A PERSON-CENTERED EXAMINATION OF ADOLESCENT CONFLICT RESOLUTION BEHAVIOR AND PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING IN PARENT AND BEST-FRIEND RELATIONSHIP CONTEXTS

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
OZYEGIN UNIVERSITY

BY

Çağla Nur Ünal

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

April 2020

Approved by:

Name of Thesis Advisor _____

(Thesis Advisor)

Name of Committee Member 1 _____

Name of Committee Member 2 _____

April 2020

To all Adolescents and their Parents…

ABSTRACT

The current study aimed to examine adolescents' conflict resolution patterns in their relationships with their mother, father, and best-friend and to investigate how these patterns differ in adolescents' well-being (i.e., life satisfaction, problem solving confidence, trait-anxiety). Participants were 1033 Turkish adolescents between the ages of 11 to 19. Adolescents' conflict resolution behaviors were examined with a person-centered approach through cluster analysis which revealed four groups of adolescents who differ in their conflict resolution patterns. The first cluster which labeled as "Confrontational and Withdrawing" was characterized by low levels of problem-solving and high levels of conflict engagement, withdrawal and compliance. The second cluster which labeled as "Problem Solver" was characterized by high levels of problem solving and low levels of conflict engagement, withdrawal, compliance. The third cluster "Confrontational but not Withdrawing" was characterized by high levels of conflict engagement and low levels of withdrawal, problem solving, compliance. The fourth cluster "Problem Solver but Withdrawing" was characterized by low levels of conflict engagement and high levels of withdrawal, problem solving, compliance. Univariate ANCOVAs, conducted to examine how these clusters differ in psychological well-being revealed that "Problem Solver" had the highest scores in well-being indicators while "Confrontational and Withdrawing" had the lowest scores. Overall, findings revealed how combinations of different resolution styles differ in well-being and highlighted the importance of developing constructive resolution behaviors in adolescence.

***Keywords*:** adolescent psychological well-being, conflict resolution styles, parent-adolescent relationship, friendship in adolescence, person-centered approach

ÖZET

Bu çalışma ergenlik dönemindeki gençlerin anne, baba ve en yakın arkadaşlarıyla ilişkilerindeki çatışma çözme stillerinin (problem çözme, uyum gösterme, çatışmaya girme ve iletişimi kesme) örüntüsünü ve bu örüntülerin esenlik hali (problem çözme becerisine olan güven, yaşam-doyumu, sürekli kaygı) ile ilişkisini incelemeyi amaçlamıştır. 11-19 yaş arası 1033 kişinin katıldığı bu çalışmada birey odaklı yaklaşım izlenerek ergenlerin üç yakın ilişki bağlamında sergilediği çatışma çözme davranışları kümeleme analiziyle incelenmiş, analiz dört farklı küme ortaya çıkarmıştır. "Çatışmacı" olarak adlandırılan ilk küme problem çözme için düşük; çatışmaya girme, iletişimi kesme ve uyum gösterme için yüksek puanlara sahip oluşuyla karakterize edilmiştir. "Problem çözücü" olarak adlandırılan ikinci küme ise tam tersi bir örüntü ortaya koymuş ve problem çözme davranışı için yüksek, diğer çatışma çözme stilleri için düşük puanlarla karakterize edilmiştir. "Çatışmacı ama İletişimi Kesmeyen" şeklinde isimlendirilen üçüncü küme çatışmaya girme için yüksek; iletişimi kesme, problem çözme, uyum gösterme için düşük puanlarla karakterize edilmiştir. Dördüncü küme ise "Problem Çözücü ama İletişimi Kesen" şeklinde isimlendirilmiş ve çatışmaya girme için düşük; iletişimi kesme, problem çözme, uyum gösterme için yüksek puanlarla karakterize edilmiştir. Kümeler arasında psikolojik esenlik hali açısından bir fark olup olmadığını anlamak için tek değişkenli varyans analizi yapılmıştır. Analiz sonuçları "Problem Çözücü" adlı kümenin yaşam doyumu ve problem çözme becerisine güven için en yüksek ve sürekli kaygı için en düşük puanlara sahipken "Çatışmacı" adlı kümenin tam tersi puanlara sahip olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Farklı çatışma çözme örüntülerinin psikolojik esenlik hali açısından farklılık gösterdiğini ortaya koyan bu bulgular, olumlu çatışma çözme davranışı geliştirmenin önemini vurgulamıştır.

Anahtar kelimeler: ergenlik dönemi, problem çözme stilleri, ergenin psikolojik esenliği, ergen-ebeveyn ilişkisi, ergenlik döneminde arkadaşlık, birey odaklı yaklaşım

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First of all, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor Dr. Ayfer Dost-Gözkan, for allowing me the opportunity to work with her. She consistently allowed this thesis to be my own work and directed me to the right way whenever I needed. I would also like to acknowledge that this research was made possible by a grant from the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey- TUBITAK (115K324) to Dr. Dost-Gözkan.

I would like to thank my committee members, Dr. Fatıma Tuba Yaylacı and Dr. Nilüfer Kafescioğlu for kindly accepting to be the members of my thesis committee and for sharing their valuable comments to strengthen this study.

I would like to express grateful thanks to my dear cohort; Ajla Hamza, Afra Taşdelen, Bengi Saral, Cansu Gökbalkan, Merve Fidan, Pelda Çoko and Sena Kuzgun. We shared many stressful moments throughout the graduate years but being altogether in that moments was one of the best things in my life.

I am very thankful to my life partner Muhammed Öztürkci for always listening and encouraging me through the process of writing this thesis.

Finally, my special thanks belong to my parents Meryem and Fatih Ünal and to my dear brothers Çağatay and Çağrı Ünal who provided me with their unconditional support through the process of writing this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

As conflict is an inevitable part of interpersonal relations, conflict resolution is an indispensable social skill that is needed in these interpersonal relations. Although it is important throughout the life, developing conflict resolution skills in adolescence has been seen crucial and attracted particular attention (Seiffge-Krenke, 2000). In this period, parent-adolescent relations become more challenging and interpersonal relations outside the family (i.e., with friends and peers) increasingly become important which makes this period more demanding in terms of conflict resolution skills as well as more enabling for development of these skills. Moreover, findings which showed that adolescents who lack conflict resolution skills has been seen at risk for various negative outcomes such as delinquency (Jaffee & D'Zurilla, 2003), depression and antisocial behavior (Colsman & Wulfert, 2002) and called attention to the importance of conflict resolution in adolescence.

Relationships with one's mother, father and best friend are three important close relationships in adolescents' life and all of them are influenced by developmental changes during adolescence. Adolescent-parent conflict increases in this period; this poses some challenges for the adolescent and the family but at the same time provides important opportunities such as promoting autonomy and identity development (Laursen & Collins, 2009). Peer relations which become more intimate in adolescence (Chow, Ruhl, & Buhrmester, 2016) has conflicts too and these conflicts also provide unique opportunities (e.g. fostering cognitive and interpersonal skills) for development (Laursen & Hafen, 2010). At this point, conflict resolution in these relationships are crucial since benefiting these opportunities depend to a certain extend on the way conflict is resolved.

The current study aimed to examine adolescents' conflict resolution patterns in their three close relationships (i.e., mother, father and best friend) using the person-centered approach and to investigate the relationship between these conflict resolution patterns and adolescents' psychological well-being (life satisfaction, problem-solving confidence and trait-anxiety).

In the present study, adolescents' conflict resolution behaviors were not examined through focusing on adolescents' conflict resolution styles separately, rather they were examined through focusing on behavior patterns that consisted of different conflict resolution styles (conflict engagement, problem-solving, withdrawal, and compliance), by means of a person-centered approach. Adopting a person-centered approach is important for several reasons. First of all, as Branje, van Doorn, van Der Valk and Meeus (2009) pointed out, individuals do not use only one conflict resolution style, but they use different resolution styles together. For example, an individual who generally employ compromise in conflict situations might also use problem solving as a conflict resolution strategy while another strategy may include a combination of compromise and conflict engagement. Secondly, in addition to examining linear links between variables, it is also needed to examine the characteristics of patterns in order to understand development broadly (Laursen & Hoff, 2006). However, most studies in the field of adolescence have focused on conflict resolution styles separately and have not dealt with conflict resolution patterns of adolescents. To our knowledge only one study examined adolescents' conflict resolution patterns using a person-centered approach (Branje et al., 2009).

Moreover, the research to date has tended to focus on the links between negative psychological outcomes and adolescent conflict resolution behavior rather ignoring positive psychological outcomes. However, the absence of negative outcomes is not enough to understand adolescents' psychological well-being and more studies examining positive

outcomes are needed to fully understand adolescent well-being (Park, 2004). For example, as Park (2004) stated, an adolescent whose negative symptoms are very low might still have low levels of well-being. Therefore, the current study focused on positive psychological outcomes such as life-satisfaction and problem-solving confidence in addition to the negative psychological outcome such as trait-anxiety as indices of well-being.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Definition of Conflict

Although there is no consensus on the definition of conflict, the frame that Shantz (1987) presented for the definition of conflict has been widely used in the conflict literature. Accordingly, the first step of the conflict has been accepted as having incompatible behaviors or purposes. Second, these incompatible behaviors or purposes must be elicited apparent verbal or behavioral opposition in order to define the situation as conflict. Moreover, even though some researchers assert that initial opposition is adequate for the definition of conflict, according to the Shantz's definition, these oppositions need to be mutual and should include at least two people who are mutually opposing (Shantz, 1987).

One important point while defining conflict is to not confuse the term conflict with aggression. Since aggression usually involve conflict, some studies tend to use aggression as an alternative for conflict. However, although aggression usually involve conflict; conflict may not involve aggression. While the definition of aggression involves negative behaviors such as intention to hurt, conflicts do not necessarily involve negative intentions but involve incompatible behaviors or purposes which may or may not reveal aggression afterwards (Shantz, 1987). Similarly, in many studies conflict is being measured with the negative affect expressed during a discussion. However, since conflicts do not necessarily involve negative affect or anger, this type of measurements are not able to define conflict comprehensively and miss out conflicts that do not involve negative affect (Collins & Laursen, 1992).

2.2. Parent-Adolescent Relationship

Adolescence is characterized by changes in variety of domains (physical, cognitive, and interpersonal) (Steinberg, 2005). Recent studies have especially emphasized the role of

adolescent's cognitive advances on parent-adolescent relationship. Adolescents have more advanced abstract thinking abilities as compared to children which promote a change in their interaction patterns with parents. A vertical, asymmetrical and unequal parent-child interaction turns into a more horizontal interaction in adolescence which is also more egalitarian and symmetrical (De Goede, Branje, & Meeus, 2009; Laursen & Collins, 2009). Adolescents' advanced cognitive abilities which enable them to reason in multifaceted ways also lead them consider social conventions, parental rules and parental authority different from the way they consider in childhood (Smetana, 2000). With these more advanced reasoning abilities, it becomes harder to accept parental rules and authority without reasoning, and adolescents rely more on their personal jurisdictions rather than accepting their parents' jurisdictions (Smetana & Daddis, 2002).

In sum, changes in adolescence such as adolescent's cognitive advances might challenge parent-adolescent relationship. Besides, literature shows that these challenges not only do not pose an obstacle to maintain the positive and close parent-child relationship, but they might as well promote adolescents' development and provide opportunities for family such as renegotiation and internalization of parental rules and autonomy (Laursen & Collins, 2009; Smetana, Crean, Campione-Barr, 2005). Despite a decline in the quantity of time spent with parents in adolescence, the content of this time changes in a positive direction with more mutual interaction (Larson et al., 1996).

It is also important to note that, although some studies have argued that the influence of parents declines as the influence of peers increases from childhood to adolescence (Larson & Richards, 1991) other studies have demonstrated that parental influence does not necessarily diminish as peer influence increase during adolescence (Smetana, Campione-Barr, & Metzger, 2006). Accordingly, parents and friends function complementarily in adolescent

development (Brown & Bakken, 2011) and neither friendships nor family relationships can substitute each other.

2.3. Conflict Between Adolescents and Parents

Developmental changes in adolescence generally challenges adolescent-parent relationships. For example, conflict between adolescents and parents increases during early years of adolescence (Tucker, McHale & Crouter, 2003). Although some authors viewed adolescence as a period of "storm and stress" which is characterized by variety of difficulties including heightened and severe parent-adolescent conflict (Blos, 1967; Buchanan, Eccles, Flanagan, Midgley, Feldlaufer, & Harold, 1990; Freud, 1958), recent scholars challenge the storm and stress view (Steinberg & Morris, 2001; Steinberg & Silk, 2002). Although it has been shown that conflict between parents and adolescents increase, studies have also demonstrated that these conflicts has been generally reported over mundane issues of family life (e.g., doing chores and homework, adolescent's activities and social life, obedience to parental rules); whereas rarely reported over delicate issues (e.g., politics, sex, drugs) (Smetana, Daddis, & Chuang, 2003).

A great amount of these conflicts stems from adolescents' and their parents' different expectations about appropriate behavior and timing of developmental tasks (Smetana et al., 2005; Smetana, 2008). For example, although establishment of autonomy is a normative task of adolescence; conflicts may arise when adolescents seek autonomy much faster than their parents' expectations or when parents lag behind their children's pace for autonomy (Collins & Russell, 1991).

Literature also puts emphasis on developmental functions of parent-adolescent conflict. Moderate levels of parent-adolescent conflict provide a context for adolescent development in social-emotional domain and it provides an opportunity for adolescent's autonomy and identity development (Laursen & Collins, 2009). According to Steinberg

(2001), parent-adolescent conflict is a normal part of development and absence of conflict is a sign of hindered development especially in terms of individuation. In a similar vein, Adams & Laursen (2007) found a positive relationship between moderate conflict and positive adolescent outcomes in high quality parent-adolescent relationships characterized by low levels of perceived relationship negativity.

To sum up, although parent-adolescent conflict might increase regarding both conflict rate and affective intensity in the early years of adolescence, it generally includes small issues of daily life and do not threaten closeness of the relationship as asserted by storm and stress view. Moreover, moderate levels of parent-adolescent conflict have developmental functions for adolescent in many domains.

2.4. Friendship in Adolescence

During adolescence, close friendships become more prominent as compared to childhood (Brown & Larson, 2009). Friendships serve important functions and have a unique role in the adolescent development. (Scholte & van Aken, 2008). Sullivan's (1953) interpersonal theory of development offers important insights into understanding the importance of friendship in adolescence. Sullivan highlights basic social needs which are important to our emotional-well-being and argues that different social needs become apparent at different developmental stages. In early adolescence, according to Sullivan, the need for interpersonal intimacy and consensual validation becomes highly apparent and adolescence friendships has the potential to fulfil these social needs.

Friendship intimacy in adolescence contributes to cognitive and socioemotional development (Bauminger, Finzi-Dottan, Chason, & Har-Even, 2008) and alleviates adolescents' psychological distress related to other interpersonal contexts (Chow, Ruhl, & Buhrmester, 2015).

Moreover, studies have revealed that adolescents who have close friendships are more prosocial, less emotionally distressed, better at academic success (Wentzel, McNamara-Barry & Caldwell, 2004) and they have lower levels of internalizing problems (Waldrip, Malcolm, & Jansen-Campbell, 2008) Besides, friendships in adolescence were found to predict initiation of romantic relationships later in life (Connolly, Furman, & Konarski, 2000).

Overall, these studies show that close friendships are very important in adolescent development and have distinctive functions which could not be easily found in other relational contexts. Accordingly, the current study took importance of close friendships in the period of adolescence into consideration and examined this context in relation to conflict resolution behaviors of adolescents.

2.5. Conflict Between Close Friend-Adolescent

As opposed to parent-adolescent conflict, conflicts with close friends are not mostly over small and mundane issues of daily life. Rather, adolescents mostly engage in conflicts with their close friends over more serious issues like difficulties they have in relationships (Adams & Laursen, 2001). Even so, adolescents usually continue social interaction with their close friends after conflicts (Collins & Steinberg, 2006) and they use more negotiation in conflicts with their friends as compared to parent-adolescent conflicts (Laursen, Finkelstein, & Betts, 2001).

Adams and Laursen (2001) conducted telephone interviews with adolescents to examine their conflicts in depth and found relationship differences in immediate outcomes of conflicts: While conflicts with parents were found to end up predominantly with a winner or loser independently of the conflict topic, the immediate outcome of conflicts with friends differed with respect to the conflict topic. For example, conflicts over autonomy issues ended up with no-outcome and conflicts over relationship issues ended up with win-lose outcome or no-outcome.

To sum up, adolescents' conflicts with their close friends generally include more positive affect, may end up with win-lose or no-outcome situation (Adams & Laursen, 2001) and usually include continued social interaction afterwards (Laursen, 1993). Nevertheless, although these are some common features of peer conflict in adolescence, it is not possible to describe all conflicts with these features; adolescents also experience conflicts with their friends which include more negative characteristics. It is important to note that according to the literature, these characteristics are important determinants of conflict outcome. Collins, Laursen, Mortensen, Luebker, and Ferreira (1997) found that adolescents whose conflicts with their friends include negative affect and discontinued social interaction showed less adaptive social-emotional and academic skills than adolescents whose conflicts include positive affect and continued social interaction.

As well as parent-adolescent conflict, constructive peer conflict also has developmental functions (Collins & Laursen, 2004). Constructive peer conflict contributes adolescents' development through providing a context for cognitive and social abilities (Laursen & Hafen, 2010). Risk for relationship dissolution in friendships require more negotiation in time of conflict and this characteristic of friendships provide an opportunity for adolescents to practice negotiation, conflict resolution, perspective taking and other social and cognitive skills which are necessary to maintain a relationship (Laursen, Finkelstein, & Betts, 2001).

2.6. Conflict Resolution

Along with the lifelong importance, much of the literature on conflict resolution pays particular attention to adolescence. Developing conflict resolution skills in adolescence has been seen critical. Research showed that while positive conflict resolution behaviors are related to adolescent adjustment, negative resolution behaviors are linked with adolescent maladjustment (Caughlin & Malis, 2004; Rubenstein & Feldman, 1993). A study which

implemented behavioral observation method for conflict resolution found that adolescents who demonstrated negative conflict resolution behaviors had externalizing problems such as fighting and drug use as well as antisocial behaviors and poor academic achievement (Colsman & Wulfert, 2002). Another study reported that poor conflict resolution skills have predicted school violence in adolescence (Brinson, Kottler, & Fisher, 2004). In a similar vein, Van Doorn, Branje, & Meeus (2008) examined the links between adolescent delinquent behavior and conflict resolution styles of parents and adolescent after controlling for conflict frequency and conflict affect which are both linked to problem behavior. Both adolescent's own conflict resolution behavior itself and its relations with parents' resolution behaviors emerged as important predictors of adolescent delinquency. Jaffee & D'Zurilla (2003) also found that adolescents' own conflict resolution behavior predicted aggressive and delinquent behavior after controlling for parents' resolution behaviors.

The literature reviewed above deals with the direct links between conflict resolution and adolescent adjustment. Some studies, on the other hand, are concerned with the moderating role of conflict resolution behavior. It has been suggested that conflict resolution either strengthens or weakens the relationship between conflict and adolescent adjustment. Tucker, McHale, and Crouter (2003) examined the moderating effect of conflict resolution in the association between conflict frequency and adolescent outcomes for the first time and found that conflict resolution significantly moderated the relation between conflict frequency and adolescent depression in mother-child dyads. A broader view was adopted by Branje and colleagues (2009) who examined moderating role of different conflict resolution style patterns in the relationship between conflict frequency and adolescent outcomes. The relationship between conflict frequency and adolescent problems was found to be differ in adolescents who have different patterns of conflict resolution. Adolescents who have a pattern of conflict resolution style including conflict engagement, withdrawal and some compliance

demonstrated the highest levels of internalizing problems that are related to conflict frequency. Adolescents who mostly use withdrawal and rarely use problem solving showed the highest levels of externalizing behaviors which are associated with conflict frequency. Moreover, as conflict resolution may moderate the relationship between conflict frequency and conflict outcomes it has been also linked with decreases in conflict frequency. In a large longitudinal study, Missotten, Luyckx, Branje, Hal, & Meeus (2017) found a decrease in conflict frequency and destructive conflict resolution behaviors over time in relation of adolescents' positive conflict resolution behaviors.

In summary, developing positive conflict resolution skills have been seen critical throughout the life, but the period of adolescence have attracted particular attention. Many studies in the adolescence literature which revealed direct links between positive conflict resolution behaviors and adolescent adjustment as well as moderating effect of conflict resolution have pointed out the importance of studying conflict resolution in adolescence. Indeed, the nature of adolescence period with transformations in parent-child and peer relations described above also implies how conflict resolution in this period is of vital importance.

2.7. Conflict Resolution Styles

Research has also paid attention to specific conflict resolution styles that individuals use. Sternberg and Soriano (1984) identified seven conflict resolution styles and sorted them by frequency of administration as follows: third party intervention (appealing to a third party for support to resolve conflict), step down (being more pleasant to be understood), accept the situation (accepting and tolerating a situation unpleasant to you), economic action (using economic threats for restriction), wait and see (going into no act), undermine esteem (suppress other's view), physical action (stop someone physically). Jensen-Campbell, Graziano, and Hair (1996) have assembled these resolution styles along with the resolution

styles identified by Vuchinich (1990) under three categories; power assertion, negotiation and disengagement. In many studies of the conflict resolution literature, these three categories are included even they are stated in different names.

Gottman and Krokoff (1989) indicated positive problem solving, compliance, conflict engagement and withdrawal as four main resolution styles. Positive problem solving have been explained as acknowledging own liability, seeking for an agreement, clarifying and explaining; compliance as understanding, accepting and giving a consent; conflict engagement as opposing and criticizing; and withdrawal as not explaining and not answering and communicating irrelevantly (Missotten, Luyckx, Branje, & van Petegem, 2018). These resolution styles also have been commonly used in the conflict resolution literature and present study focused on these four styles while investigating adolescents' conflict resolution behaviors.

Many studies in the literature have examined conflict resolution styles separately. As Branje et al. (2009) pointed out, however, individuals do not use only one conflict resolution style, they employ different resolution styles. For example, Branje and colleagues (2009) investigated combinations of different resolution styles adolescents use rather than examining resolution styles separately and found five different groups of adolescents. They also found that the links between conflict frequency and problem behavior would differ according to the resolution pattern used. In brief, although few in number, recent studies have highlighted the importance of addressing different conflict resolution styles that a person can use together. In the light of these studies, the current study treats conflict resolution styles together in three important close relationships during adolescence.

2.8. Person Centered Approach in Analysis

Person-centered approach investigates different groups of individuals who have similar characteristics in certain characteristics. It challenges the view which considers the

population as homogenous and it asserts that population is heterogeneous in terms of associations among variables (Laursen & Hoff, 2006). In person-centered approach, the effect of a certain variable on different individuals would have different outcomes for each individual since they have different patterns including some other variables in varying degrees (Magnusson, 2003). Variable-centered approach, on the other hand, investigates associations among variables, describes processes that are similar to all individuals in the group, and builds upon the view that asserts homogeneity of population (Magnusson, 2003).

Person-centered approach includes statistical methods such as latent profile analysis, latent class analysis and cluster analysis which "are well suited for questions that concern group or individual differences in patterns of development and associations among variables" (Magnusson, 2003); whereas variable-centered approach includes analyses such as correlation, regression, factor analyses, structural equation modeling (Laursen & Hoff, 2006; Magnusson, 2003).

It is important to note that none of these approaches has a superiority over each other, rather they complement each other through presenting different views. To understand human development comprehensively, both the associations between variables and the characteristics of patterns among the variables must be understood (Laursen & Hoff, 2006).

Laursen and Hoff (2006) explained how variable-centered and person-centered approaches would complement each other by giving examples from current research that utilized both approaches in their analyses. One study, for example, examined not only the effectiveness of a preventive intervention program but also the characteristics of the group who get the most benefit from the program utilizing both the variable and person-centered approaches in the analyses. Variable-centered approach revealed correlations among participation to intervention and target behavior (i.e., effectiveness of the intervention). Person-centered approach revealed that there were certain groups which showed differences in terms of target

behavior and the group in which the program was most effective predominantly consisted of individuals who participated the program.

2.9. Current Study

Many studies in the conflict resolution literature have examined different conflict resolution styles separately. However, recent research shows that conflict resolution styles are not used independently from each other (Missotten et al., 2017). This study aims to contribute to this area of research by addressing adolescents' conflict resolution behavior as a whole and examining patterns in conflict resolution styles rather them examining them separately. The first aim of this study was to investigate conflict resolution patterns of adolescents which include different resolution styles together in their three important close relationships.

Secondly, although there have been studies examining the positive outcomes of effective conflict resolution, most of the studies in this area of research have examined the links between conflict resolution styles and adolescent problem behaviors or other negative outcomes. This study aimed to examine the differences between the groups in terms of psychological well-being (life satisfaction, trait anxiety, and problem-solving confidence). In this manner, rather than examining the links between psychological well-being and a particular conflict resolution style, this study examines the links between psychological well-being and behavior patterns including the combinations of different resolution styles.

The present study seeks to address the following questions:

1. What are conflict resolution patterns adolescents have in their three close relationship contexts (mother, father, and best friend)?
2. How do adolescents with different conflict resolution patterns differ in terms of psychological well-being (life satisfaction, trait anxiety, and problem-solving confidence)?

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

3.1. Participants

We used the data set from a study which was funded by the Turkish Technological and Scientific Research Council (Project no: 115K324) for this study. The original data set was consisted of 1605 Turkish adolescents. The present study included a subset of the sample, which included adolescents who also completed items on relationship with the best friend as well (*N*= 1033. The mean age of the participants was 15.04 (*SD*= 1.50), ranging between 11 and 19.

Comparisons of demographic characteristics of girls and boys showed that girls (*M*= 15.18, *SD*= 1.42) were, on average, older than boys (*M*= 14.85, *SD*= 1.58). Comparisons of other demographics indicated that there were no significant differences between girls and boys in terms of their mothers' and fathers' age, parental education levels, marital status, employment status, and SES. SES was a composite score based on the means scores of maternal and paternal education levels. Mothers' ages were between 29 and 72 (*M* = 41.31, *SD*= 5.41) and fathers' ages were between 28 and 75 (*M* = 45.47, *SD* = 5.85). Mothers' (*M* = 3.31, *SD*= 1.32) and fathers' (*M* = 3.66, *SD* = 1.24) education levels, and SES (*M* = 3.47, *SD*= 1.17) ranged between "0" and "6" (0 = *İlliterate*, 1 = *Literate*, 2 = *Primary school*, 3 = *Middle school*, 4 = *High school*, 5 = *College degree*, 6 = *Graduate degree*).). Majority of mothers (61.8%) were non-employed, 31.3% of the mothers were employed while and 6.1% were retired. Majority of fathers (88.4%) were employed while 2.1% were not employed, and 8% were retired. Majority of the parents (90.5%) were married.

3.2. Procedure

Before starting out to collect data standard ethical procedures were followed: Approvals from Istanbul branch of Ministry of Education and from Ethics Review Board at Ozyegin University were obtained. Eight public secondary schools from different districts of Istanbul, which vary in SES, were contacted. Adolescents and their parents received informed consent forms before collecting the data. Adolescents whose parents and themselves gave consent for participation participated in the study. Participants were adolescents and they filled out a questionnaire, which included items on relationships with their parents and best friends as well as adolescents' well-being in a class time (40 minutes) that school administrators found appropriate.

3.3. Measures

3.3.1. Conflict Resolution Styles (Kurdek, 1994). Conflict resolution styles were measured with Conflict Resolution Style Inventory (CRSI) which is originally generated by Kurdek (1994) for adult romantic relationships. Turkish adaptation was conducted by project coordinator (Dost-Gözkan, 2017). This Inventory measures 4 conflict resolution styles: conflict engagement, positive problem solving, withdrawal, and compliance. Conflict engagement and withdrawal involve more negative strategies such as being defensive and avoiding problems while positive problem-solving and compliance involve more positive strategies such as being constructive and being not defensive. Each conflict resolution style is measured by 4 items and there is a total of 16 items in the inventory. Each item was rated on a 5-point *Likert* scale (1= *never*; 5 = *always*). Sample items are: Conflict engagement: "Letting myself go and saying things I do not really mean" and "Getting furious and losing my temper"; Positive problem solving: "Negotiating and trying to find a solution that is mutually acceptable" and "sitting down and discussing the differences of opinion": Withdrawal: "Refusing to talk any longer" and "withdrawing from the situation"; Compliance: "Not defending my position". The internal consistency in the original CRSI ranges between .68 and

.82 for problem-solving; .72 and .85 for conflict engagement; .66 and .86 for withdrawal; .77 and .89 for compliance and coefficients for 1-year stability ranges between .54 and .83 (Kurdek, 1994). The Cronbach's alpha of the Turkish adaptation, the sample of which was used in this study, ranges between .73 and .74 for problem-solving; .81 and .85 for conflict engagement; .62 and .63 for withdrawal; .54 and .57 for compliance.

3.3.2. Multidimensional Life Satisfaction Scale (Huebner, 2001; Huebner & Gilman, 2002) was standardized in Turkish by Irmak and Kuruüzüm (2009). MSLSS is a self-reported scale which is appropriate for the ages between 8 and 18. It has a total of 40 items with 5 domains; self, family, school, friends and neighborhood. Sample items are: Self: "I am nice person" and "Most people like me"; Family: " I like spending time with my parents" and " My family gets along well together"; School: "I like being school" and " School is interesting"; Friends: "My friends treat me well" and "My friends are great"; Neighborhood: "I like where I live" and "I like my neighbors". In the current study neighborhood domain was not included as it was not relevant to aims of the study. A total of 30 items were used in the current study and each item was rated on a 5-point *Likert* scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). Cronbach's alphas in the original scale ranges from .70 to .90. In the current sample Cronbach's alphas for the subscales ranges between .81 and .90. The total score of life satisfaction was used in the present study, and the Cronbach's alpha for the total scale is .90.

3.3.3. The State-Trait Anxiety Scale (Spielberger, Gorsuch, Lushene, Vagg, & Jacobs, 1970) was adapted to Turkish by Öner and Le Compte (1985). The scale measures the general mood irrespective of the current mood. There are 20 items which are rated on a 4-point *Likert* scale (1= *almost never*, 4= *almost always*). Sample items are; "I feel that difficulties are piling up so that I cannot overcome them"; "I take disappointments so keenly

that I can't put them out of my mind"; "I am happy" and "I feel secure". Cronbach's alpha in the original scale ranges between .86 and .92 and in the current study it is .84.

3.3.4. Problem-solving Confidence Scale (Heppner & Peterson, 1982) adapted to Turkish by Şahin, Şahin and Heppner (1993) is a subscale of Problem Solving Inventory. The scale consists of six items, rated on a 5-point *Likert* scale (1= *never*, 2= *always*). The scale assesses participants' perceived confidence in their problem-solving abilities. Sample items are Problem-solving Confidence Scale has Internal consistency in the original subscale is .85 and it is .79 in the present study.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

4.1. Analyses Plan

First conflict resolution clusters were identified. In order to achieve this goal, a hierarchical cluster analysis was conducted in order to see and generate appropriate number of clusters. Secondly, we conducted a between group multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) to validate the clusters and to see whether they are distinct from each other. A Repeated Measures MANOVA was also performed to understand the cluster patterns. Demographic differences between the clusters were examined with ANOVAs. Lastly, we performed multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA), controlling for the demographic variables that significantly differ across the groups, in order to investigate differences across clusters in terms of psychological well-being (problem solving confidence, life satisfaction, trait anxiety).

4.2. Creating the Clusters

To create the conflict resolution clusters, firstly we conducted a hierarchical cluster analysis on the standardized the scores of conflict resolution style variables. We used these standardized scores in our first agglomerative hierarchical cluster analysis in order to search for the number of clusters best representing the data. At this step, we examined the dendrogram which is a graphical illustration of the possible clusters (Yim & Ramdeen, 2015). In the graphical illustration we can see how similar the cases are. When we move towards from left to right on the horizontal line of the dendrogram, the similarity of the cases within a cluster decreases (Richette, Bardin, Clerson, Perissin, & Flipo, 2015). Moreover, in the dendrogram we see rescaled distances between the range of 1 to 25 which in fact represents the actual distances. The examination of the dendrogram (see the Figure 1) revealed that 3 to

7 clusters could be appropriately representing the clusters. While the rescaled distance of 10 corresponds to 3 cluster solution in our dendrogram, it corresponds to 4 cluster solution as it is approached to the rescaled distance of 5 in which each cluster include more similar cases as compared to the rescaled distance of 10.

After the examination of dendrogram, we proceeded with the examination of agglomeration coefficient in order to decide on the optimal number of clusters. To achieve this, we applied a stopping rule which focuses on the percentage changes in heterogeneity. According to this rule, we need to stop when the percentage of increase in heterogeneity gets larger while moving to the next stage (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2014). When we look at the column for four cluster solution (stage 1000) at Table 1, we can see that the increase is higher than the previous stages which suggests applying the stopping rule at this point. Therefore, we concluded from the agglomeration coefficient that four solution is the most appropriate solution for our data.

Table 1. Agglomeration Schedule

Stage	Clusters Combined		Coefficient	Number of Clusters	Difference	Proportionate Increase
	Cluster 1	Cluster 2				
997	3	20	7181.239	7	296.154	4.1 %
998	31	88	7477.393	6	315.806	4.2 %
999	3	12	7793.199	5	323.973	4.2 %
1000	**23**	**21**	**8117.172**	**4**	**409.649**	**5.0 %**
1001	29	30	8526.821	3	634.233	7.4 %
1002	3	21	9161.054	2	1.195,180	13.0 %
1003	23	29	10356.234	1		

4.3. Validating the Cluster Solution

We conducted a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) to validate the cluster solution and found a significant multivariate effect, Pillai's Trace = 1.50, F (36, 2976) = 82.81, p<.001, partial η^2= .5. Levene's homogeneity of variances test was significant for all conflict resolution styles which shows homogeneity of variances assumption is violated for all of these conflict resolution styles. Therefore, we used Games-Howell test for post-hoc analysis. According to Games-Howell Post Hoc analyses our four clusters differed significantly from at least two of these clusters on conflict resolution styles (Table 2). A Repeated Measures MANCOVA was also conducted to understand the pattern structure. The multivariate effect was significant, Pillai's Trace = .412, F(8, 4012)=130.08, p<.001, partial η^2 = .2.

We used Means procedure and compared the mean values of conflict resolution styles (with mother, father, and best friend) in each cluster with the average mean values of the whole sample in order to describe and label the clusters (Table 3). The first cluster, labeled "*Confrontational and withdrawing*" (n= 169), is characterized by lower scores in problem solving and higher scores in conflict engagement, withdrawal and compliance across the three relationship contexts. Between group comparisons showed that Cluster 1 had significantly the highest withdrawal scores among other clusters and higher conflict engagement scores than Cluster 2 and Cluster 4 in all relationships. Moreover, problem solving scores in Cluster 1 were significantly lower than Cluster 2 and Cluster 4 while compliance scores were significantly higher than Cluster 2 and Cluster 3 in all relationships. Within group comparisons showed that there were differences and similarities in conflict resolution styles across relationships in Cluster 1. Conflict engagement with best-friend (M= 3.13, SD= .98) was significantly higher than conflict engagement with mother (M=2.77, SD= 1.05) and with father (M=2.35, SD= 1.01). Also, conflict engagement with mother (M=2.77, SD= 1.05) was significantly higher than conflict engagement with father (M=2.35, SD= 1.01). Problem

solving with mother (*M*= 3.10, *SD*= .91) was significantly higher than problem solving with best-friend (*M*= 3.51, *SD*= .80) and problem solving with best friend (*M*= 3.51, *SD*= .80) was significantly higher than problem solving with father (*M*= 3.03, *SD*= .93). Use of compliance with best-friend (*M*= 2.27, *SD*= .93) was significantly lower than use of compliance with mother (*M*= 2.71, *SD*= .96) and father (*M*= 2.71, *SD*= .97). Moreover, use of withdrawal with father (*M*= 3.50, *SD*= .78) was significantly higher than use of withdrawal with mother (*M*= 3.33, *SD*= .78) and use of withdrawal with father (*M*= 3.50, *SD*= .78) was significantly higher than use of withdrawal with best-friend (*M*= 3.26, *SD*= .80).

The second group, labeled as "*Problem Solver*" (*n*= 354), is characterized by higher scores on problem solving and lower scores on conflict engagement, withdrawal and compliance. Between group comparisons indicated that Cluster 2 had the highest problem-solving scores and had the lowest withdrawal scores in all relationships. Moreover, it was significantly lower than Cluster 1 and Cluster 3 in conflict engagement while significantly lower than Cluster 1 and Cluster 4 in compliance in all relationships. Within group comparisons showed conflict engagement with best-friend (*M*= 2.07, *SD*= .79) was significantly higher than conflict engagement with mother (*M*=1.60, *SD*= .65) and conflict engagement with father (*M*=1.43, *SD*= .57). Also, conflict engagement with mother (*M*=1.60, *SD*= .65) was significantly higher than conflict engagement with father (*M*=1.43, *SD*= .57). Problem solving with mother (*M*= 4.20, *SD*= .56) and father (*M*= 4.22, *SD*= .58) were significantly lower than problem solving with best-friend (*M*= 4.30, *SD*= .54). The use of compliance with best-friend (*M*= 1.54, *SD*= .52) was significantly lower than use of compliance with mother (*M*= 1.99, *SD*= .75) and use of compliance with father (*M*= 1.78, *SD*= .56). Also, use of compliance with mother (*M*= 1.99, *SD*= .75) was significantly higher than use of compliance with father (*M*= 1.78, *SD*= .56) and use of withdrawal with father (*M*=

1.83, *SD*= .59) was significantly higher than use of withdrawal with mother (*M*= 1.76, *SD*= .59).

The third cluster, labeled as "*Confrontational but not Withdrawing*" (*n*= 276), is characterized by lower scores in problem solving, compliance, withdrawal and higher scores in conflict engagement. Between group comparisons showed that Cluster 3 was significantly higher than Cluster 2 and Cluster 4 in conflict engagement while it was significantly the lowest in problem-solving across clusters in all relationships. In the use of withdrawal strategy, Cluster 3 was significantly lower than Cluster 1 and Cluster 4 while it was significantly higher than Cluster 2 in all relationships. Moreover, Cluster 3 was significantly the lowest in compliance in adolescent-mother relationship while it was significantly lower than only Cluster 1 and Cluster 4 in relationships with father and best-friend. Within group comparisons showed conflict engagement with best-friend (*M*= 2.98, *SD*= .99) was significantly higher than conflict engagement with mother (*M*=2.50, *SD*=.1.01) and with father (*M*=2.24, *SD*= 1.01). Also, conflict engagement with mother (*M*=2.50, *SD*= 1.01) was significantly higher than conflict engagement with father (*M*=2.24, *SD*= 1.01). Problem solving with mother (*M*= 2.76, *SD*= .72) and father *M*= 2.73, *SD*= .76) were significantly lower than problem solving with best-friend (*M*= 2.96, *SD*= .79). The use of compliance with best-friend (*M*= 1.56, *SD*= .61) was significantly lower than use of compliance with mother (*M*= 1.82, *SD*= .66) and with father (*M*= 1.76, *SD*= .66). The use of withdrawal with father (*M*= 2.05, *SD*= .71) was significantly higher than use of withdrawal with mother (*M*= 1.91, *SD*= .62). Use of withdrawal with best-friend (*M*= 2.05, *SD*= .71). was significantly higher than use of withdrawal with mother (*M*= 1.91, *SD*= .62).

The fourth group labeled as "*Problem Solver but Withdrawing*" (*n*= 206), shows a pattern which has lower scores in conflict engagement and higher scores in problem solving, compliance as well as in withdrawal (Table 3). Between group comparisons showed that

Cluster 4 was significantly lower than Cluster 1 and Cluster 3 in conflict engagement while it was significantly the highest in compliance in all relationships. It was lower than Cluster 1 and higher than Cluster 2 and Cluster 3 in withdrawal in all relationships. Moreover, it was significantly lower than Cluster 2 and significantly higher than Cluster 1 and Cluster 3 in problem-solving in all relationships. Within group comparisons showed that conflict engagement with best-friend (*M*= 2.26, *SD*= 1.00) was significantly higher than conflict engagement with mother (*M*=1.50, *SD*= .60) and father (*M*=1.38, *SD*= .57). Also, conflict engagement with mother (*M*=1.50, *SD*= .60) was significantly higher than conflict engagement with father (*M*=1.38, *SD*= .57). Problem solving with mother (*M*= 3.68, *SD*= .74) and father (*M*= 3.69, *SD*= .80) were significantly lower than problem solving with best-friend (*M*= 3.82, *SD*= .80). The use of compliance with best-friend (*M*= 2.66, *SD*= .85) was significantly lower than use of compliance with mother (*M*=3.49, *SD*= .79) and father (*M*=3.25, *SD*= .83). Also, use of compliance with mother (*M*=3.49, *SD*= .79) was significantly higher than use of compliance with father (*M*=3.25, *SD*= .83).

Table 2. Statistics for the Conflict Resolution Differences Between Clusters

		Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4			
		Mean (SD)	*Mean (SD)*	*Mean (SD)*	*Mean (SD)*	*F (df)*	η^2	*p-value*
Mother	Conflict Engagement	2.77 (1.05)	1.60 (.65)	2.50 (1.01)	1.50 (.60)	134.87 (3)	.28	1>2,4***,3* 3>2,4***
	Problem Solving	3.10 (.91)	4.20 (.56)	2.76 (.72)	3.68 (.74)	237.15 (3)	.41	2>1,3,4*** 4>1,3*** 1>3***
	Withdrawal	3.33 (.78)	1.76 (.59)	1.91 (.62)	2.26 (.68)	243.28 (3)	.42	1>2,3,4*** 4>2,3*** 3>2**
	Compliance	2.71 (.96)	1.99 (.75)	1.82 (.66)	3.49 (.79)	227.00 (3)	.4	4>1,2,3*** 1>2,3*** 2>3*
Father	Conflict Engagement	2.35 (1.01)	1.43 (.57)	2.24 (1.01)	1.38 (.57)	99.84 (3)	.23	1>2,4*** 3>2,4***
	Problem Solving	3.03 (.93)	4.22 (.58)	2.73 (.76)	3.69 (.80)	243.47 (3)	.41	2>1,3,4*** 4>1,3*** 1>3**
	Withdrawal	3.50 (.78)	1.83 (.59)	2.05 (.70)	2.35 (.74)	238.31 (3)	.41	1>2,3,4*** 4>2,3*** 3>2***
	Compliance	2.71 (.97)	1.78 (.56)	1.76 (.66)	3.25 (.83)	245.44 (3)	.42	4>1,2,3*** 1>2,3***
Best Friend	Conflict Engagement	3.13 (.98)	2.07 (.79)	2.98 (.99)	2.26 (1.0)	80.06 (3)	.19	1>2,4*** 3>2,4***
	Problem Solving	3.51 (.80)	4.30 (.54)	2.96 (.79)	3.82 (.80)	189.63 (3)	.36	2>1,3,4*** 3<1,4*** 1<4**
	Withdrawal	3.26 (.80)	1.82 (.62)	2.05 (.71)	2.31 (.71)	171.84 (3)	.34	1>2,3,4*** 4>2,3*** 3>2***
	Compliance	2.27 (.93)	1.54 (.52)	1.56 (.61)	2.66 (.85)	149.43 (3)	.30	4>1,2,3*** 1>2,3***

*Note. ***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05*

Table 3. Conflict Resolution Clusters and Mean Values

Cluster Names	N	Conflict Engagement Mother	Withdrawal Mother	Problem Solving Mother	Compliance Mother	Conflict Engagement Father	Withdrawal Father	Problem Solving Father	Compliance Father	Conflict Engagement Friend	Withdrawal Friend	Problem Solving Friend	Compliance Friend
Confrontational and Withdrawing (1)	169	2.77	3.33	3.10	2.71	2.35	3.50	3.03	2.71	3.13	3.26	3.51	2.27
Problem Solver (2)	354	1.60	1.76	4.20	1.99	1.43	1.83	4.22	1.78	2.07	1.82	4.30	1.54
Confrontational but not Withdrawing (3)	276	2.50	1.91	2.76	1.82	2.24	2.05	2.73	1.76	2.98	2.05	2.96	1.56
Problem Solver but Witdrawing (4)	206	1.50	2.26	3.68	3.49	1.38	2.35	3.69	3.25	2.26	2.31	3.82	2.66
Total	1005	2.02	2.17	3.51	2.37	1.80	2.28	3.50	2.23	2.54	2.23	3.70	1.90

Note. Red Cells: above the general mean; Blue cells: below the general mean.

4.4. Demographic Differences across Clusters

After validating the cluster solution, we investigated whether there were demographic differences between the clusters. ANOVA results revealed that there were significant age differences between groups, F (3,991) = 10.21, p<.001, η^2=.03. Levene's homogeneity of variances test was significant (p<.001); therefore, we used Games-Howell test for post-hoc analysis. Results revealed that members of cluster 1 (M= 14.88, SD= 1.39) were, on average, older than the members of cluster 4 (M= 14.33, SD= 1.44). Moreover, members of cluster 4 (M= 14.33, SD= 1.44) were younger than the members of cluster 2 (M= 14.81, SD= 1.37) and members of cluster 3 (M= 15.00, SD= 1.25). One-way ANOVA results revealed that there were also significant SES differences between the clusters, F (3,1000)= 5.82, p=.001, η^2=.02. Levene's homogeneity of variances test was not significant (p=.63) and therefore we used Scheffe test for post-hoc analysis. Results revealed that cluster 2 (M=3.64, SD=1.09) had significantly higher SES score than cluster 4 (M= 3.44, SD= 1.14). Also, cluster 3 (M=3.77, SD=1.16) had significantly higher SES score than cluster 4 (M= 3.44, SD= 1.14). Cluster 1 (M=3.67, SD=1.16) did not show significant SES differences with other clusters. Results of Chi-square test revealed that there were significant differences between clusters in terms of sex distribution, X^2 (3, 1001) = 13.687, p=.003 (Table 4). Accordingly, 16.2 % of the girls and 17.8 % of the boys are in the first cluster; 39.4 % of the girls and 29 % of the boys are in the second cluster; 26.6 % of the girls and 28.5 % of the boys are in the third cluster; 17.8 % of the girls and 24.6 % of the boys are in the fourth cluster.

Table 4. Sex Distributions Across Clusters

	Girls		Boys	
Cluster	n	%	n	%
1st Cluster	96	16.2	73	17.8
2nd Cluster	233	39.4	119	29
3rd Cluster	157	26.6	117	28.5
4th Cluster	105	17.8	101	24.6
Total	591	100	410	100

X^2 (3, 1001) = 13.687, p=.003

4.5. Differences in Psychological Well-being across the Clusters

We conducted a multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA), in order to investigate whether there were differences between clusters in terms of well-being (life satisfaction, trait anxiety, problem solving confidence). SES, sex and age were entered as covariates. The multivariate effect of clusters was significant, Pillai's Trace = .207, F(9, 2904)=23.85, p<.001, partial η^2 = .07. Univariate effects of clusters were significant for sex, F(3, 966)=25.07, p<.001, partial η^2 = .07, age, F(3, 966)=17.72, p<.001, partial η^2 = .05, and SES, F(3, 966)=3.61, p<.05, partial η^2 = .01. Since we found significant multivariate effect across clusters for well-being indicators, we conducted univariate ANCOVAs (table 5) for further examination to see where the difference was coming from.

ANCOVA results comparing the clusters on life satisfaction showed that *Cluster 2* was significantly higher than all other clusters. While *Cluster 4* was significantly higher than *Cluster 1* and *Cluster 3*; *Cluster 3* was significantly higher than *Cluster 1* on life satisfaction scores. ANCOVA results comparing the clusters on problem solving confidence showed that *Cluster 2* was significantly higher than all other clusters. Moreover, *Cluster 4* was significantly higher than *Cluster 1* and *Cluster 3* while there was no significant difference between *Cluster 1* and *Cluster 3*. ANCOVA results comparing the clusters on trait-anxiety

showed that *Cluster 1* had the highest scores on anxiety while *Cluster 2* had the lowest scores. *Cluster 1* was significantly higher than all other clusters; while *Cluster 2* was significantly lower than *Cluster 3* and *Cluster 4*.

Table 5. Statistics for the Well-being Differences between the Clusters

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4			
	Mean (SD)	*Mean (SD)*	*Mean (SD)*	*Mean (SD)*	*F (df)*	η^2	*p-value*
Life Satisfaction	3.41 (.55)	4.01 (.54)	3.60 (.56)	3.95 (.58)	61.79^{***} (3)	.16	$2>1,3^{***}$ $2>4^{*}$ $4>1,3^{***}$ $3>1^{**}$
Problem Solving Confidence	3.48 (.91)	4.01 (.66)	3.49 (.85)	3.80 (.83)	28.90^{***} (3)	.08	$2>1,3^{***}$ $2>4^{**}$ $4>3^{***}$ $4>1^{**}$
Trait Anxiety	2.56 (.48)	2.11 (.47)	2.24 (.50)	2.23 (.49)	36.69^{***} (3)	.10	$1>2,3,4^{***}$ $3>2^{**}$ $4>2^{**}$

Note. $^{***}p<.001$, $^{**}p<.01$, $^{*}p<.05$

Note. Cluster 1 *Confrontational and Withdrawing* was characterized by low scores on problem solving, high scores on conflict engagement, withdrawal and compliance. Cluster 2 *Problem Solver* was characterized by high scores on problem solving and low scores on conflict engagement, withdrawal and compliance. Cluster 3 *Confrontational but not Withdrawing* was characterized by high scores on conflict engagement and low scores on withdrawal, problem solving and compliance. Cluster 4 *Problem Solver but Withdrawing* was characterized by low scores in conflict engagement and high scores in problem solving, compliance and withdrawal.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The primary aim of the current study was to identify adolescents' conflict resolution patterns in three close relationship (i.e., mother, father and best friend) with a person-centered approach (using cluster analysis); and how these patterns differ with respect to life satisfaction, problem solving confidence, trait-anxiety as indicators of well-being. Cluster analysis revealed four different patterns of conflict resolution which significantly differ in well-being. These groups were labelled as "Confrontational and Withdrawing", "Problem Solver", "Confrontational but not Withdrawing" and "Problem Solver but Withdrawing". In the following section these findings are discussed in detail within the framework of the relevant literature.

5.1. Characteristics of Clusters

The first group, "Confrontational and Withdrawing", showed a pattern which included low levels of problem solving and high levels of conflict engagement, withdrawal and compliance. This group was notably the highest in conflict engagement as well as withdrawal strategies. The second group, "Problem Solver", had a pattern which consisted of very high levels of problem solving and low levels of conflict engagement, withdrawal and compliance. The second group's pattern was the exact opposite pattern of the first group. The third group, "Confrontational but Not Withdrawing", showed a pattern that included high levels of conflict engagement and low levels of withdrawal, problem solving and compliance. The fourth group, "Problem Solver but Withdrawal" had a conflict resolution pattern consisted of low levels of conflict engagement and high levels of withdrawal, problem solving and compliance, which seems to have the opposite pattern of the third group.

These patterns supported the claim that conflict resolution behaviors are exhibited as patterns that include combinations of different resolution styles rather than exhibited as a single resolution style (Branje et al., 2009). It might be argued that, examining resolution styles individually or examining the link between a particular resolution style and psychological outcomes would be sufficient. However, as the current literature shows, the use of a particular resolution style is not independent from use or nonuse of the other resolution styles (Missoten et al., 2017). For example, in our study both the first group and the fourth group showed high levels of withdrawal, but withdrawal was not the only strategy they reported to use in their conflicts; while the first group use conflict engagement in combination with withdrawal, the fourth group use both problem solving and withdrawal more commonly than others. Therefore, this finding suggests that examining conflict resolution behavior as a pattern which include different combinations of resolution styles is noteworthy.

We have also found some similarities and differences in conflict resolution styles across the relationships (i.e., mother, father, best friend) for each cluster. Accordingly, adolescents' use of problem solving with their mother and father were similar across all clusters. Their use of withdrawal with their mother and best friend were similar in all clusters except the third one in which use of withdrawal was higher with best friend as compared to mother. Moreover, their use of withdrawal with their father and best friend were similar in all groups except the first cluster in which use of withdrawal was higher with father as compared to best friend. However, conflict engagement and compliance across the relationships were not significantly different from each other in all of the clusters. In the literature, there are studies questioning whether conflict resolution behaviors differ across relationships or not and there are two models that most of these studies based upon; the social problem-solving model which consider conflict resolution behavior as similar across contexts and the contextual view which consider conflict resolution behavior as different across contexts (Dost-Gözkan, 2019).

In the current study, we examined these similarities/differences for each cluster and found partial supports for both views. For conflict engagement and compliance, our results were consistent with the view that assert differences across contexts in conflict resolution behaviors (e.g Adams & Laursen, 2001). On the other hand, our results concerning withdrawal and problem solving were in line with the studies that found similarities across relationships on conflict resolution behavior (e.g., van Doorn et al., 2011). Moreover, the variable centered analyses of a recent study which used the same date set with the current study revealed similarities as well as differences in conflict resolution styles across the relationships (i.e., mother, father, best friend) (Dost-Gözkan, 2019). The person-centered analyses of the current study were consistent with the variable-centered analyses in that it revealed both similarities and differences in conflict resolution styles across relationships for each cluster.

5.2. Differences in Psychological Well-being across the Clusters

Our second research question aimed to examine the differences in psychological well-being across groups. The second group "*Problem Solver*" had the highest scores in all well-being indicators (i.e., life satisfaction, problem solving confidence, trait-anxiety) while the first group "Confrontational and Withdrawing" had the lowest scores across all groups. The fourth group "*Problem Solver but Withdrawing*" also had higher scores in all well-being indicators as compared to first group and had higher scores in life satisfaction and problem-solving confidence as compared to third group. The third group "*Confrontational but not Withdrawing*" had higher levels of life satisfaction and problem-solving confidence only when compared to first group.

Our finding that adolescents in the "*Problem Solver"* group showed the highest level of well-being was in line with previous research which found a negative association between problem solving and adolescent problems (Tucker et al., 2003). But more importantly, this finding extends our knowledge by showing how positive problem solving is differentially

related to psychological well-being when coupled with use or nonuse of other resolution styles. Among the four groups, there are two groups of adolescents who predominantly use positive problem solving in their conflicts; the "*Problem Solver"* and the "*Problem Solver but Withdrawing"* groups. However, the *Problem Solver* group was significantly higher than the *Problem Solver but Withdrawing* on psychological well-being indices. Although the *Problem Solver but Withdrawing* group also showed high levels on well-being and was significantly higher than the remaining groups, the significant difference between these two groups is notable. Both groups showed low levels of conflict engagement coupled with high levels of problem solving. However, they differ in their withdrawal and compliance levels; while the *Problem Solver* group showed very low levels of withdrawal and compliance, the *Problem Solver but Withdrawing* group showed moderate to high level of withdrawal along with the very high level of compliance. A possible explanation for this difference on well-being may be the destructive role of withdrawal. Several studies have linked withdrawal with adolescents' long-term emotional and behavioral problems (Seiffge-Krenke, 2000) as well as delinquency (Jaffee & D'Zurilla, 2003), other studies have considered the destructive effects of withdrawal on family environment (Sturge-Apple, Davies, & Cummings, 2006). Moreover, Missotten et al. (2017) argued that adolescents who use withdrawal as a conflict resolution strategy weaken their capacity for positive resolution strategies over time. It may be that when the adolescent withdraws, the conflict might be left unresolved which leads more negative outcomes in children (Cummings, Simpson, & Wilson, 1993).

On the other hand, two groups of adolescents were also notable since they inform us about which combinations of resolution styles are related to lower levels of well-being: The "*Confrontational and Withdrawing"* and "*Confrontational but Not Withdrawing"* groups. Adolescents in these two groups engage in conflicts with their parents and best friends but do not attempt to solve problems. We can highlight the importance of problem solving here too.

Their conflict resolution patterns differ in their withdrawal and compliance levels, the *Confrontational and Withdrawing* group showed high levels of withdrawal and compliance as opposed to third group. Actually, it is not surprising that the group who had a resolution pattern that consisted of high levels of negative resolution styles and low levels of positive problem solving scored lowest on well-being. This finding is consistent with the previous research which linked negative resolution styles with adolescent maladjustment and positive resolution styles with adolescent adjustment (Caughlin & Malis, 2004; van Doorn et. al., 2008).

What is somewhat surprising is the compliance levels across groups, especially for the "*Confrontational and Withdrawing"* and "*Problem Solver"* groups. Adolescents in the *Confrontational and Withdrawing* group which had the lowest well-being scores showed low levels of compliance and adolescents in the *Problem Solver* group which had the highest scores on well-being showed high levels of compliance that has been accepted as a positive conflict resolution style. Since this study was not concerned with the resolution styles individually, this could be simply attributed to the fact that the impact of a certain resolution style would differ with the use or nonuse of the other resolution styles (Branje et al., 2009). However, another possible explanation might be that compliance can be used both as constructively coming to an agreement and complying obediently without a sincere agreement (Missotten et al., 2018). When the adolescent complies obediently, the conflict might be again left unresolved and unresolved conflicts lead more negative outcomes in children (Cummings, Simpson, & Wilson, 1993) as stated earlier similarly for withdrawal.

5.3. Culture and Gender Related Differences

Cross-cultural studies have indicated that adolescents' conflict resolution behaviors vary across cultures. In a study, adolescents from non-European backgrounds were found to show more compliance in conflicts with their parents as compared to European American

adolescents (Phinney, Kim-Jo, Osorio, Saloniki, & Vilhjamsdottir, 2005). In another study, German adolescents were found to use compromise and confrontation more than Indonesian adolescents (Haar & Krahe, 1999). Similar to adolescents in other collectivistic countries, Turkish adolescents were found to use compliance and compromise more often than other resolution styles (Dost-Gözkan, 2012). However, in the current study Cluster 2 and Cluster 3 which include a great majority of participants had low levels of compliance and withdrawal. It might be expected that Turkish adolescents living in a collectivistic culture would show greater levels of compliance since they value harmony in interpersonal relationships. However, it should be noted that although some cultural differences have found in adolescents' conflict resolution styles, no variations in adolescent autonomy were found across cultures (Yau & Smetana, 2003; Phinney et al., 2005). Adolescent-parent conflict have an important role in adolescent's autonomy development and this developmental task do not show culture-specific patterns (Yau & Smetana, 2003). Therefore, even in collectivistic cultures, despite the cultural expectations regarding respect and harmony in interpersonal relationships, adolescents' developmental desire for autonomy may promote less compliant behavior in conflict situations.

We have also revealed some differences between clusters in terms of sex distributions. There are two remarkable clusters in this respect; the second cluster "Problem Solver" which include 39.4 percent of girls and 29 percent of boys; and the fourth cluster "Problem Solver but Withdrawing" which include 17.8 percent of girls and 24.6 percent of boys. These results do not inform us about sex differences for conflict resolution styles but show sex distributions across four clusters. Accordingly, while the majority of girls appeared at a group which has the highest problem solving and the lowest withdrawal scores, a considerable majority of boys as compared to girls appeared at a group which has high levels of withdrawal and compliance as well as high levels of problem solving. Although the most salient difference between these

two groups seems like withdrawal levels, previous research found girls use withdrawal more often than boys (Owens, Daly, & Slee, 2005; De Wied, Branje, Meeus, & 2007) or found no sex differences for withdrawal (Dost-Gözkan, 2019).

5.4. Strengths

One of the major strengths of the current study is the person-centered approach that enabled us to examine characteristics of different conflict resolution patterns. Most work in the literature on conflict resolution used variable-centered approach and examined the associations among variables. The current study examined how these associations vary among different groups through adopting a person-centered approach. Secondly, the current study differed from the previous studies showing the links between adolescent conflict resolution and negative outcomes by revealing the links between adolescent conflict resolution and positive psychological outcomes. The third strength of the current study is that we controlled for the SES, age and sex which are found to be differed significantly across the clusters. Another strength of the study is its sample size which included a total of 1033 adolescents.

5.5. Limitations and Future Directions

Finally, there are several limitations of this study that need to be considered. First, this study has a cross-sectional design and for this reason it is not possible to make any causal inferences. A future study could investigate the long-term effects of adolescents' conflict resolution patterns. Second, the data relied on self-reports of adolescents which may lead social desirability bias and common method bias. Although adolescents' reports were found to be a reliable and valid measure of parent-child conflict (Metzler, Biglan, Ary, & Li, 1998) future studies may also include parents' and best friends' reports to measure conflict behavior. Third, the internal consistency coefficients of the compliance subscale in both the original scale and in the Turkish adaptation that was used in this study was low which may threaten construct validity. This may be due to the operationalization of compliance which refers both

to complying negatively without a sincere agreement and to complying positively with an agreement (Dost-Gözkan, 2017). Further work is required to revise compliance subscale and re-examine what the items actually measure. Lastly, data were collected only from a metropolitan city Istanbul in Turkey. Therefore, this sample may not be representative enough for the Turkish population and may restrict the generalization of the findings. Future studies could extend our findings with a more representative sample which also include adolescents from rural areas of Turkey. Moreover, although it is beyond the scope of this study it would be interesting for future research to investigate developmental mechanisms of conflict resolution patterns. What are the mechanisms behind these patterns? What are the variables that predict different combinations of resolution styles in adolescence?

5.6. Implications

The most obvious and general finding to emerge from this research is that adolescents who have different conflict resolution patterns differ in psychological well-being (life-satisfaction, problem solving confidence and trait-anxiety). Based on this finding, the current study has several implications for future practice. Most school-based conflict resolution training programs are aimed at reducing negative behaviors of adolescents such as violence, substance use and delinquency (Farrell, Meyer, Kung & Sullivan, 2001; Lane-Garon & Richardson, 2003). The importance of such programs could not be underestimated as the literature has clearly shown the links between destructive conflict resolution and adolescent problem behavior (Colsman, Wulfert, 2002; Jaffee & D'Zurilla, 2003; Brinson, Kottler, & Fisher, 2004). However, there is also a need for conflict resolution trainings that aim to improve adolescents' positive development in domains such as life satisfaction or problem-solving competence. Adolescents who do not display negative behaviors might still have difficulties in important life-skills or need support for further development (Weissberg & Greenberg, 1998). Therefore, promoting positive development is as noteworthy as reducing

negative behaviors (Graczyk, Domitrovich, Small, & Zins, 2006). Accordingly, one possible implication for future research and practice would be developing an intervention program grounded in the positive youth development framework which can both promote positive development and reduce negative behaviors (Taylor, Oberle, Durlak, Weissberg, 2017).

Secondly, since it is known that conflict resolution trainings frequently coincide with social emotional learning programs in nature (Jones, 2004) it would be practical and useful to incorporate conflict resolution training into a social and emotional learning program administered in school settings. Moreover, findings of the current study call attention to the need for parenting programs that focus on conflict resolution. Several studies in the literature highlight the importance of family context in developing positive conflict resolution behaviors (Parke & Buriel, 2006) and applying these behaviors to other contexts (van Doorn et al., 2011). Finding of the current study which indicate a similar use of withdrawal across contexts was in a similar direction with the studies mentioned above and may help us to understand the importance of parenting programs for conflict resolution. At this point, it is important to note that most of the parenting programs for adolescents' parents are based on behavioral approaches and they overlook the importance of parents' own resources on emotion regulation and emotion socialization (Havighurst, Kehoe, & Harley, 2015). Nevertheless, literature shows the importance of parental emotional regulation and emotion socialization on conflict resolution behaviors of adolescents (Collins & Madsen, 2003). Therefore, it would be convenient to take parents' own emotion regulation and emotion socialization practices into consideration while developing a parenting program on conflict resolution.

APPENDICIES

APPENDIX A. Demographics

Aşağıda bazı demografik bilgileri cevaplamanız istenmektedir.

1. Doğum tarihiniz (gün/ay /yıl):_____/_____/_____
2. Cinsiyetiniz: Kız___ Erkek___
3. Kaçıncı sınıfta öğrencisiniz?_____
4. Genel not ortalamanızı yazınız:_____
5. Anneniz çalışıyor mu? Evet___ Hayır___ Emekli___
6. Annenizin mesleğini yazınız_____
7. Babanız çalışıyor mu? Evet___ Hayır___ Emekli___
8. Babanızın mesleğini yazınız_____
9. Anneniz ve babanız: Evli _____ Boşanmış_____ Diğer (belirtiniz): _____
10. Anneniz kaç yaşında?_____
11. Babanız kaç yaşında?_____

	Annenizin Eğitim Durumu	Babanızın Eğitim Durumu
Okur-yazar değil		
Okur-yazar		
İlkokul mezunu		
Ortaokul mezunu		
Lise ve dengi okul mezunu		
Fakülte/yüksekokul mezunu		
Yüksek lisans/doktora derecesine sahip		

APPENDIX B. Conflict Resolution Style Inventory

Her bir cümlede sözü edilen davranışı ne sıklıkta gösterdiğinizi verilen 5'li ölçeğe göre değerlendiriniz.

1	2	3	4	5
Hiçbir zaman	**Nadiren**	**Bazen**	**Sık sık**	**Her zaman**

Annemle/babamla/en yakın arkadaşımla bir çatışma yaşadığımda,

1. Ona yönelik sert sözler söylerim.	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
2. Aramızdaki soruna odaklanırım.	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
3. Uzun süre sessiz kalırım.	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
4. Kendimi savunmak için istekli olmam.	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
5. Öfke patlaması yaşar, kontrolden çıkarım.	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
6. Görüş ayrılıklarımız konusunda yapıcı bir şekilde konuşurum.	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
7. Kendimi diyaloğa kapatır, daha fazla konuşmayı reddederim.	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
8. Çok uyumlu davranırım.	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
9. Kendimi kaybeder, söylemek istemediğim şeyler söylerim.	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
10. İkimizin de kabul edebileceği seçenekler bulurum.	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
11. Onu yok sayarım/ilgi göstermem.	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
12. Kendi görüşümü savunmam.	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
13. Kırıcı sözler söylerim.	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
14. Sorunu tartışır ve bir orta yol bulmaya çalışırım.	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
15. Geri çekilir, mesafeli ve ilgisiz davranırım.	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
16. Kendi görüşümü biraz ifade etmeye çalışsam da onun isteğine uyarım.	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

APPENDIX C. Multidimentional Life Satisfaction Scale

Aşağıdaki ifadelerin sizin için ne kadar geçerli olduğunu verilen 5'li ölçeğe göre değerlendiriniz.

	Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 1	Biraz katılıyorum 2	Katılıyorum 3	Oldukça katılıyorum 4	Kesinlikle katılıyorum 5
1. Arkadaşlarım bana karşı naziktir	1	2	3	4	5
2.Birlikte zaman geçirmesi keyifli biriyimdir	1	2	3	4	5
3. Okulda kendimi kötü hissederim	1	2	3	4	5
4. Arkadaşlarımla kötü zaman geçiririm	1	2	3	4	5
5. İyi yapabildiğim pek çok şey vardır	1	2	3	4	5
6. Okulda çok şey öğrenirim	1	2	3	4	5
7. Anne ve babamla zaman geçirmekten hoşlanırım	1	2	3	4	5
8. Ailem, pek çok aileden daha iyidir	1	2	3	4	5
9. Okulla ilgili sevmediğim çok şey var	1	2	3	4	5
10. Güzel/yakışıklı olduğumu düşünüyorum	1	2	3	4	5
11. Arkadaşlarım çok iyidir	1	2	3	4	5
12. İhtiyacım olursa arkadaşlarım bana yardım ederler	1	2	3	4	5
13. Keşke okula gitmek zorunda olmasaydım	1	2	3	4	5

14. Kendimi severim	1	2	3	4	5
15. Arkadaşlarım bana iyi davranırlar	1	2	3	4	5
16. Çoğu insan beni sever	1	2	3	4	5
17. Ailemle birlikte olmaktan hoşlanırım	1	2	3	4	5
18. Ailem birbirleriyle iyi geçinir	1	2	3	4	5
19. Okula gitmeyi dört gözle beklerim	1	2	3	4	5
20. Ailem bana adil davranır	1	2	3	4	5
21. Okulda olmaktan hoşlanırım	1	2	3	4	5
22. Arkadaşlarım bana kötü davranır	1	2	3	4	5
23. Şimdiki arkadaşlarımdan farklı arkadaşlarım olmasını isterdim	1	2	3	4	5
24. Okul keyifli bir yerdir	1	2	3	4	5
25. Ailemdeki bireyler birbirleriyle konuşurken kibardır	1	2	3	4	5
26. Arkadaşlarımla çok eğlenirim	1	2	3	4	5
27. Annem babam ve ben birlikte eğlenceli zaman geçiririz	1	2	3	4	5
28. Ben iyi bir insanım	1	2	3	4	5
29. Yeni şeyler denemeyi severim	1	2	3	4	5
30. Yeteri kadar arkadaşım var	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX D. The State-Trait Anxiety Scale

Aşağıda kişilerin kendilerine ait duygularını anlatmada kullandıkları bazı ifadeler verilmiştir. Bu ifadelerin sizin için ne ölçüde doğru olduğunu verilen 4'lü ölçeğe göre değerlendiriniz.

	Hiç doğru değil	Biraz doğru	Doğru	Tamamen doğru
1. Genellikle keyfim yerindedir.	1	2	3	4
2. Genellikle çabuk yorulurum.	1	2	3	4
3. Genellikle kolay ağlarım.	1	2	3	4
4. Başkaları kadar mutlu olmak isterim.	1	2	3	
5. Çabuk karar veremediğim için fırsatları kaçırırım.	1	2	3	4
6. Kendimi dinlenmiş hissederim.	1	2	3	4
7. Genellikle sakin, kendime hakim ve soğukkanlıyım.	1	2	3	4
8. Güçlüklerin yenemeyeceğim kadar biriktiğini hissederim.	1	2	3	4
9. Önemsiz şeyler hakkında endişelenirim.	1	2	3	4
10. Genellikle mutluyum.		2	3	4
11. Her şeyi ciddiye alır ve etkilenirim.	1	2	3	4
12. Genellikle kendime güvenim yoktur.	1	2	3	4
13. Genellikle kendimi emniyette hissederim.	1	2	3	4

14. Sıkıntılı ve güç durumlarla karşılaşmaktan kaçınırım.	1	2	3	4
15. Genellikle kendimi hüzünlü hissederim.	1	2	3	4
16. Genellikle hayatımdan memnunumum.	1	2	3	4
17. Olur olmaz düşünceler beni rahatsız eder.	1	2	3	4
18. Hayal kırıklıklarını öylesine ciddiye alırım ki hiç unutmam.	1	2	3	4
19. Aklı başında ve kararlı bir insanım.	1	2	3	4
20. Son zamanlarda kafama takılan konular beni tedirgin eder.	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX E. Problem Solving Confidence Scale

Aşağıdaki cümleler, günlük yaşantınızdaki sorunlarınıza genel olarak nasıl tepki gösterdiğinizi belirlemeye çalışmaktır. Bu problemler, kendini karamsar hissetme, arkadaşlarla geçinmeme, bir mesleğe yönelme konusunda yaşanan belirsizlikler gibi hepimizin başına gelebilecek türden sorunlar olabilir. Her bir cümlede sözü edilen davranışı ne sıklıkta gösterdiğinizi verilen 5'li ölçeğe göre değerlendiriniz.

1 2 3 4 5

Hiçbir zaman Nadiren Bazen Sık sık Her zaman

1. Sorunlarımı çözme konusunda genellikle yaratıcı ve etkili çözümler üretebilirim.	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
2. Başlangıçta çözümünü fark etmesem de sorunlarımın çoğunu çözme yeteneğim vardır.	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
3. Yeterince zamanım olur ve çaba gösterirsem, karşılaştığım sorunların çoğunu çözebileceğime inanıyorum.	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
4. Yeni ve zor sorunları çözebilme yeteneğime güveniyorum.	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
5. Bir sorunla karşılaştığımda, o durumla başa çıkabileceğimden genellikle pek emin değilimdir.	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
6. Elimdeki seçenekleri karşılaştırırken ve karar verirken kullandığım sistematik bir yöntem vardır.	(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

REFERENCES

Adams, R. E., & Laursen, B. (2001). The organization and dynamics of adolescent conflict with parents and friends. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 63*, 97–110.

Adams, R. E., & Laursen, B. (2007). The correlates of conflict: dis-agreement is not necessarily detrimental. *Journal of Family Psychology, 21*, 445–458.

Bauminger, N., Finzi-Dottan, R., Chason, S., & Har-Even, D. (2008). Intimacy in adolescent friendships: The roles of attachment, coherence, and self- disclosure. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 25*, 409-428.

Blos, P. (1967). The second individuation process of adolescence. *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 22*, 162-186.

Branje, S., van Doorn, M., van der Valk, I., & Meeus, W. M. H. J. (2009). Parent–adolescent conflicts, conflict resolution types, and adolescent adjustment. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 30*, 195–204.

Brinson, J. A., Kottler, J. A., & Fisher, T. A. (2004). Cross-cultural conflict resolution in the schools: Some practical intervention strategies for counselors. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 82*, 294-301.

Brown, B. B., & Larson, J. (2009). Peer relationships in adolescence. In R. M. Lerner & L. Steinberg (Eds.), *Handbook of adolescent psychology* (3rd ed., pp. 74–103). New York, NY: Wiley.

Brown, B. B., & Bakken, J. P. (2011). Parenting and peer relationships: Reinvigorating research on family-peer linkages in adolescence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 21*, 153–165.

Buchanan, C. M., Eccles, J. S., Flanagan, C., Midgley, C., Feldlaufer, H., & Harold, R. D. (1990). Parents' and teachers' beliefs about adolescents: Effects of sex and experience. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 19,* 363-394.

Caughlin, J. P., & Malis, R. S. (2004). Demand/withdraw communication between parents and adolescents as a correlate of relational satisfaction. *Communication Reports, 17*, 59–71.

Chow, C. M., Ruhl, H., & Buhrmester, D. (2015). Romantic relationships and psychological distress among adolescents: Moderating role of friendship closeness. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 61*, 711-720.

Chow, C. M., Ruhl, H., & Buhrmester, D. (2016). Reciprocal associations between friendship attachment and relational experiences in adolescence. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 33*, 122-146.

Collins, W. A., & Laursen, B. (1992). Conflict and relationships during adolescence. In C. U. Shantz & W. W. Hartup (Eds.), *Conflict in child and adolescent development* (pp. 216-241). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Collins, W. A., & Madsen, S. D. (2003). Developmental change in parenting interactions. In L. Kuczinski (Ed.), *Handbook of dynamics in parent-child relations.* London: Sage Publications.

Collins, W. A., & Russell, G. (1991). Mother-child and father-child relationships in middle childhood and adolescence: A developmental analysis. *Developmental review, 11*, 99-136.

Collins, W. A., Laursen, B., Mortensen, N., Luebker, C, & Ferreira, M. (1997). Conflict processes and transitions in parent and peer relationships: Implications for autonomy and regulation. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 12,* 178-198.

Collins, W. A., & Laursen, B. (2004). Changing relationships, changing youth: Interpersonal contexts of adolescent development. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 24*, 55-62.

Collins, W. A., & Steinberg, L. (2006). Adolescent development in interpersonal context. Social, emotional, and personality development. In N. Eisenberg, W. Damon & R. Lerner (Eds), *Handbook of child psychology* (pp. 1003–1067). New York, NY: Wiley.

Colsman, M., & Wulfert, E. (2002). Conflict resolution style as an indicator of adolescents' substance use and other problem behaviors. *Addictive Behaviors, 27,* 633-648.

Connolly, J., Furman, W., & Konarski, R. (2000). The role of peers in the emergence of heterosexual romantic relationships in adolescence. *Child Development, 71*, 1395-1408.

Cummings, E. M., Simpson, K. S., & Wilson, A. (1993). Children's responses to interadult anger as a function of information about resolution. *Developmental Psychology, 29,* 978−985.

de Goede, I. H. A., Branje, S. J. T., & Meeus, W. M. H. J. (2009). Developmental changes in adolescents' perceptions of relationships with their parents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 38,* 75-88.

de Goede, I. H. A., Branje, S. J. T., Delsing, M. J. M. H., & Meeus, W. M. H. J. (2009). Linkages over time between adolescents' relationships with parents and friends. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 38,* 1304–1315.

De Wied, M., Branje, S. J., & Meeus, W. H. (2007). Empathy and conflict resolution in friendship relations among adolescents. *Aggressive Behavior: Official Journal of the International Society for Research on Aggression, 33,* 48-55.

Dost-Gözkân, A. (2012). Adolescent-parent discrepancies in beliefs about family relationships in Turkish families: Links to conflict, cohesion, life satisfaction and conflict management. Michigan: UMI Dissertation Publishing.

Dost-Gözkân, A. (2017). Çatışma çözme stili envanterinin psikometrik özelliklerinin ergen örnekleminde incelenmesi. *Psikoloji Çalışmaları Dergisi, 37*, 51–72.

Farrell, A. D., Meyer, A. L., Kung, E. M., & Sullivan, T. N. (2001). Development and evaluation of school-based violence prevention programs. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, *30*, 207– 220.

Freud, A. (1958). Adolescence. In R. Eissler, A. Freud, H. Hartman, & M. Kris (Eds.), *Psychoanalytic study of the child* (pp. 255–278). New York: International Universities Press.

Gottman, J. M., & Krokoff, L. J. (1989). Marital interaction and satisfaction: A longitudinal view. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 57,* 47-52.

Graczyk, P. A., Domitrovich, C. E., Small, M., & Zins, J. E. (2006). Serving all children: An implementation model framework. *School Psychology Review*, *35*, 266-274.

Haar, B. F., & Krahe, B. (1999). Strategies for resolving interpersonal conflicts in adolescence. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 30,* 667-683.

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2014). Multivariate data analysis: Pearson new international edition. *Essex: Pearson Education Limited*.

Havighurst, S. S., Kehoe, C. E., & Harley, A. E. (2015). Tuning in to teens: Improving parental responses to anger and reducing youth externalizing behavior problems. *Journal of adolescence*, *42*, 148-158.

Heppner, P. P., & Petersen, C. H. (1982). The development and implications of a personal problem solving inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 29,* 66-75.

Huebner, E. S. (2001). *Manual for the multidimensional students' life satisfaction scale.* Columbia, SC: Department of Psychology, University of South Carolina.

Huebner, E. S., & Gilman, R. (2002). An introduction to the multi-dimensional students' life satisfaction scale. *Social Indicators Research*, *60*, 115–122.

Irmak, S., & Kuruüzüm, A. (2009). Turkish validity examination of the multidimensional students' life satisfaction scale. *Social Indicators Research, 92*, 13-23.

Jaffee, W. B., & D'Zurilla, T. J. (2003). Adolescent problem solving, parent problem solving, and externalizing behavior in adolescents. *Behavior Therapy, 34*, 295-311.

Jensen-Campbell, L. A., Graziano, W. G., & Hair, E. C. (1996). Personality and relationships as moderators of interpersonal conflict in adolescence. *Merrill- Paimer Quarterly, 42*, 148-164.

Jones, T. S. (2004). Conflict resolution education: The field, the findings, and the future. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, *22*, 233.

Kurdek, L. A. (1994). Conflict resolution styles in gay, lesbian, heterosexual nonparent, and heterosexual parent couples. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 56*, 705-722.

Lane-Garon, P. S., & Richardson, T. (2003). Mediator mentors: Improving school climate, nurturing student disposition. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, *21*, 47-67.

Larson, R. W., & Richards, M. H. (1991). Daily companionship in late childhood and early adolescence: Changing developmental contexts. *Child Development, 62*, 284-300.

Larson, R. W., Richards, M. H., Moneta, G., Holmbeck, G., & Duckett, E. (1996). Changes in adolescents' daily interactions with their families from ages 10 to 18: Disengagement and transformation. *Developmental psychology*, *32*, 744-754.

Laursen, B. (1993). Conflict management among close peers. In B. Laursen (Ed.) *Close friendships in adolescence: New directions for child development* (pp. 39-54). San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.

Laursen, B., Finkelstein, B. D., & Townsend-Betts, N. (2001). A developmental meta-analysis of peer conflict resolution. *Developmental Review*, *21*, 423-449.

Laursen, B., & Hoff, E. (2006). Person-centered and variable-centered approaches to longitudinal data. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 52*, 377-389.

Laursen, B., & Collins, W. A. (2009). Parent-child relationships during adolescence. In R. M. Lerner & L. Steinberg (Eds), *Handbook of adolescent psychology*. *Contextual influences on adolescent development* (pp. 3–42). New Jersey: Wiley.

Laursen, B., & Hafen, C. A. (2010). Future directions in the study of close relationships: Conflict is bad (except when it's not). *Social Development, 19*, 858-872.

Magnusson, D. (2003). The person approach: Concepts, measurement models, and research strategy. In S. C. Peck & R. W. Roeser (Eds.), *New directions for child and adolescent development: Person-centered approaches to studying development in context* (pp. 3-23). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Metzler, C. W., Biglan, A., Ary, D. V., & Li, F. (1998). The stability and validity of early adolescents' reports of parenting constructs. *Journal of Family Psychology, 12,* 600–619.

Missotten, L. C., Luyckx, K., Branje, S. J. T., Hale, W. W., & Meeus, W. H. (2017). Examining the longitudinal relations among adolescents' conflict management with parents and conflict frequency. *Personality and Individual Differences, 117*, 37–41.

Missotten, L. C., Luyckx, K., Branje, S., & Van Petegem, S. (2018). Adolescents' conflict management styles with mothers: Longitudinal associations with parenting and reactance. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 47,* 260-274.

Owens, L., Daly, A., & Slee, P. (2005). Sex and age differences in victimisation and conflict resolution among adolescents in a South Australian school. *Aggressive Behavior: Official Journal of the International Society for Research on Aggression, 31*, 1-12.

Öner, N., & Le Compte, A. (1985). *Süreksiz (durumluluk)- sürekli kaygı envanteri elkitabı.* İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Park, N. (2004). The role of subjective well-being in positive youth development. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 591*, 25-39.

Parke, R. D., & Buriel, R. (2006). Socialization in the family: Ethnic and ecological perspectives. In W. Damon (Series Ed.) & N. Eisenberg (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology*: Vol. 3.

Reese-Weber, M., & Bartle-Haring, S. (1998). Conflict resolution styles in family subsystems and adolescent romantic relationships. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 27*, 735-752.

Reese-Weber, M. (2000). Middle and late adolescents' conflict resolution skills with siblings: Associations with interparental and parent-adolescent conflict resolution. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 29*, 697-711.

Richette, P., Clerson, P., Perissin, L., Flipo, R., Bardin, T. (2015). Revisiting comorbidities in gout: a cluster analysis. *Ann Rheum Dis, 74,* 142-147.

Rubenstein, J. L., & Feldman, S. E. (1993). Conflict-resolution behavior in adolescent boys: Antecedents and adaptational correlates. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 3*, 41-66.

Seiffge-Krenke, I. (2000). Causal links between stressful events, coping style, and adolescent symptomatology. *Journal of Adolescence, 23*, 675–691.

Scholte, R. H. J., & van Aken, M. A. G. (2008). Peer relationships in adolescence. In S. Jackson & L. Goossens (Eds), *Handbook of adolescent development* (pp. 175–197). Hove: Psychology Press.

Shantz, C. U., (1987). Conflict between children. *Child Development, 58,* 283-305.

Smetana, J. G. (2000). Middle class African American adolescents' and parents' conceptions of parental authority and parenting practices: A longitudinal investigation. *Child Development, 71*, 1672–1686.

Smetana, J., & Daddis, C. (2002). Domain-specific antecedents of parental psychological control and monitoring: The role of parenting beliefs and practices. *Child Development, 73*, 563–580.

Smetana, J. G., Crean, H. F., & Campione-Barr, N. (2005). Adolescents' and parents' changing conceptions of parental authority. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development, 108*, 31–46.

Smetana, J. G., Campione-Barr, N., & Metzger, A. (2006). Adolescent development in interpersonal and societal contexts. *Annual Review of Psychology, 57*, 255–284.

Smetana, J. G. (2008). Conflicting views of conflict. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 73*,161–168.

Spielberger, C. D., Gorssuch, R. L., Lushene, P. R., Vagg, P. R., & Jacobs, G. A. (1983). *Manual for the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

Steinberg, L. (2001). We know some things: Parent–adolescent relationships in retrospect and prospect. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 11*, 1–19.

Steinberg, L., & Morris, A. S. (2001). Adolescent development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *52*, 83-110.

Steinberg, L., & Silk, J. (2002). Parenting adolescents. In M. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Children and parenting* (pp. 103–133). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Steinberg, L. (2005). Cognitive and affective development in adolescence. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *9*, 69-74.

Sternberg, R. J., & Soriano, L. J. (1984). Styles of conflict resolution. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *47*, 794-812.

Sturge-Apple, M. L., Davies, P. T., & Cummings, E. M. (2006). Impact of hostility and withdrawal in interparental conflict on parental emotional unavailability and children's adjustment difficulties. *Child Development, 77,* 1623-1641.

Sullivan, H. S. (1953). *The interpersonal theory of psychiatry.* New York. NY: W.W. Norton.

Şahin, N., Şahin, N. H., & Heppner, P. P. (1993). Psychometric properties of the Problem Solving Inventory in a group of Turkish university students. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 17,* 379-396.

Taylor, R. D., Oberle, E., Durlak, J. A., & Weissberg, R. P. (2017). Promoting positive youth development through school-based social and emotional learning interventions: A meta-analysis of follow-up effects. *Child Development, 88,* 1156-1171.

Tucker, C. J., McHale, S. M., & Crouter, A. C. (2003). Conflict resolution: Links with adolescents' family relationships and individual well-being. *Journal of Family Issues, 24,* 715-726.

van Doorn, M. D., Branje, S. J. T., & Meeus, W. H. J. (2008). Conflict resolution in parent-adolescent relationships and adolescent delinquency. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 28,* 503–527.

van Doorn, M. D., Branje, S. J. T., van der Valk, I. E., De Goede, I. H. A., & Meeus, W. H. J. (2011). Longitudinal spillover effects of conflict resolution styles between adolescent–parent relationships and adolescent friendships. *Journal of Family Psychology, 25,* 157–161.

Vuchinich, S. (1990). The sequential organization of closing in verbal family conflict. In A. D. Grimshaw (Ed.), *Conflict talk: Sociolinguistic investigations of arguments in conversations*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Waldrip, A. M., Malcolm, K. T. & Jensen-Campbell, L. A. (2008). With a little help from your friends: the importance of high-quality friendships on early adolescent adjustment. *Social Development, 17,* 832–852.

Weissberg, R. P., & Greenberg, M. T. (1998). School and community competence-enhancement and prevention programs. In I. E. Siegel & K. A. Renninger (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology*. Child psychology in practice (pp. 877–954). New York: Wiley.

Wentzel, K. R., McNamara-Barry, C., & Caldwell, K. A. (2004). Friendships in middle school: Influences on motivation and school adjustment. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *96*, 195–203.

Yau, J., & Smetana, J. (2003). Adolescent-parent conflict in Hong Kong and Shenzhen: A comparison of youth in two cultural contexts. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 27*, 201-211.

Yim, O., & Ramdeen, K. T. (2015). Hierarchical cluster analysis: comparison of three linkage measures and application to psychological data. *The Quantitative Methods for Psychology*, *11*, 8-21.