Kobak *et al.*, 1993; Kobak and Deumler, 1994). Persons with avoidant attachment style use cooperative conflict resolution style very lesser in comparison with secure persons (Corcoran and Mallinckrodt, 2000). Persons with secure attachment style act more effective than others in management and controlling sentiments of themselves and others. Secure persons act more competent than others in conflict and stress occasions (Caldwell, 1995). Insecure persons ask for lesser help of others in comparison with other groups because of their doubt about others (Bartholomew and Horowitz, 1991). However, this tendency (tendency to cooperative behaviors) among secure persons is at high level (Kummel, 1999). Some of researchers has assessed relationship between personality factors like attachment styles and conflict resolution styles positive and has executed studies for it (Morris and Brassard, 2006). Relationship between attachment styles and conflict resolution styles is positive in the friendly relations (Karney and Bradbury, 1995; Mearns, 1991; Cowan *et al.*, 1996). Self-efficacy is of other internal or personality factors that affect conflict resolution style of coaches. Self-efficacy indicates to one's judgments about his/her abilities, capacities and capabilities for doing especial assignments (Arianpoor, 2005). In Bandaura's opinion, set of beliefs and expectations about abilities related to effective assignment executing and accomplishment of what should be accomplished is one of self-concept's elements of each person and has named this element as self-efficacy (Bandaura, 1997). Bandaura believe that one's especial expectations about his/her abilities for especial activities execution is effective on his/her effort in execution of the activity, endurance and suitable motivations. Furthermore self-efficacy has positive relationship with previous achievements (Arianpoor, 2005). Different researches have been done about effect of self-efficacy on conflict resolution styles of coaches. Foe example Alper *et al.* (2000) discovered that reducing of conflict among groups coaches resulted in their own self-efficacy augmentation (Ghasemi, 2003). There is relationship between cooperative conflict resolution style and self-efficacy (Sipps *et al.*, 1988). Relationship between conflict resolution styles and self-efficacy and pluckiness is positive (Volkema and Bergmann, 1995). Friedlander and Snyder (1983) perceived that there are significant differences between experts and beginner from the view point of conflict resolution styles and in researchers' opinion, the difference between them is related to their self-efficacy (Fiedlander and Snyder, 1983). Persons with high self-efficacy behave at conflict occasions more

effective than other groups (Deutsch, 1993). Self-efficacy of persons with insecure attachment style is lower than secure ones (Corcoran and Mallinckrodt, 2000). Persons who have low self-efficacy behave avoidant or dominant in conflict occasions (Burton, 1990; Vandevilert, 1997). Mikulincer and Florain (2000) believed that high level self-efficacy culminate in increased adaptation and cooperation in persons. Melchert *et al.* (1996) and Johnson believed that augmentation of self-efficacy of coaches, cause increase of skills that are required in conflict resolution. Also, results of Loukinzord and Haroon and Shavwer showed that persons with secure attachment style have higher self-efficacy in comparison with other groups. Feeling of qualification and self-efficacy is higher, among persons with secure attachment style in comparison with other groups (Banerjee, 2006; Meyers, 1998). There is positive relationship between secure attachment style and self-efficacy (Bartholomew and Horowitz, 1991).

According to evaluation of references related to topic, following hypothesis was edited:

- There is relationship between secure attachment style and each of 5 conflict resolution styles among sport coaches.
- There is relationship between avoidant-insecure attachment style and each of five conflict resolution styles among sport coaches.
- There is relationship between ambivalence avoidant-insecure attachment style and each of 5 conflict resolution styles among sport coaches.
- There is relationship between self-efficacy and each of five conflict resolution styles among sport coaches.
- Attachment styles and self-efficacy have capability for prediction of conflict resolution styles of sport coaches.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Since the main aim of present study is to predict conflict resolution styles through attachment styles and self-efficacy, correlation study type has been used. Statistical society of present study have comprised of coaches of individual and public sport courses resident in Ardabil province within 2005 at 20-50 age range. Statistical sample include 120 of sport coaches that have been selected through simple sampling method. Data related to conflict resolution style were collected through Rahim's questionnaire that is a simple 30-item scale. This questionnaire has 5 categories which are dominant style, avoidant style, accordance style, comprise style and

cooperation style. Rahim used factor analysis to assess validity of product. Results of factor analysis have extracted five factors that explain variance 0.89. Also, to assess reliability of this test, he executed it on 119 students at three weeks range, through retest method that Cronbach's Alpha of test has reported 0.60-0.83.

Second tool used in this survey is attachment scale. This questionnaire is a self-assess sclae that assesses skills of relation making and course of close attachments formation. Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of this test in study of Collins and Read in a sample of students in A, D and C sub-scales has reported 0.85, 0.78 and 0.81, respectively. On the other hand Pakdaman showed in Iran through retest within distance of one month, that this test is reliable at level of 0.95 (Sarafraz, 2006). Bandaura's self-efficacy questionnaire is another tool that has been used in this research. This questionnaire has been formulated by Bandaura at 1980 and has 17 principles. Baraty used intersection method to assess reliability of this scale. Reliability coefficient of test was 0.76 through Spearman-Brown method and it was 0.76 through Gutman's intersection method. Cronbach's Alpha or general consistency of questions was 0.79 that is satisfier. Since used scale for prediction and criterion variables was interval and distribution of participants' scores follow the normal curve. Owing to these reasons, for data analysis parametric statistic tools like Pierson correlation and multivariate regression coefficient were used (Arianpoor, 2005).

RESULTS

Results presented in Table 1 is showing that there is significant negative correlation between self-efficacy with dominant ($r = -0.224$), avoidant ($r = -0.349$) accordance ($r = -0.274$) conflict resolution styles and insecure ($r = -0.453$), avoidant-insecure ($r = -0.346$) attachment styles ($p<0.05$). And there is positive significant correlation between this variable (self-efficacy) with

cooperation conflict resolution style ($r = 0.312$) and secure attachment style ($r = 0.536$) ($p<0.05$). It means that coaches with high self-efficacy use cooperative conflict resolution style more than other conflict resolution style and their attachment style is more secure than other groups.

There is positive correlation ($p<0.05$) between dominant conflict resolution style with avoidant attachment style ($r = 0.270$) and there is significant negative correlation ($p<0.05$) between dominant conflict resolution style with cooperation conflict resolution style ($r = -0.282$) and secure attachment style ($r = -0.381$). It means that coaches with dominant conflict resolution style use rarely cooperation conflict resolution style and conflict resolution among players often use avoidant conflict resolution style and their attachment style is secure type.

There is significant negative correlation ($p<0.05$) between avoidant conflict resolution style with cooperation conflict resolution style ($r = -0.282$) and secure attachment style ($r = -0.381$). However, there is significant positive correlation ($p<0.05$) between this variable (avoidant conflict resolution style) with accordance conflict resolution style ($r = 0.339$), insecure attachment style ($r = 0.334$) and avoidant-insecure attachment style ($r = 0.493$). It means that attachment style of coaches with avoidant conflict resolution style often is of secure and avoidant-insecure types. There is significant positive correlation ($p<0.05$) accordance with comprise conflict resolution style ($r = 0.353$), insecure attachment style ($r = 0.329$) and avoidant-insecure attachment style ($r = 0.183$). However, significant negative correlation exist between this variable (accordance conflict resolution style) with insecure attachment style ($r = -0.218$). There is significant positive correlation ($p<0.05$) between cooperation conflict resolution style with secure attachment style ($r = 0.398$) and significant negative correlation between cooperation conflict resolution style with insecure attachment style ($r = -0.260$).

Table 1: Simple correlation coefficients of attachment styles, self-efficacy and quintuple aspects of conflict resolution styles of sport coaches

		Self-efficacy	Dominant	Avoidant	Accordance	Comprise	Cooperation	Secure attachment	Insecure attachment	Insecure-avoidant attachment
Self-efficacy	r	1	-0.224	-0.349	-0.274	-0.047	0.312	0.536	-0.453	-0.346
	sig	0	0.005	0	0.005	0.662	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Dominant	r		1	0.27	0.13	-0.024	-0.241	-0.22	0.013	0.165
	sig		0	0.007	0.2	0.818	0.016	0.024	898.00	0.092
Avoidant	r			1	0.339	-0.021	-0.282	-0.381	0.0334	0.493
	sig			0	0	0.839	0.003	0.000	0.000	0.000
Accordance	r				1	0.353	-0.091	-0.218	0.329	0.183
	sig				0	0.001	0.351	0.023	0.000	0.05
Comprise	r					1	0.012	0.125	0.198	-0.027
	sig					0	0.912	0.232	0.57	0.794
Cooperation	r						1	0.398	-0.26	-0.357
	sig						0	0.000	0.02	0.000

Table 2: Multivariate regression coefficient with enter method for prediction of dominant conflict resolution style according to insecure, avoidant-insecure and seure attachment style and self-efficacy

Predictor	Non-standard coefficient		Standard coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	β	t	Sig
Insecure attachment	2.021	0.441	0.408	4.518	0.00
Avoidant-insecure	2.025	0.448	0.409	4.995	0.00
secure attachment	-2.333	0.499	-0.409	-4.99	0.00
self-efficacy	1.99	0.420	-0.401	-4.999	-0.004

Table 3: Multivariate regression coefficient with enter method for prediction of avoidant conflict resolution style according to insecure, avoidant-insecure and secure attachment styles and self-efficacy

Predictor	Non-standard coefficient		Standard coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	β	t	Sig
Insecure attachment	2.013	76.4	2.40	4.481	0.000
Avoidant-insecure	0.397	0.490	0.078	0.809	0.421
Secure attachment	-1.045	0.509	-0.203	1.994	-0.049
Self-efficacy	-0.030	0.061	-0.053	0.492	0.624

Table 4: Multivariate regression coefficient with enter method for prediction of cooperation conflict resolution style according to insecure, avoidant-insecure and seure attachment style and self-efficacy

Predictor	Non-standard coefficient		Standard coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig
Insecure attachment	-1.222	0.509	-0.260	-2.398	-0.018
Avoidant-insecure	-0.72	0.322	-0.267	-2.177	-0.032
Secure attachment	2.011	0.437	0.337	4.468	0.000
Self-efficacy	0.424	0.227	0.184	1.864	0.05

It means that coaches with secure attachment style use cooperation conflict resolution style more than coaches with secure and avoidant-insecure attachment style.

As it is seen in the Table 2 can say that insecure, insecure-avoidant and secure attachment style among coaches have been the most powerful predictors of dominant conflict resolution style (df = 4.99, f = 14.151, p<0.005, R = 0.774).

As it is seen in the Table 3 can say that insecure and secure attachment style among coaches have been the most powerful predictors of avoidant conflict resolution style (df = 4.99, F = 12.151, p<0.005, R = 0.574).

As it is seen in the Table 4 can say that insecure, insecure-avoidant and secure attachment style and self-efficacy among coaches are of variables that predict cooperation conflict resolution style (df = 4.99, F = 13.171, p<0.005, R = 0.674).

DISCUSSION

The first hypothesis was predicting that there is relationship between secure attachment style and each of quintuple style of conflict resolution styles among sport coaches. Obtained results show that there is negative relationship between secure attachment style with avoidant, dominant and accordance conflict resolution styles and the relationship of secure attachment style to cooperation is significant positive. Obtained results accord with results of researches of Banerjee (2006), Pistole (1989), Cohen *et al.* (1992), Kobak *et al.* (1993), Pistole and Arricale (2003), Corcoran and Mallinckrodt (2000), Mikulincer and Florian (2001), Caldwell (1995), Larose and Bernier (2001), Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991), Kummel (1999), Nordling (1993), Morris-Rothschild and Brassard (2006), Bippus an Rollin (2003), Volkema and Bergman (1995), Karney and Bradbury (1995) Mearns (1991), George *et al.* (1996) and Cowan *et al.* (1996). Secure attachment style form in the situation which in child can resolve presence or absence of others by his will and control. This isn't possible unless consider condition of others. In fact, high cooperation conflict resolution style, among coaches with secure attachment style arises from their childhood's learning.

The second hypothesis is that there is relationship between insecure-avoidant attachment style and each of quintuple styles of conflict resolution style among sport coaches. Obtained results show that there is positive relationship between avoidant-insecure attachment style with avoidant and accordance conflict resolution style and there is significant negative relationship between avoidant-insecure attachment style and cooperation conflict resolution style. Obtain results accord with results of researches of Banerjee (2006), Pistole (1989), Cohen *et al.* (1992), Kobak *et al.* (1993), Pistole and Arricale (2003), Corcoran and Mallinckrodt (2000), Mikulincer and Florian (2001), Caldwell (1995), Larose and Bernier (2001), Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991), Kummel (1999), Nordling (1993), Morris-Rothschild and Brassard (2006), Bippus an Rollin (2003), Volkema and Bergman (1995), Karney and Bradbury (1995), Mearns (1991), George *et al.* (1996) and Cowan *et al.* (1996).

Next hypothesis is that there is relationship between insecure attachment style and each of quintuple styles of conflict resolution style among sport coaches. Obtained results show that there is positive relationship between insecure attachment style with avoidant and accordance conflict resolution style and that there is significant negative relationship between insecure attachment style and cooperation style. Obtain results accord with results of researches of Banerjee (2006), Pistole (1989), Cohen *et al.* (1992), Kobak *et al.* (1993), Pistole and Arricale (2003), Corcoran and Mallinckrodt (2000), Mikulincer and Florian (2001), Caldwell (1995), Larose and Bernier (2001), Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991), Kummel (1999), Nordling (1993), Morris-Rothschild and Brassard (2006), Bippus an Rollin (2003), Volkema and Bergman

(1995), Karney and Bradbury (1995) Mearns (1991), George *et al.* (1996) and Cowan *et al.* (1996). We can say that high social anxiety is of prominent specifications of persons with insecure attachment style and this factor (high social anxiety) has caused that they avoid conflict resolution styles that need direct contact with others and instead use styles like avoidance and dominancy.

Other hypothesis is that there is relationship between self-efficacy and each of quintuple styles of conflict resolution style among sport coaches. Obtained results show that there is negative relationship between self-efficacy with dominant, avoidant and accordance and there is significant negative relationship between self-efficacy and cooperation style. Obtained results accord with results of researches of Alper *et al.* (2000), Sips *et al.* (1988), Volkema and Bergman (1995), Fiedlander and Snyder (1983), Deutsch (1993), Corcoran and Mallinckrodt (2000), Mikulincer and Florian (2000), Melchert *et al.* (1996) and Jounson *et al.* (1989). We can say that high capability of conflict resolution of coaches with cooperation conflict resolution style result in that they resolve interpersonal conflicts exist in the sport societies that this factor itself cause increase of self-efficacy in these coaches.

Another hypothesis is that there is relationship between self-efficacy and each of quintuple styles of attachment style among sport coaches. Obtained results show that there is negative relationship between self-efficacy with insecure and avoidant- insecure attachment style and that there is significant positive relationship between self-efficacy secure attachment style. Obtained results accord with results of researches of Collins and Read (1990), Hazan and Shaver (1987), Banerjee (2006), Mears (1998) and Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991). Presence of high abilities and skills among secure persons has caused that they achieve their goals and wills easily in the social occasions and this factor cause increase of self-efficacy, too.

The last hypothesis is that there is difference between mean of scores of 2 male and female groups of coaches. Obtained results show that difference of mean of scores of groups in self-efficacy variable isn't significant in the level of 5%.

REFERENCES

Arianpoor, S., 2005. Survey and comparison of body-relaxation and conceptual Imagination training effect on self-monitoring. Tolerance of ambiguity, self-efficacy (general and sport) and sporting performance of athletics. Thesis of MSc of Mohaghegh Ardabili University.

Alper, S., D. Tjosvold and K.S. Law, 2000. Conflict management, efficacy. Counselor Education and Supervision, 28: 205-218.

Amidi, A., 2002. Sampling theory and its applications. Tehran. Jahade Daneshgahi Publication, Vol. 1.

Banddura, A., 1997. Self-efficacy toward unifing theory of behavioral change. Psychol. Rev., 84: 191-215.

Banerjee, R., 2006. Attachment Theory Shaping Adult Development: Impact on Mentoring Experiences Conference: Urban and International Education Section. Miami: Florida International University, pp: 1-6.

Bartholomew, K. and L.M. Horowitz, 1991. Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. J. Personality Soc. Psychol., 61 (2): 226-244.

Bippus, A.M. and E. Rollin, 2003. Attachment style differences in relational maintenance and conflict behaviors: Friend's perceptions. Communication Reports, 16: 113-123.

Burton, G.E., 1990. The measurement of distortion tendencies induced by the win-lose nature of in-group loyalty. Small Group Res., 21 (1): 128-141.

Caldwell, R.L., 1995. Attachment style and personality functioning among normal adults (Doctoral dissertation, Texas Aand M University, 1995). Dissertation Abstracts International, 55: 4619.

Ciechanowski, P. *et al.*, 2003. The relationship of attachment style to depression catastorphizing and health care utilization in patients with chronic pain. Pain, 104: 627-(000).

Cohn, D.A., D.H. Silver, C.P. Cowan and J. Parson, 1992. Working models of childhood attachment and couple relationships. J. Family Issues, 13 (4): 432-449.

Collins, N.L. and S.J. Read, 1990. Adult attachment, working models and relationship quality in dating couples. J. Personality Soc. Psychol., 58: 644-663.

Corcoran, K.O. and B. Mallinckrodt, 2000. Adult attach-ment, self-efficacy, perspective-taking and conflict resolution. J. Counseling Dev., 78 (4): 473-483.

Cowan, P., D. Cohn, C. Cowan and J. Pearson, 1996. Parents' attachment histories and children's externalizing and internalizing behaviors: Exploring family systems models of linkage. Consult. Clin. Psychol., 64: 53-63.

Delavar, A, 1995. Theoretical and practical principles of Surveys in social sciences and liberal art. Tehran. Roshd Publication.

Deutsch, M., 1993. Educating for a peaceful world. Am. Psychol., 48: 510-517.

Engels, R.E. *et al.*, 2001. Parental attachment and adolescent emotional adjustment the associations with social skills and relational competence. J. Counseling Psychol., 48 (4): 428-439.

Friedlander, M.L. and J. Snyder, 1983. Trainees' expectations for the supervisory.

George, C., N. Kaplan and M. Main, 1996. Adult Attachment Interview. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Psychology, University of California, Berkeley 3rd Edn.

Ghasemi, B., 2003. Organizational behavior Theory. Tehran. Hayat Publication.

Gross, D., 1996. Company policy: Employee-friendly travel guidelines make compliance more likely. Crain's New York Business, 12 (38): 23.

Hazan, C. and P. Shaver, 1987. Conceptualizing romantic love as an attachment process. J. Personality Soc. Psychol., 52: 511-524.

Karney, B. and T. Bradbury, 1995. The longitudinal course of marital quality and stability: A review of theory, method and research. Psychol. Bull., 118: 3-34.

Kobak, R., H. Cole, R. Ferenz-Gillies and W. Fleming, 1993. Attachment and emotion-regulation during mother-teen problem solving: A control theory analysis. Child Development, 64: 231-245.

Kobak, R. and S. Duemmler, 1994. Attachment and Conversation: Toward a Discourse Analysis of Adolescent and Adult Security. In: Bartholomew, K. and D. Perlman (Eds.). Attachment processes in adulthood. Advances in personal relationships, London7 Jessica Kingsley, 5: 121-149.

Kummel, P.E., 1999. Bringing your family to work: Attachment in the workplace (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1999). Dissertation Abst. Int., 59: 3747.

Larose, S. and A. Bernier, 2001. Social support processes: Mediators of attachment state of mind and adjustment in late adolescence. Attachment and Human Development, 3 (1): 96-120.

Mayseless, O., 1996. Attachment patterns and their outcomes. Human Development, Mode Instrument, Tuxedo, NY., 39 (4): 206-223.

Melchert, T.P., V.L. Hays, L.M. Wiljanen and A.K. Kolocek, 1996. Testing models of counselor development with a measure of counseling self-efficacy. J. Counseling Dev., 74: 640-644.

Meyers, S.A., 1998. Personality correlates of adult attachment style. J. Soc. Psychol., 138 (3): 407-410.

Mikulincer, M. and V. Florian, 2000. Exploring individual differences in reactions to mortality salience: Does attachment style regulate terror management mechanisms? J. Personality Soc. Psychol., 79 (2): 260- 273.

Morris-Rothschild, B.K. and M.R. Brassard, 2006. Teachers' conflict management styles: The role of attachment styles and classroom management efficacy. J. School Psychol., 44: 105-121.

Nordling, W.J., 1993. The relationship of adult attachment styles to conflict resolution, quality of communication and satisfaction in intimate dyadic relationships. Dissertation Abstracts International, 54 (3-B), U.S.: University Microfilms International.

Pistole, M. and F. Arricale, 2003. Understanding attachment: Beliefs about conflict. J. Counseling Dev., 81: 318-328.

Pistole, M., 1989. Attachment in adult romantic relationships: Style of conflict resolution and relationship satisfaction. J. Soc. Personal Relationships, 6: 505-510.

Robbins, S.P., 1998. Organizational behaviour. New Jersey: Simon and Schuster.

Sarafraz, M.R., 2006. Survey of attachment styles' place in structure of 5 grand factors of personality. Collection of Articles of 3rd cross-country seminar of collegians' mental health.

Sipps, G.J., G.J. Sugden and C.M. Favier, 1988. Counselor training level and verbal response type: Their relationship to efficacy and outcome expectations. J. Counseling Psychol., 35: 397-401.

Slabbert, A.D., 2004. Conflict management styles in traditional organizations. Soc. Sci. J., 41: 83-92.

VandeVliert, E., 1997. Complex interpersonal conflict behavior. East Sussex, UK7 Psychology Press.

Volkema, R.J. and T.J. Bergmann, 1995. Conflict styles as indicators of behavioral. Process: Testing a developmental model. Counselor Education and Supervision, 22: 343-348.