Perceived Work Stress and Felt Stress of Workers: The Moderating Role of Assertive Conflict Handling Modes

Serkan Erebak
Marmara University

ARTICLE INFO

Received 12.09.2016
Received in revised form 12.12.2016
Accepted 12.16.2016

Key Words: Conflict, Stress, Assertiveness, Caregiving

ABSTRACT

Objectives: We intend to examine whether high or low assertive conflict handling modes can moderate the relationship between stress perception and felt stress at workplace.

Methods: The sample is consisted of 225 caregiving staff who works in a nursing home. The staff’s conflict handling modes were determined and the scores of perceived and felt stress were obtained through survey method.

Results: Findings showed that high assertive conflict handling modes, but not the low one, can be a moderator between stress perception and felt stress at workplace.

Originality: Assertiveness may help to cope with stress better at nursing homes by reducing the stress perception and felt stress of caregivers.

ÖZ

Amaç: Bu araştırmada, yüksek veya düşük atılganlık seviyelerinin iş yerinde algılanan ve hisseden stres arasındaki düzenleyici etkisinin olup olmadığını incelendiktedir.

Yöntem/Tasarım: Örneklemin huzurevinde çalışan 225 bakım personelinden oluşmaktadır. Anket yöntemi uygulanarak toplanan bilgilerle, çalışanların çatışma yönetim strolleri belirlenmiş ve iş yerinde algılanan ve hissettikleri stres düzeyleri tespit edilmişdir.

Sonuçlar: Bulgular yüksek atılganlık seviyesinin iş yerinde algılanan ve hissedilen stres arasında düzenleyici etkisini oluşturmaktadır. Ancak benzer sonuç düşük atılganlık seviyesinde bulunamamıştır.

Özgün Değer: Algılanan stresi ve hissedilen stresi azaltmasından dolayı atılganlık stresle daha iyi başa çıkma konusunda huzurevlerindeki bakım personeline yararlı olacağı düşünülmektedir.
1. Introduction

In today’s work life, people spend most of their time at workplace where the nature of the environment requires interaction with people and this in return may result in some problems. To eliminate continuity of these problems and their negative outcomes, it is vital to focus on workplace environment. The well-being of the employees at workplace is largely influenced by the work stress which can be defined as the loss of control of the individual over his performance for work (Anderson & Pulich, 2001). It means that, knowledge, skill and ability of the person become not enough for the demands of the work. This situation suggests the availability of stressors which may show themselves under three dimensions; job related demands, role demands and group related demands (Anderson & Pulich, 2001). Job related demands may contain work overload, change, lack of control or autonomy and others. Role demands involve the stressors such as role conflict and role ambiguity. Group related demands usually reveal when interdependencies in groups arise. These workplace stressors may trigger individual responses which can be classified as physical, psychological, emotional, behavioral, and cognitive (Roberts et al., 1997; Britt & Jex, 2015). In physical responses, the individual may experience high blood pressure, perspiration, headache, cancer, and even death. Psychological and emotional responses involve aggression, anxiety, depression, fear, psychosis and many others. Behaviorally, the person may indicate overeating, substance abuse, dangerous behaviors, even may suicide. Cognitively, attention deficit, over sensitivity to criticism, decrease in concentration, difficulties in decision making may be given as an example. High absenteeism, alienation to co-workers, job dissatisfaction, and decrease in organizational commitment may be counted as organizational basis responses. As negative work stress has several impacts on individual (McVicar, 2003), the organization is also under the risk of being affected. Reduction in productivity may result in defective production, reduced quantity and quality of the products. Moreover, many communicational problems may occur with customers and other organizations.

The health care sector is one of the most stressful workplace environment (Anderson & Pulich, 2001) where the work overload, interpersonal problems, and intense care patients can be given as most common stressors (Duquette et al, 1995). Stress factors that negatively influence health care givers can be listed as giving health care to patients who are in their terminal term, insufficient equipment, work overload, conflicts with co-workers, insufficient performance appraisal mechanism, uncertainty, angry and over demanding patients (Chang et al, 2006) and similarly these stressors are seen in nursing homes which is one of the branches of health care sector. For example, in the nursing home where the present study was done, every resident has at least one disease which requires permanent health care. In health care workplace environment, caregiving staffs take a special position that puts them in a high potential stressful situation. Because that profession requires the ability to work as a teammate, responsibility of giving care during 24 hours and ability to stay emotionally strong (Philips & Brooks, 1996). However, stating only a few factors that determine the degree of these staff’s distress does not provide enough explanation about the issue. For example, one of the prominent stress factors in that profession is the intense shift working that negatively influences their social life in return. The shortage of staff increases the work much more that influence (Philips & Brooks, 1996). Furthermore, with various stressors, healthcare organizations show a unique characteristic: various professions have to work in cooperation, the service has vital importance for patients, time management is a requirement, several different technical equipment is used and interaction with many people is prerequisite (Chang et al, 2006). This characteristic makes the healthcare organizations have a workplace environment where conflicts are seen very often. In these kinds of organizations, different management styles, high demands, high distress cause conflicts particularly in healthcare professionals (Harrison et al, 2002). The increase in these conflicts affects the caregiving quality and also causes high turnover of the staff. This problem may result in waste of money and damage of the work process.
The aim of this research is to examine the felt stress of the caregiving staffs who work at a nursing home while taking the organizational stressors at workplace into consideration. The conflict modes of the staff are thought as a potential moderator between stress perception and the felt stress at workplace; and, it will be utilized to test the following model:

![Figure 1 The Research Model]

In the development of theories for psychological perspectives about organizations, there is a tendency to make an assumption that stress factors trigger same responses for all people (Spector, 1982). In our research, we are adding conflict handling modes into our model, and we predict that there is a subjectivity of giving meaning to organizational stress factors and feeling the stress differs among caregiving staff. The theoretical explanations for the proposed model will be indicated in the following literature review. After that, the theoretical foundations will reveal some proposed hypotheses.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Stress Perception and Felt Stress

Stress is one of the most common terms which is used in daily conversations very often (Britt & Jex, 2015). Although, stress is becoming more and more familiar to society with a simple negative meaning, its complex and multi-angular structure should be defined separately. In a broad perspective, stress can be seen as a cycle which contains internal or external factors (stressors) that cause physical, cognitive, behavioral or emotional reactions (responses) and impact (strain) and force the person to cope (coping) with them (Brehm, 1998). While this concept is scrutinized by several studies, there reveals some approaches and models. Approaches to stress can be divided into four angles as stimulus based, response based, interactional and transactional (Babatunde, 2013). In stimulus based approach, stress is defined with the all physical, psychological and social factors that cause tension in people (Kahn, 1986, p. 42). Life changing events, natural disasters, and difficult work conditions can be shown as normative stress factors that influence each individual and result in same readjustment needs. In response based approach, the focus is on the physical, cognitive, behavioral or emotional reactions which are caused by stressors. The defense response involves three steps; first, when the person notices the stressor, the alarm stage activates; after that activation, resistance occurs and the person gives responses; after these defense responses, the person gets exhausted (Selye, 1983, p. 4). The interactional approach takes attention to the relationship between the stimulus and the response in a statistical way (Richard & Krieshok, 1989). The aim is to find possible correlation and possible moderator effects on that relationship. The final approach to stress is the transactional one which concentrates on the transaction between the individual and the environment that surrounds him. That means, when the person encounters an event, the type and the intensity of the response depends on the person’s adaptation to his environment (Folkman & Lazarus, 1988a, 1988b). In that approach, person’s perception and appraisal of the stressor determines the characteristic of the stress.

As a part of this process, the person chooses the coping style and applies to it (Folkman & Lazarus, 1988a, 1988b). Keeping well-being, staying healthy and having motivation and a good work performance mostly
depends on the degree of the stress. High degree of stress may result in burnout while low degree of stress may result in underproduction and underperformance. The process which starts from eustress (positive stress) and enters to distress (negative stress) is a subjective continuum mostly depends on the interaction between the person and the environment surrounding him (McVicar, 2003). Therefore, the strength of the factors that negatively affect the person can be shaped by the individual’s perception. Work stress appears when the stressors at work start to interact with the individual and influence her psychological or physical well-being and in this process the meaning given by an employee to work stressors is called as stress perception (Folkman & Lazarus, 1988a, 1988b). Changing psychological state of the person as a result of stress perception can be called as felt stress. People may perceive stress differently from one workplace to another and even in the same workplace environment the degree of distress varies from person to person (Folkman & Lazarus, 1988a). The stress at workplace seems to have three major aspects playing their roles. First one is the workplace environment where the stress occurs. Second one is the demands of the individual which are the results of his perception of the workplace environment. Thirdly, physiological, psychological, behavioral and emotional responses of the individual according the situation reveal and these three interdependent factors form the stress cycle at the workplace (Brehm, 1998, pp. 1-2).

To analyze work stress, some important factors should also be scrutinized (Levi, 1981). These are the characteristics of the work in terms of quantity and quality; and the degree of control and freedom of decision making that the employee has over the work which is called as job control (Karasek et al., 1981). The characteristics of work quality include: role conflict, when expected behaviors by others are not consistent at workplace (Travers & Cooper, 1993), role ambiguity, when the individual is not given enough information about her role at work (Kahn et al., 1964), and interpersonal communication problems (Cooper & Marshall, 1976) which may also cause to the work stress. The characteristics of work quantity contain work overload that is forcing the employee to work beyond his/her physical or psychological capacity, also appears to have positive relationship with health problems (Sonnenberg, 1986) and psychological strain (Caplan et al, 1980). Moreover, Caplan and his colleagues (1980) state that particularly blue colored workers have very low degree of job control. If the employee’s job control is broadened, psychological strain which is a result of passive role of the individual will be decreased and usability of the personal skills and knowledge will be risen (Karasek et al., 1981). Besides, the relationship between stress and health of the employee is also affected the employee’s job control (Karauus, 1984). In addition to these factors, the risk of experiencing dangerous situations in the workplace environment, general physical environment of the workplace, conflicts in the organization, and the job development procedures are indicated as other possible stress factors (Cooper & Marshall, 1976). The complexity of the job and the underemployment which involves the use of employees’ skills, abilities and knowledge under their potential, cause stress and health symptoms (Spillane, 1984).

To comprehend how caregiving staffs for the elderly feel stress can give us a better understanding to control its outcomes. In this research, we deal with how assertive conflict modes might influence caregiving staff’s stress perception and felt stress. So, first of all, it is necessary to understand the relationship between stress perception and felt stress at workplace. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

**Hypothesis 1:** There is a positive relationship between caregiving staff’s stress perception and felt stress.

### 2.2. Conflict Handling Modes

In a situation where at least two people have similar goals but have limited resources, there reveal a struggle while these people try to achieve their goals. This situation is named as conflict (Rahim, 2000). In conflict times, individual has his own form of behavior that he exhibits to other people with whom he has a conflict (Rahim, 2000). The individual’s own way to respond to the conflict is known as conflict handling modes. Particularly, at
workplace individuals spend time and interact with other workers (Friedman et al, 2000). This situation causes many conflicts; so, individuals should learn how to solve the problems under various conditions and situations (Munz et al, 2001). If the conflicts are not solved in appropriate time, that creates distress on individuals and influence their healthy decision making mechanisms (Hyde et al, 2006). Decision making and thinking in an unhealthy way may make the individual having more problems in workplace environment (Munz et al, 2001). Ineffective conflict management practices result in inappropriate use of the limited resources and increased stress levels (Hyde et al, 2006). Conflict has several negative outcomes (Hatfield & Hatfield, 1995). Conflicted parties may damage each other’s psychological and physiological well beings. Wasted time and monetary funds, low levels of motivation and work satisfaction are some of the negative outcomes.

Individuals who work at the same workplace may have many interpersonal conflicts (Hyde et al, 2006). However individuals’ style of approaching conflicts may differ person to person (Friedman et al, 2000). These styles were researched and the responses for each style were grouped. In most of the studies there are seen three main models to differentiate the styles (Patricia & Valentine, 1995). Although, these models are studied by different parties they have similar names and approaches to the issue. In our research Thomas and Kilmann’s model of conflict handling modes will be used. These conflict handling modes are stated as competing, collaborating, compromising, avoiding, and accommodating across two dimensions: assertiveness and cooperativeness (Thomas & Kilmann, 1975) (see Figure 2). Collaboration is the approach of the individual to solve the conflict while considering both parties’ concern. It is mostly formed with empathy and open communication that aims assertive situation which also requires high cooperation between the parties (Hatfield & Hatfield, 1995). In this mode, decision making with systematic approach is generally used. The main point in collaboration is that there can be found shared points in spite of the differences among people. The aim is not to decide on whether any party is right or wrong, but to solve the problem (Hatfield & Hatfield, 1995). Collaboration contributes more positive outcomes (Friedman et al, 2000). It gives individual the sense of belongings to the organization, higher work performance and satisfaction. In accommodating mode, individuals tend to abandon their goals in order to keep positive relations with the other party. The other party’s concern is more important than the self-concern (Thomas & Kilmann, 1975). Individuals who have this mode perceive the conflict situation in a negative way and the continuity of the relationship with submission is seen as a best way to end the conflict (Friedman et al, 2000) in an unassertive but cooperative manner (Thomas & Kilmann, 1975). However with an assertive but uncooperative manner, an individual uses the competing mode in conflict situations, puts his own concerns in a high position. This approach may increase the intensity of the conflict rather than to solve the problem (Friedman et al, 2000); however, stating the personal desires may have positive contributions to the individual as well. Another approach is to expect each party’s sacrifice their own concerns and compromise on the conflict. Compromising style may bring temporary solution to the conflict, however in the long term the conflict may revive again, and this can cause long term stress problem. In addition, this mode is generally used when people in the conflict think that their power is equal (Rahim, 1983a). Nonetheless, in conflict situations even though compromising is not the most effective way, it can soften the organizational climate among the individuals. In another style, when conflict occurs some individuals pretend not to see the conflict (Friedman et al, 2000). Decisions are usually delayed and unassertive-uncooperative approach reveals. Avoiding mode may be useful in cases when the goals that cause conflict are not important enough and there is strong need to save the energy and time. This mode usually revives when the conflict is with the superior (Rahim, 1983a)
While the conflicts at the workplace are increasing, the conflict handling modes of the individuals play a very important role in the solution of these conflicts (Friedman et al, 2000). Particularly, in healthcare organizations where caregivers also work, the continuity of conflicts damages the workplace environment, and that may negatively affect physiological and psychological wellbeing (Patricia & Valentine, 1995). These conflicts may result in turnover, absenteeism, low cooperation and unproductiveness. In healthcare organizations individuals who experience conflicts, also perceive distress. Because of this distress, healthcare professionals show many psychosomatic symptoms (Harrison et al, 2002). However, if conflicts at the workplace are managed successfully, the negative conditions may be changed into more positive ones such as high motivation, work satisfaction, the sense of success (Rahim, 2000). Therefore, using appropriate conflict handling modes may result in lower stress whether it directly effects or not.

### 2.3. Conflict Handling Modes as a Moderator

Theoretically, conflict handling modes were influenced by Blake and Mouton’s (1964) research (Kilmann & Thomas, 1977). Their research was built on two main dimensions of conflict handling modes. One of them is “the desire to satisfy person’s own concern” and the other one is “the desire to satisfy other’s concern” (Thomas, 1976). These researchers state that the personal conflict mode has some degree between these dimensions. However, that raises a question: is there really a conflict mode that every person has? If these conceptions are accepted, the view that conflict modes of the individuals can’t be changed easily and are very stable should be accepted as well (Pruitt, 1983). Not surprisingly, some researchers usually label them as a strategy or intention. Therefore, the bias that focusing on conflict modes as unchanging personal characteristic, will be eliminated. Particularly, at workplace the person’s conflict mode can be changed according to other people’s social status or positions (Rahim, 2000). This indicates that the situational factors may shape the preferred conflict mode. However, the personality characteristics of individuals shouldn’t be ignored. For example, according to a study agreeableness may influence the conflict modes (Graziano et al., 1996). According to Barry and Friedman (1998), big five personality characteristics and their outcomes are closely associated with conflict handling modes. It can be inferred that personality traits are in a relationship with conflict styles. Furthermore, while considering stress factors, according to the transactional view, stress appears as a result of the interaction between the person and the environment. That means it is not produced just by one side. In line with this view, the term, appraisal, has a significant role. For example in a workplace appraisal situation, the person gives meanings to the job and the workplace environment. After that, the individual focuses on the relationship between these two parties (Lazarus, 1991). This cognitive appraisal forms the association between the person and environment. Cognitive appraisal consists of two main processes. First process involves, the perception of the individual about the situation or the event and the importance that individual gives to them. In the second process, the person thinks how to cope with that situation or event. The main idea of these processes is to find to what degree the individual has control and coping mechanism to get over them (Folkman & Lazarus, 1980). In the first process, the person may not see the stressors as important; however, in the second process she can use her conflict handling mode to cope. For example, conflicts can be seen as a stressor (McGrath, 1976) and the conflict handling mode of the person may determine to what degree the person exposes to the stressors (Friedman et al., 2000). So, the conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High</th>
<th>Collaborating</th>
<th>Accommodating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Competing</td>
<td>Avoiding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2 Two dimensional model of conflict handling modes (Thomas & Kilmann, 1975)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaborating</th>
<th>Avoiding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


handling mode influences the intensity of the stressor as being a coping source, and determines the degree of the exposure.

As it is stated above, conflict handling modes have two dimensions: assertiveness and cooperativeness. To our predictions, it is plausible to say that assertiveness is one of the important factors that affects workplace stress coping. People who have high assertiveness can state their positions. Therefore, that gives them a sense of control and influence on the environment. However, people who have low assertiveness, do not talk about their concerns and take a passive position with a sense that they don’t have control over the environment.

The research shows that people who are highly assertive have coping sources against the stressors; however, people who are low assertive do not have this coping source (Luthar, 1991; Elliott & Gramling, 1990). Similar studies revealed the negative relationship of mastery, self-efficacy, and locus of control with stress. According to the studies, there is a relationship between mastery and stress appraisal. People who have a high mastery indicated lower stress and higher sense of control, challenge and coping skills. Additionally, there revealed a negative relationship between mastery level and distress. Furthermore, while the mastery level increased, experienced anxiety, hostility, depression, and somatization decreased (Gilbar et al., 2010). An individual’s age-related reactions to the life events changes when the person started to perceive negative changes in control and mastery (Cairney & Krause, 2008). Self-efficacy is also a predictor of stress (Akpochofo, 2014). Rescue workers who have low self-efficacy were negatively influenced by stressful situations more than the ones who have high self-efficacy (Prati et al., 2010). People who think that external factors have more power on the control between the environment and them, are prone to more distress (Gadzella et al., 2009). People who have high internal locus of control are more into problem-focus coping (Demir et al., 2014) which is one of Lazarus and Folkman’s two kinds of group of strategies in Transactional theory that people use when they came face to face with stress: concentrating on emotions or concentrating on the problems (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Problem-focused coping consists of the particular behaviors, using instrumental support, and the plans to end the stress that derived from the problem. In emotion focused coping, the concentration is on the reappraisal of the stress factors, using some cognitive strategies and applying friends or family to take emotional support. Differences in the locus of control may predict the preferred coping styles. So, people who believe that they have responsibility, self-control, and self-improvement to solve the problem which creates stress, copes better (Roberts et al., 1997). One of the main coping strategy of the problem-focus coping is being assertive (Bartram & Gardner, 2008). Assertiveness involves the sense of control and asserting personal positions. In the focus of problem-focus coping, it can be inferred that people who have low assertiveness do not talk about the problem enough with the other party, don’t be active while choosing the strategy, and don’t struggle for the solution (Bartram & Gardner, 2008). However, people who have high assertiveness try to solve the conflicts more effectively, experience less problems and are healthier in work life. Because, as a personality characteristic, assertiveness leads increase in sense of control which results in coping with stress and a low level stress perception. Assertiveness also takes part among the characteristics of extraversion type of personality (Rothbart & Hwang 2005). Extroverts who exert themselves to solve the problems need high energy which can be initiated by assertiveness (Vollrath, 2001).

To sum up, these studies state that having assertive conflict modes may moderate the relationship between stress perception and the felt stress at workplace that a result of these stress factors. The addition of this study is to scrutinize this relationship in a healthcare environment where there is a high risk of stress. It is logical to think that assertive conflict modes may have an effect on stress perception and preferred strategies to cope with the felt stress that these stress factors may create. If this logic function in real life, caregiving staff for the elderly who have assertive conflict modes may see themselves as having a high sense of control over environmental stress factors and see these factors as challenging and can be solved. In contrast, the staff that has unassertive conflict handling modes may see same conditions as tiring, stressful, and unsolvable.
It has been stated above that stimulus based approach says that every person perceives the stress similarly (Kahn, 1986, p. 42). According to response based approach, every person’s responses to the stress similarly (Selye, 1983, p. 4). Transactional view adds the personal variables between stimulus and response (Folkman & Lazarus, 1988a, 1988b). Hence, when we add conflict handling modes into the relationship of stress perception and felt stress, we may have more clear aspect to understand the perceived stress factors and reported felt stress. Therefore, all in all we hypothesize that.

**Hypothesis 2:** Assertive conflict handling modes moderates the relationship between stress perception and caregiving staff’s felt stress; such that caregiving staff with high assertive conflict mode will experience lower levels of felt stress than the ones with unassertive conflict mode.

To scrutinize these hypotheses, 8 workplace stress factors which are revealed by Caplan and his colleagues (1980), were used to measure and assess the moderating role of assertive conflict modes.

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1. Sample

Data were gathered from a sample of 245 caregiving staff in one of the biggest nursing homes for the elderly in the city of Istanbul, Turkey. The sample was reached via the allowance of nursing home administration. The survey was formed on the internet and filled by the staff individually in an empty room in the nursing home. 225 responses were obtained. A Shapiro-Wilk test was used to test for normality on the main dependent variable felt stress; and that indicated that the data was normally distributed in both high and low assertive groups. See Table 1 for the demographic characteristics of the sample.

**Table 1.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive statistics of the sample</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>50,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>49,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict Handling Modes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competing (High Assertive)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborating (High Assertive)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromising (Medium Assertive)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>40,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding (Low Assertive)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodating (Low Assertive)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal Education Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>34,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>49,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2. Measures

Stress Perception and Felt Stress

The factors that influence stress perception at workplace consist of the work stressors that are thought to have potential to affect the felt stress of the caregiving staff. These workplace stress factors listed to be answered as work overload (6 items), work conflict (3 items), not leaving the workplace (3 items), having control over work (2 items), believing the necessity and meaning of the work (3 items), social variables (10 items) and responsibility of the work (4 items) which are firstly determined by Caplan and his colleagues (1980), developed by Reiche and Dijkhuizen (1980) and adapted by Turk (1997) to Turkish samples. Items are responded with 5 point Likert-type scale. These stress factors cannot be directly accepted as stress creators. They can cause stress if the staff perceives them as a stress source.

In the current study, the felt stress was measured through the degree of tension that the staff has as a result of their perception of stress. Participants responded to the questions utilizing a scale with a range of 0 (no tension) to 10 (high tension) which is adapted from Unsal and her colleagues (2010). Therefore, for the same item two scales were used; one of them measured the stress perception and the other one measured the felt stress.

Conflict Handling Modes

Conflict handling modes were determined by using Thomas Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument (Kilmann & Thomas, 1977). The instrument forces the individuals to choose the possible behaviors between 30 pairs of statements that they are likely to use in conflict cases. These conflict handling modes vary on two dimensions: assertiveness and cooperativeness. In this study, conflict handling modes were separated across assertiveness degree according to Thomas and Kilmann (1975) research (see figure 2): high assertiveness (competing, collaborating), medium assertiveness (compromising), low assertiveness (avoiding, accommodating). Statistics for the conflict handling modes were described in Table 1. For the analyses, to use respondent’s conflict handling modes as a categorized variable, high assertive and low assertive conflict modes were recoded as dummy variables among the three variables high assertive, medium assertive and low assertive conflict modes. As “conflict modes” has these three levels, we needed two dummy variables to represent it. In this study, we particularly interested in whether the fact that people who have high assertive conflict handling modes experience less stress perception and less felt stress. After analyzing correlations among variables, it is decided to leave out the dummy variable of medium assertiveness in order to obtain a stronger association. Therefore, the comparison was obtained between high assertiveness and low assertiveness.
3.3. Data Analysis

To test the hypotheses SPSS 21 software program was used. A standard multiple regression analysis was carried out using felt stress as the dependent variable, stress perception as predictor variable, and high and low assertiveness as the moderator variables. Descriptive statistics and correlations between the variables entered into the model were also obtained. For the correlation analyses, each conflict handling mode was recoded as dummy variable.

4. Findings

The results of the correlation analyses showed that stress perception is in a positive correlation with felt stress (r=0.903, p<0.01), and low assertiveness (0.507, p<0.01); and it has a weak positive correlation with conflict handling modes such as compromising (r=0.204, p<0.01), avoiding (r=0.299, p<0.01) and accommodating (r=0.394, p<0.01) as well. Besides, stress perception has a negative correlation with high assertiveness (r=-0.659, p<0.01) and collaborating conflict handling mode (r=-0.460, p<0.01); and it has a weak negative correlation with competing one (r=-0.390, p<0.01) as well. The results of correlation analyses for felt stress showed that it has positive correlation with low assertiveness (r=0.442, p<0.01); and it has a weak positive correlation with conflict handling modes such as compromising (r=0.323, p<0.01), avoiding (r=0.363, p<0.01) and accommodating (r=0.205, p<0.01) as well. Besides, felt stress has a negative correlation with high assertiveness (r=-0.723, p<0.01), competing conflict handling mode (r=-0.461, p<0.01) and collaborating conflict handling mode (r=-0.461, p<0.01). Other results of correlation analyses were depicted in Table 2.

Table 2.
Results from the correlation analyses showing the relationship among variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Stress Perception</td>
<td>2.983</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td>.903**</td>
<td>.659**</td>
<td>.507**</td>
<td>.390**</td>
<td>.460**</td>
<td>.204**</td>
<td>.299**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Felt Stress</td>
<td>3.987</td>
<td>1.771</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.723**</td>
<td>.442**</td>
<td>.461**</td>
<td>.461**</td>
<td>.323**</td>
<td>.363**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. High Assertiveness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.421**</td>
<td>.749**</td>
<td>.492**</td>
<td>.612**</td>
<td>.327**</td>
<td>.221**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Low Assertiveness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.316**</td>
<td>-.208**</td>
<td>-.459**</td>
<td>.777**</td>
<td>.525**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Competing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.208**</td>
<td>-.459**</td>
<td>-.245**</td>
<td>-.166*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Collaborating</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.302**</td>
<td>-.161*</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Compromising</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.356**</td>
<td>-.241**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Avoiding</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Accommodating</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The results of the regression analyses are indicated that our first hypothesis (H1) was supported. (see Table 3). Stress perception is related to felt stress positively. That is, the more caregiving staff perceived stress, the higher they experienced stress; R = 0.900, F(1, 223) = 954.975, p < .001. Additionally, between our proposed moderator levels, high and low assertive conflict handling modes were significantly related to felt stress respectively; R= -0.771, F(1, 223) = 327.447, p < .001; R = 0.418, F(1, 223) = 47.168, p < .001. These results suggest that, there is a negative relationship between assertive conflict handling modes and felt stress; so it can be said that people who have high assertive conflict handling modes feel less stress. However, there is a positive relationship between low assertive conflict handling modes and felt stress; therefore, it can be inferred that people who use low assertive conflict handling modes, experienced stress more.

Table 3.
Results from the regression analyses showing the linear regression between predictors as stress perception, high and low assertive conflict modes and outcome variable as felt stress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-8.207</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>-20.327</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress Perception</td>
<td>4.039</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>30.903</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>5.204</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>54.404</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Assertive Conflict Modes</td>
<td>2.885</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>-0.771</td>
<td>18.095</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.744</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>29.881</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Assertive Conflict Modes</td>
<td>1.756</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>6.868</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B: unstandardized beta; SE: standard error; β: standardized beta; p: significance level; t: t statistic; R²: variance. * p < .001

Our moderation hypothesis (H2) was partially supported. To test for moderation, we conducted a linear regression analysis and entered stress perception and the interaction of stress perception respectively with our proposed dummy moderator levels high and low assertive conflict handling modes as predictor variables and felt stress as the outcome variable. In equation 1, the interaction effect of stress perception and high assertive conflict handling mode on the outcome of felt stress was significant (Beta = -0.293; t = -9.096, p < .001). However, in equation 2, the interaction effect of stress perception and low assertive conflict handling mode on the outcome of felt stress was not significant (Beta = -0.058; t = -1.695, p > .05). Therefore, these results suggest that there was a moderation effect of high assertive conflict handling modes on the relationship between the staff's stress perception and felt stress (see Table 4).

Table 4.
Results from the regression analyses showing the moderation effect of high and low assertive conflict handling modes on the relationship between stress perception and felt stress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equation 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-5.258</td>
<td>0.474</td>
<td>-11.1</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress Perception (SP)</td>
<td>3.205</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>22.159</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP X High Assertive Conflict Modes</td>
<td>-0.403</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>-9.096</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equation 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-8.566</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>-18.852</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress Perception (SP)</td>
<td>4.175</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>27.304</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP X Low Assertive Conflict Modes</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>-1.695</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B: unstandardized beta; SE: standard error; β: standardized beta; p: significance level; t: t statistic; R²: variance. * p < .001

Taken all these results into consideration, it is clear that stress perception is closely related with felt stress. So, people who perceived more stress also felt more stress. Among these people, who have high assertive conflict modes, perceived and felt less stress. Therefore, high assertiveness moderated the relationship between stress perception and felt stress and then contributed reducing stress.

5. Conclusion, Discussions And Suggestions

The aim of this research was to determine the moderator effects of high and low assertive conflict handling modes on the relationship of perceived and felt stress. It is proposed that people who use assertive conflict
handling modes may perceive stress factors lesser; and in line with this perception, they may also feel stress less in comparison to people who use low assertive conflict handling modes.

The results of the current study suggest that stress perception is positively related with felt stress. People who perceive stress more are prone to experience the feeling of stress more. Furthermore, it was found out that caregiving staff with high assertive conflict modes (competing, collaborating) is better to cope with workplace stress factors. It was revealed that the staff with high assertive conflict handling modes exposes less stress perception and experiences less stress. However, it was not attained significant result for the low assertive conflict handling modes in the moderation hypothesis.

The results of this research support findings of past studies. Particularly, the positive influence of assertiveness on stress was emphasized by many researchers through focusing on a wide variety of variables. For example, there were found an inverse relationship between high assertiveness and anxiety (Orenstein, Orenstein, & Carr, 1975), experiencing health problems (Williams & Stout, 1985), negative emotion (Tomaka et al., 1999), and perceiving stress factors as threat (Tomaka et al., 1999). In line with our study, according to Friedman and colleagues (2000), in a clinical department of a hospital, people with more collaborating conflict handling mode experienced less stress and people with avoiding mode experienced more stress. However, same study states that people with competing mode also experienced more stress which contradicts with our findings. This difference may be explained through the sensitivity of the medical environment which may have less tolerance for more dominating mode. Nevertheless, Friedman and colleagues (2000) emphasize that the work environment was partly the employee’s own making. Therefore, stress perception is closely related with employees’ approach to the conflict. Likewise, Petrie and Rotheram (1982) think that while assertiveness is in a negative relationship with stress, it also positively influences these people’s self-esteem. Furthermore, Schiffrin and Nelson (2010) say that stress perception has an inverse relationship with happiness. Hence, conflict handing modes which help to experience less stress perception may contribute to more happiness.

In work life individuals are prone to stress (Britt & Jex, 2015). To overcome these stress factors coping styles are used. However, the severity of these stress factors usually depends on employees’ perception of them and their workplace environment. Besides, the degree of the negative impact of these stress factors largely influenced by individuals’ coping mechanisms (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). The appropriate type of these coping mechanisms should be determined according to the perceived control over the stress factor. If a person thinks that she/he can control the stress factor and solve it, it is useful and effective to carry on the problem-focus coping style. People who are assertive exhibit problem-focus coping behavior which also includes using negotiation skills, approaching with different solutions to the problem and evaluating practical advice from other people (Bartram & Gardner, 2008). That meaning, individuals’ approaches to the problems may create different coping strategies which may worsen or improve the situation. In healthcare organizations, it is seen that professionals are using several strategies to overcome many workplace stressors and generally they use problem-focused coping mechanism rather than emotion focused one when they try to overcome workplace stress factors (Fathi et al., 2012).

It is difficult for some people to decide to what extent they have control of the stress factors when some they expose to workplace stress; because, they may not know that they can solve the problem or not. There may be some other concerns that workers see important. They may experience anxiety about losing their job; because, their intervention may affect others in the organization. Particularly, some managers may not see the stress factor as a problem. These conditions may discourage some staff and they may prefer low assertive conflict modes which in return results in more disturbance. However, individuals who have assertive conflict handling modes may evaluate the situation easily and may decide to control the stress situation.

All in all, employees as human beings are prone to come face to face with several stress factors. In time, new ways of behavioral, psychological or cognitive coping styles may be developed. New interventions of worksite
management may become one of the first applied practices. Training healthcare professionals with communication and conflict handling programs which intends to heighten assertiveness may contribute a lower number of conflicts. That in return can contribute to the positive organizational and individual outcomes (Rahim, 2000), the appropriate level of stress as well. It can also help individuals to choose their coping styles and adapt to their life. Assertiveness trainings were suggested by several researchers particularly for reducing health problems (Wolpe, 1980). Some studies indicated that assertiveness trainings may help people feel less interpersonal anxiety (Alberti, 1977; Alberti & Emmons, 1974). According to Lee and Crockett, these trainings are very important to reduce stress and eliminating nonassertive approaches. This study’s findings might be used in order to form new training programs.

The contribution of the study is the exploration of the conflict handling modes’ effect on felt stress at workplace. This research can add a new aspect to the literature about the relationship between conflict handling modes and work stress. The main finding is the staff with high assertive conflict handling modes experiences less stress. These people may use problem-focus coping effectively. Training programs may be developed to improve the employee’s assertiveness may help to the reduction of work stress. Workplace counselors may use these findings to evaluate clients’ problems. Managers may encourage assertiveness among his/her subordinates in conflict situations in order to solve the problems effectively.

6. Limitations

There are some limitations that should be taken into consideration while thinking about above findings. Participants filled out the questionnaire at their workplace. People who think that the results of the questionnaires will influence their performance evaluations, may show potential threat of social desirability for the study (although participants are provided with the information that their results will be kept by the researcher). The high number of medium assertiveness (compromising conflict mode) may be explained by this limitation.
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Appendixes

Appendix 1.
Scale of Stress Perception and Felt Stress

1- Benden hızlı bir çalışma temposu bekleniyor.
2- Normalden daha fazla çalışmagı gerektği zamanlar oluyor.
3- Bazen birden fazla iş aynı anda yapmam gerekiyor.
4- Zaman geçtikçe daha da karmaşık hale geldiği için işimde zorluk çektiğim oluyor.
5- İşimi bitirmek için zamanımı yetmediği oluyor.
6- Benim için fazla zor olan bir iş yapmak zorunda kalıyorum.
7- Bana ters gelen emirler alıyorum.
8- Bir iş istediğimde çok farklı bir biçimde yapmak zorunda kaldığım oluyor.
9- Yapmanmayı tercih etmeceğim bir iş yapmak zorunda kaldığım oluyor.
10- İşimi yaparken site içerisinde durmam gerekiyor.
11- Gerektiğiinde birkaç dakikalık işimin başından ayrılabilmirim.*
12- İşimi birkaç dakikalığına herhangi bir nedenle terk edebilirim.*
13- İşin yerine getirilme şekli konusunda ben de düşünümcüm.*
14- İş temposunun ayarlanmasında benim etkimi oluyor.*
15- İşimi severek yapıyorum.*
16- Çalışmaktan bence bir anlam taşıyor.*
17- İşin yerine getirilme şekli konusunda önemli buluyorum.*
18- İşimde site sorumluluğu veya diğer şeflerim tarafından takdir edildiğini düşünüyorum.*
19- İşimde iş arkadaşlarınının tarafındandakir edildiğini düşünüyorum.*
20- Site cambi bir sorun olduğuunda site sorumlusu veya diğer şeflerim tarafından takdir edilen bir sorun olduğu bana dauşumuyorum.*
21- Site cambi bir sorun olduğuunda iş arkadaşlarımızla bu sorunun tartışılması bana da dudumuyorum.*
22- İş arkadaş desarmları ile anlaşmazlıkları oluyor.*
23- Site sorumluluğu veya şefimle anlaşmazlıklar oluyor.*
24- Site sorumluluğu veya şefimle anlaşmazlık durumu şu şekilde.*
25- İş arkadaşlarımızla anlaşmazlık durumu şu şekilde.*
26- İşinle ilgili özel duruma girebilmeksite sorumlulukunun ve diğer şeflerimle gecersiz hale gelmesi.*
27- İşinle ilgili özel duruma girebilmeksite arkadaşlarınızın gecersiz hale gelmesi.*
28- Çalışmaktan bence bir anlam taşıyor.*
29- Bir sakinin bakımında sorumluluğum vardır.*
30-Aceptarin güvenliği konusunda sorumluluğum vardır.*
31- Sakeklerin geleceğinden sorumluluğum vardır.*
32- Kendimi öfkeli veya kızgın hissediyorum.*
33- Kendimi gergin hissediyorum.*
34- Kendimi çaresiz hissediyorum.*
35- Kendimi neşeli hissediyorum.*
36- Kendimi sinirli hissediyorum.*
37- Kendimi tükenmiş hissediyorum.*
38- Kendimi sahih hissediyorum.*
Appendix 2.
Turkish Version of Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument


1) Problemim çözülebilmesi için sorumluluğu başkalara bırak娉 zamanlar olur.
A) Anlaşmadıgımız şeyler üzerinde müzakere etmek yerine ikimizin de üzerinde anlaştığı şeylerı vurgulamaya çalışırım.
B) Özerinde uzlaşmaya varlabilicek bir çözüm bulmaya çalışırım.

2) Hem benin endişelerim hem de diğer herkesin endişelerini de dikkate almayı düşünürüm.
A) Genellikle kararları bir şekilde hedeflerimin arkasında dururum.
B) Aramızdaki iki kişiyi korumak maksadı olmak üzere, çoğunu hislerine uygun davranmayı deneyebilirim.

3) Aramızdaki iki kişiyi korumak maksadı olmak üzere, çoğunu hislerine uygun davranmayı deneyebilir.
A) Özerinde uzlaşmaya varlabilicek bir çözüm bulmaya çalışırım.
B) Bazen başka birinin istekleri uğruna kendi isteklerimi feda ederim.

4) Bir çözüm bulmak için uğraşırken düzenli olarak başkalarının fikrini de dikkate alırım.
A) Ortak bir noktada anlaştığımızı belirtmek için ne gerekirse yapmayı denerim.
B)孕育 dişiğenlikten kaçınmak için ne gerekirse yapmayı denerim.

5) Eğer bu kişinin mutlu ediyorsa onun kendi fikirlerini sürdürmesine ses çıkarmam.
A) Ortak bir noktada anlaştığımızı belirtmek için ne gerekirse yapmayı denerim.
B)孕育 dişiğenlikten kaçınmak için ne gerekirse yapmayı denerim.

6) Hemen başka birisi karşılaştığımızda kendi fikirlerimi diğerlerine anlattıktan sonra onlarla da kendilerini ifade ederim.
A) Hemime dair genel kabul edilen konuları onların hislerine uygulamaya çalışırım.
B) Hemime dair genel kabul edilen konuları onların hislerine uygulamaya çalışırım.

7) Kendim de müzakere etmek yerine bir çözüm bulmaya çalışırım.
A) Anlaşmada olduğumuz şeyler üzerinde müzakere etmek yerine ikimizin de üzerinde anlaştığı şeylerı vurgulamaya çalışırım.
B) Özerinde uzlaşmaya varlabilicek bir çözüm bulmaya çalışırım.

8) Hemime dair genel kabul edilen konuları onların hislerine uygulamaya çalışırım.
A) Hemen başka birisi karşılaştığımızda kendi fikirlerimi diğerlerine anlattıktan sonra onlarla da kendilerini ifade ederim.
B) Ortak bir noktada anlaştığımızı belirtmek için ne gerekirse yapmayı denerim.

9) B) Bir çözüm bulmak için uğraşırken düzenli olarak başkalarının fikrini de dikkate alırım.
A) Ortak bir noktada anlaştığımızı belirtmek için ne gerekirse yapmayı denerim.
B)孕育 dişiğenlikten kaçınmak için ne gerekirse yapmayı denerim.

10) Ortak bir noktada anlaştığımızı belirtmek için ne gerekirse yapmayı denerim.
A) Ortak bir noktada anlaştığımızı belirtmek için ne gerekirse yapmayı denerim.
B)孕育 dişiğenlikten kaçınmak için ne gerekirse yapmayı denerim.

11) Ortak bir noktada anlaştığımızı belirtmek için ne gerekirse yapmayı denerim.
A) Ortak bir noktada anlaştığımızı belirtmek için ne gerekirse yapmayı denerim.
B)孕育 dişiğenlikten kaçınmak için ne gerekirse yapmayı denerim.

12) Ortak bir noktada anlaştığımızı belirtmek için ne gerekirse yapmayı denerim.
A) Ortak bir noktada anlaştığımızı belirtmek için ne gerekirse yapmayı denerim.
B)孕育 dişiğenlikten kaçınmak için ne gerekirse yapmayı denerim.

13) Ortak bir noktada anlaştığımızı belirtmek için ne gerekirse yapmayı denerim.
A) Ortak bir noktada anlaştığımızı belirtmek için ne gerekirse yapmayı denerim.
B)孕育 dişiğenlikten kaçınmak için ne gerekirse yapmayı denerim.
A) Ortak bir noktada anlaşmayı öneririm.
B) Görüş farklığımı belirtenin her zaman da gerekli olmadığımı hissediyorum.
A) Diğer kişinin hislerini incitmeye çalışırım.
B) Her zaman problemi diğer kişiyle paylaşım böylece sorunu halledebiliriz.
A) Problemın çözülebilmesi için sorumluluğunun başkanına bırakduğum zamanlar olur.
B) Anlaşmadığımız şeyler üzerinde müzakere etmek yerine ikiimizin de üzerinde anlaştığı şeylerı vurgulamaya çalıştırır.

A) Üzerinde uzlaşma varlığımızın bir çözüm bulmaya çalışdır.
B) Aramızdaki iliskiyi korumak maksadıyla diğer tarafın hislerine uyun davranmayı deneyebilirim.

A) Üzerinde uzlaşma varlığımızın bir çözüm bulmaya çalıştır.
B) Bazen başka birinin istekleri uğruna kendisi isteklerini feda ederim.

A) Bir çözüm bulmaktan uzワークaya varılabilecek bir çözüm bulmaya çalışır.
B) Hem benim endişelerimi hem de diğer herkesin endişelerini dikkate almaya çalıştırı.

A) Genellikle kararlı bir şekilde hedeflerimin arkasında dururım.
B) Üzerinde uzlaşma varlığımızın bir çözüm bulmaya çalıştır.

A) Hemen açıkça orta yerde tüm endişeleri ve konuları konuşmayı amaçetim.
B) Aramızdaki iliskiyi korumak maksadıyla diğer tarafın hislerine uyun davranmayı deneyebilir.

A) Biz bir çözüm bulmak için uğraşırken düzenli olarak başkalarının fikrini de dikkate alırı.
B) Gereksiz gerginliklerden kaçınmak için ne gerekliyse yapmayı denerüm.

A) Kendi iyiliğim için tatsızlık yaratmaktan kaçınmayı denemek.
B) Kendi duruşumu göstermeyi denerim.

A) Hemen açıkça orta yerde tüm endişeleri ve konuları konuşmayı amaçetim.
B) Aramızdaki iliskiyi korumak maksadıyla diğer tarafın hislerine uyun davranmayı deneyebilir.

A) Genellikle kararlı bir şekilde hedeflerimin arkasında dururım.
B) Üzerinde uzlaşma varlığımızın bir çözüm bulmaya çalıştır.

A) Hemen açıkça orta yerde tüm endişeleri ve konuları konuşmayı amaçetim.
B) Aramızdaki iliskiyi korumak maksadıyla diğer tarafın hislerine uyun davranmayı deneyebilir.

A) Genellikle kararlı bir şekilde hedeflerimin arkasında dururım.
B) Üzerinde uzlaşma varlığımızın bir çözüm bulmaya çalıştır.

A) Kendi fikirlerimi diğerlerine anlattıktan sonra onlara da kendi fikirlerimi anlattırı.
B) Ona kendi fikirleriminin mantığını ve faydalarını göstermeye çalıştır.

A) Ortak bir noktada anlaşmayı öneririm.
B) Karşılıklı taviz verilmesi şartıyla bazı hususlarda taviz verebilirim.

A) Bir çözüm bulmak için uğraşırken düzenli olarak başkalarının fikrini de dikkate alırı.
B) Gereksiz gerginliklerden kaçınmak için ne gerekliyse yapmayı denerüm.

A) Diğerlerinin hislerini incitmemeye çalıştır.
B) Kendi fikirlerimi diğerlerine anlattıktan sonra onlara da kendi fikirlerimi anlattırı.

A) Ortak bir noktada anlaşmayı öneririm.
B) Her zaman problemi doğrudan tartışılmasına eğilimliyim.

A) Çoğu zaman kendisi istekleri yerine getirmeye ilgilendirir.
B) Problemlerin çözülebilmesi için sorumlulüğumun başkanına bırakıyorum zamanlar olur.

A) Eğer diğer tarafın görüşünü onlara önemi bütünüğüyorsa, onları isteklerini karşılamaça çalıştır.
B) Diğer kişinin hissederinîn bir çözümlü olmasına çalıştır.

A) Karşılıklı taviz verilmesi şartıyla bazı hususlarda taviz verebilirim.
B) Her zaman probleminin doğrudan tartışılmasına eğilimliyim.

A) Ortak bir noktada anlaşmayı öneririm.
B) Kendi fikirlerimi diğerlerine anlattıktan sonra onlara da kendi fikirlerimi anlattırı.

A) Ortak bir noktada anlaşmayı öneririm.
B) Görüş farklılığı belirtmeyi denemek.

A) Ortak bir noktada anlaşmayı öneririm.
B) Karşılıklı taviz verilmesi şartıyla bazı hususlarda taviz verebilirim.

A) Ortak bir noktada anlaşmayı öneririm.
B) Her zaman probleminin doğrudan tartışılmasına eğilimliyim.

A) Ortak bir noktada anlaşmayı öneririm.
B) Kendim fikirlerimi diğerlerine anlattıktan sonra onlara da kendi fikirlerimi anlattırı.

A) Ortak bir noktada anlaşmayı öneririm.
B) Her zaman probleminin doğrudan tartışılmasına eğilimliyim.