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Abstract

The purpose of the study is to understand the roles of values, organizational justice perceptions and organization based self-esteem perceptions on Turkish employees’ conflict management styles. Empirical data was collected from 237 employees (38.4% of them female and 61.6% of them male) by reaching through online surveys. Correlation analyses were conducted to find the relationship between human values, organizational justice, organization based self-esteem and exhibiting different conflict management styles. The results of the study showed that there were correlations among those variables. Besides, stepwise regression analyses were used to predict employees’ conflict management styles through their values, organizational justice perceptions and their perceived organization based self-eesteems. The results revealed that self-transcendence human value, distributive justice and organization based self-esteem predicted around 20% of integrating conflict management styles.
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Introduction

Conflict is a complex and an inevitable phenomenon in human and organizational lives. It is viewed as an interactive process manifested in incompatibility, disagreement or dissonance within or between social entities (Wilmot & Hocker, 2010).

Conflict can be functional or dysfunctional for organizations depending on how it is managed. If managed effectively, functional conflicts may help to achieve organizational goals. It can also be valuable to an organization as it promotes innovative and creative problem solving, develops genuine harmony between individuals and clarifies issues for the benefit of the members and the organization (Schermers, Hunt & Osborn, 2000). It can also improve the sense of trust among employees and facilitate team performance in organizations (Hempel, Zhang & Tjosvold, 2009). Similarly, managing conflict effectively can strengthen employees’ psychological capital (Oore, Leiter & LeBlanc, 2015). Moreover, Rahim (2010) indicated that functional way of dealing with conflict is essential for attaining and maintaining an optimum level of organizational effectiveness.

On the other hand, if conflicts are managed poorly, they may bring about unfavorable consequences on productivity and job performance (Meyer, 2004) and on organizational commitment (Thomas, Bliese, & Jex, 2005). Besides, dysfunctional management of conflicts
may increase the occurrence of prospective conflicts as well as the absenteeism of the employees (Giebels & Janssen, 2005).

Considering these findings, understanding the variables which affect conflict management styles may play an important role and it can contribute to the functional way of conflict managements. For this reason, this study will investigate the roles of values, organizational justice perceptions and the perceived organization based self-esteem on Turkish employees’ conflict management styles.

**Literature Review**

**Conflict Management & Conflict Management Styles**

Conflict is a complex and an inevitable phenomenon in human and organizational lives. According to Wilmot and Hocker (2010), conflict is viewed as an interactive process manifested in incompatibility, disagreement or dissonance within or between social entities. It was claimed that if the individuals encounter some rude behaviors, they may become offended, which in turn trigger the emergence of conflict. The conflicted situation may also bring about the engagement of uncivil behaviors among the parties (Trudel & Reio, 2011). So, they may resort to various conflict handling modes depending on their repertoire.

Rahim (2001) proposed five different modes of conflict handling styles, which are (1) integrating (collaborating or problem-solving), (2) dominating (competing or forcing), (3) obliging (accommodating), (4) avoiding, and (5) compromising.

Integrating style is characterized by problem-solving orientation and willingness to find mutually acceptable options by exploring and working with the other person in conflict. Here, the parties prefer to act in an open way and they understand the importance of the exchange of the information between each other (Rahim, 2001). It can be claimed that the integrating style is considered to be the most constructive of the conflict management styles and it is positively related to employees’ job performance (Rahim, 1985). Besides, Baillien, Neyens De Witte and De Cuyper (2009) found that using integrating strategies may decrease bullying behaviors in organizations.

Dominating style is another strategy, which is characterized by a win-lose orientation and taking the control of the interaction. This conflict management strategy reveals a high concern for one’s goals, meaning that accomplishing the goal without considering the other person’s needs (Rahim, 2001). Besides, confrontational remarks and accusations are also the representatives
of this style (Hocker & Wilmot, 1998). Trudel and Reio (2011) argues that using dominating conflict management strategy did not support the fulfillment of organizations’ goals, therefore it may lead to a hostile work environment.

Obliging is another strategy, which involves low concerns for one’s goals and high concerns for others’ goals (Rahim, 2001). It can also be described as an incomplete evaluation of alternatives, not expressing their own concerns and giving in to others’ positions (Kuhn & Poole, 2000). Avoiding is another strategy described as having low concerns for both one’s goals and others’ goals, either by ignoring the conflict or withdrawing from conflict (Rahim, 2001). People using this strategy may change the conservation to a different issue or make irrelevant comments (Hocker & Wilmot, 1998). It is important to note that avoiding conflict strategy can lead to negative emotions and increase the chance of conflict escalation in organizations (Dijkstra, De Dreu, Evers & Van Dierendonck, 2009).

Compromising is the last strategy which indicates moderate concerns for one’s goals and others’ goals. This style involves a give-and-take strategy in which the parties try to find a middle ground through giving up some important needs or goals (Rahim, 2001).

According to Healey (1995), people’s perceptions and reactions are filtered through the lenses of their cultures, values, experiences and beliefs. Thus, these factors may influence how people perceive the conflicted situation and how they come up with conflict handling styles.

Kaushal and Kwantes (2006) stated that the conflict process can be affected by people’s cultural background such that considering the goals as incompatible or the outcome as satisfactory can be dissimilar. They indicated that if the sense of mistrust to other people is reflected in a culture frequently, this can bring about low concern for others and thus the common use of dominating or avoiding conflict management styles. Similarly, if people of a particular culture are low self-monitors, they are more likely to remain stable across situations as well as have less concern for others. Thus, they may be more prone to show such dysfunctional conflict management styles as dominating, avoiding, or obliging in conflict situations. On the other hand, if ‘do good for others’ belief is preferred to have by people, this may bring about high concern for others; thus the tendency to use integrating or obliging conflict handling styles could be prevalent. Similarly, if people of a particular culture are high self-monitors, they are more likely to adapt to changing situations as well as to have high concern for others. Thus, this time they may be
more prone to show such functional conflict management styles as integrating or compromising (Kaushal & Kwantes, 2006).

Therefore, it can be claimed that cultural factors play a determining role in people’s choosing conflict management styles.

Values

The values as a concept commonly function to understand, describe and predict the attitudes and behaviors of human beings (Robbins & Sanghi, 2006). The comprehensive definition of values was made by Rokeach (1973) in such a way that it serves as criteria through which people evaluate what is good, desirable or right to them.

Values function as a guiding force and they shape people’s attitudes, beliefs and behaviors (Tevrüz, Turgut & Çinko, 2010). Values are linked to people’s feelings, and they refer to the desirable goals that motivate people to take actions in order to attain them. Besides, values also serve as standards or criteria in selecting and evaluating behaviors, events and the other people. In other words, they serve as what is good or bad for people under certain circumstances (Schwartz, 1999).

Schwartz (1999) proposed a comprehensive and integrative theory regarding the values and defined ten broad values; (self-direction, stimulation, hedonism, security, conformity, tradition, achievement, power, benevolence and universalism) and categorizes them into four clusters: i) self-transcendence, ii) self-enhancement, iii) conservation, iv) openness to change. He viewed values as organized along two bipolar dimensions in which one dimension contrasts ‘openness to change’ and ‘conservation’ values, and the other dimension contrasts ‘self-enhancement’ and ‘self-transcendence’ values. He classified self-direction, stimulation and hedonism under ‘openness to change’ values; security, conformity and tradition under the value of ‘conservation’; achievement and power under the value of ‘self-enhancement’ and finally universalism and benevolence under the value of ‘self-transcendence’.
It can be claimed that values are unique for each person and they are culture-bounded. For instance, Kağıtçıbaşı (2005) indicated that the concept of autonomy in Turkey is not understood from an individualistic perspective, rather it intersects with relatedness with the family. In other words, autonomy for the Turkish people does not mean eagerness to have self-direction, but it includes affiliation with family members. Therefore, she came up with an indigenous concept ‘autonomous-related self’ for Turkish culture (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2005).

Similar effort was performed by Tevrüz, Turgut and Çinko (2015). Tevrüz et al. (2015) conducted a study in Turkish culture and wanted to examine the integration of unique values developed in Turkey to Schwartz’s 10 universal values, by adding 23 work achievement goals developed in Turkey. Thus, they enriched the understanding of values from the Turkish culture perspective which might be useful in explaining people’s choice of conflict resolution modes, as well as contributed to the comprehensiveness and universality of Schwartz value theory.

**Values & Conflict Management Styles**

There has been some researches showing the relationship between values and conflict management styles. To begin with, Rahim (2001) indicated that when two social entities differ in their values or ideologies, they may experience the conflict of values. Rahim also underlined the role of incompatible values in explaining intrapersonal conflict, in which an organizational member is required to perform certain tasks and roles that are contradictory to their values.
In addition, researchers investigated the impact of high and low context cultures on conflict management styles. In high context cultures, communication is primarily based on non-verbal messages and persons’ status, and in low context cultures; it primarily takes place through explicit rules. It was found that people from high context cultures (eastern cultures) employed avoiding way of conflict management, whereas those from low context cultures (western cultures) preferred competing styles in conflict management (Moriss, Williams, Leung, Larrick, Mendoza, Bhatnager, Kondo, Luo & Hu, 1998).

Rahim (1992) also indicated that using dominating or obliging styles are more likely to be resorted by people from individualistic cultures, whereas, integrating or avoiding styles are more likely to be employed by people from collectivistic cultures. Collectivistic cultures’ preferences for such conflict styles could be explained by their appreciation of sustaining a positive relationship with other people (Ohbuchi, Fukushima, & Tedeschi, 1999).

Finally, a study conducted in Turkish context by Kozan (2002). Basic human values were employed in the identification of four subcultures and their influences were examined on conflict management. The researcher indicated that people from traditional subculture preferred avoiding conflict management style, people from power seekers subculture preferred competing conflict management style, and people from egalitarian subculture preferred accommodating conflict management style (Kozan, 2002).

Considering the related literature, the following was the first hypothesis of the study:

H1: Human values are correlated with exhibiting conflict management styles

Organizational Justice & Conflict Management Styles

Organizational justice can be defined as "the conditions of employment that lead individuals to believe that they are treated fairly or unfairly" (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998, p12). It has three dimensions which are distributive, procedural and interactional.

It was indicated that distributive justice was derived from equity theory and it focused on fair allocation of economic resources, responsibilities and opportunities (Greenberg & Baron, 2008). According to equity theory, perceptions of fairness in the workplace can be possible if there is a balance between individual’s perceived inputs (such as performance, experience and education) and their perceived outputs (such as rewards, payments and status). Distributive injustice takes place when there is imbalance between these two variables.
Procedural justice was defined as “the fairness issues concerning the methods, mechanisms, and processes employed to determine outcomes” (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998, p. 26). It was indicated that people not only cared about the fairness of the outcomes of their commitments, but they also consider the fairness of the procedures employed in the process of decision making (Korsgaard, Schweiger & Sapienza, 1995).

Interactional justice can be defined as the perception of the quality of the treatment during the implementation of organizational procedures. It involves the employees’ perceived fairness in interpersonal relationships, especially with authority figures, such as politeness, respect and dignity. Interactional justice is also associated with the quality and quantity of relevant information shared with individuals. It was indicated that the questions of why certain procedures were used in a certain fashion, or why outcomes were distributed in a certain ways should be explained for providing informational justice in organizations (Colquitt, 2001).

There has been some studies showing the relationship between organizational justice and conflict issues. For instance; Kerwin, Jordan and Turner (2015) concluded that when the employees’ perceived justice are high, they are more likely to show less disagreement in organizations. Finally, Rahim, Manger and Shapiro (2000) indicated that perceived organizational justice is positively related to employees’ cooperative conflict management methods. They indicated that employees are more likely to show integrative conflict management strategies, when they perceived that their supervisor treated them in an interactionally just manner. However, they argued that when the employees’ perceived fairness on the supervisor was lower, the employees were less inclined to use an integrating conflict management style.

It can be claimed perceived organizational justice may be a facilitative actor in employee’s dealing with the conflict effectively. Considering these studies, the following was the second hypothesis of the study.

H2: Organizational justice perceptions of employees are positively correlated with exhibiting cooperative conflict management styles
Organization Based Self-Esteem (OBSE) & Conflict Management Strategies

As introduced by Pierce, Gardner, Cummings and Dunham (1989), organization based self-esteem (OBSE) stands for one’s belief of personal adequacy in organizations; meaning that to what extend employees perceive themselves as important, meaningful, effective, and worthy within the organizational setting. Even though OBSE seems to involve the aspects of self-efficacy; it becomes slightly different in action. OBSE especially involves people’s work related experiences, where the perception of competence brings about the belief structure of being important for the organization. On the other hand, self-efficacy is associated with a feeling of competence which can be transferred into a successful actions (Pierce et al., 1989).

There has been several studies showing the relationship between OBSE and organizational variables. For instance, it was found that there is a positive relationship between employees’ perceived high OBSE and their better coping with ambiguous situations (Hui & Lee, 2000). OBSE has also an effect on the relationship between perceived workplace democracy and dissent expression, meaning that they communicated their disagreement in the organization to supervisors (Aksel, 2013).

It can be claimed that the high perceptions of employees on organization based self-esteem can contribute to atmosphere of the organization favorably, which in turn may improve the quality of the interpersonal relationships and as well as contribute to the increase of the organizational performance. Considering these studies, the following hypothesis was the third hypothesis of the study.

H3: Having high organization based self-esteem is positively correlated with exhibiting cooperative conflict management styles

When considering the related literature among values, organizational justice perceptions and perceived organization based self-esteem; eventually, the following hypothesis can be asserted as well.

H4: Employees’ conflict management styles would be predicted by their values, organizational justice perceptions and their perceived organization based self-estees.
Methodology

Sample
The participants of the study were reached by using an online survey with convenience sampling method. The sample of study consisted of 237 employees, 91 of them (38.4%) were females and 146 of them (61.6%) were males. 64.98% of the participants were married and 67.51% of them were working in public organizations. As for the educational statues, 54.85% of the participants had bachelor degrees, 35.02% of them had master degrees and 7.59% of them had PhD degrees. The participants’ gender, marital and educational statues and job sector can be seen in Appendix A. In addition, the mean age of the sample was 34.89 (SD = 7.58) where minimum age was 23 and maximum age was 56. The participants’ average duration for current tenure was 5.09 (SD = 5.20) years and their total job tenure 11, 29 (SD = 7.75) years. The distribution of participants' age, tenure and job tenure can be seen in Appendix B.

Measures

Organizational Justice Scale involves three dimensions; which are distributive, procedural and interactional justice. The dimensions of procedural (6 item) and interactional justice (9 item) were developed by Nieoff & Moorman (1993) and their cultural adaptations were realized by Yıldırım (2007). However, the distributive justice dimension of the scale was produced Price and Muller (1986) and its cultural adaptation was done by Çalışkan (2006). Thus, organizational justice scale employed in this study is composed of three dimensions and 21 items in total. The participants rated the scale on a five point scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5)
absolutely agree. In this study, as a result of factor analysis, 74.16 % of the total variance explained by three factors (KMO = .93, Bartlett's sphericity test chi-square = 4616.28, df = 210, p <0.001). In addition, Cronbach's alpha reliability analysis was applied for each of the dimensions of organizational justice. Accordingly, internal consistency levels of distributive justice, procedural and interactional justice were .94, .93 and .95, respectively.

Work-Achievement Goals & Value scale was generated by Tévruz et al. (2015) by integrating the indigenous values developed in Turkey to Schwartz’s (1992) universal values. They employed 23 items from their Work Achievement Goal scale (Tévruz, Turgut & Çinko, 2010) and 10 items from Schwartz’s Portrait Value Questionnaire.

Work-Achievement Goals & Value scale is consisted of four main value dimensions which are openness to change, self-enhancement, conservation and self-transcendence. According to Tévruz et al. (2015), openness to change (7 items) values involve intellectualism, self-directedness and stimulation/hedonism concerns. Self-enhancement values (6 items) involve people who dignify achievement and power. Conservative values (9 items) include people who prioritize security, conformity and tradition. Lastly, self-transcendence values (10 items) include individuals who emphasize benevolence and universalism. Thus, the scale consists of 33 items describing people who concern things in their own way, and the respondents are asked to answer the question, “How similar is that person to them?” The participants rated the scale on a five point scale ranging from (1) it does not look anything like me to (5) it is very similar to me.

Item 32 (S/he believes that it is best to do with the traditional way; respect for tradition) from conservative values dimension and item 33 (According to him/her, every person should be treated equally and have equal opportunity) from self-transcendence dimension were discarded due to decreasing the internal consistency of the scale. Afterwards, factor analysis was conducted again. As a result of factor analysis, 63.30 % of the total variance explained by four factors (KMO = .84, Bartlett's sphericity test chi-square = 3350.57, df = 528, p <0.001). In addition, Cronbach's alpha reliability analysis was applied for each of the dimensions of Work-Achievement Goals & Value scale. Accordingly, internal consistency levels of conservative, self-enhancement, openness to change and self-transcendence dimensions were .78, .86, .81 and .82, respectively.

Organization Based Self-Esteem (OBSE) scale was Pierce et al. (1989) and cultural adaptation was done by İslamoğlu. OBSE is composed of 10 items. The participants rated the scale on a
five point scale ranging from (1) never to (5) always. In this study, as a result of factor analysis, 60.42% of the total variance explained by one factor (KMO = .93, Bartlett's sphericity test chi-square = 15.19.20, df = 45, p <0.001). In addition, Cronbach's alpha reliability analysis was applied. Item 10 (I work in cooperation in my organization) was discarded due to decreasing the internal consistency of the scale. Accordingly, internal consistency level of scale was .93 with 9 items.

Organizational Conflict Management Style scale was developed by Rahim (1983) to identify conflict management strategies in organizations. The inventory was translated into Turkish by Gümüşeli (1994). The scale used in this study consists of 28 items which measure five types of conflict management styles; integrating (12 items), obliging (5 items), dominating (4 items), avoiding (4 items) and compromising (3 items). The participants rated the scale on a five point scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) absolutely agree.

Item 18 (I benefit from my expertise in order to reach a conclusion I want) from dominating style and item 27 (I refrain from discussing with colleagues in order to prevent the occurrence of negative thoughts) from avoiding style were discarded due to decreasing the internal consistency of the scale. Afterwards, factor analysis was conducted. As a result of factor analysis, 61.12% of the total variance explained by five factors (KMO = .89, Bartlett's sphericity test chi-square = 3466.22, df = 378, p <0.001). In addition, Cronbach's alpha reliability analysis was applied for each of the dimensions of organizational conflict management style. Accordingly, internal consistency levels of integrating, obliging, dominating, avoiding and compromising .91, .72, .89, .76 and .65, respectively.

Results

Descriptive statistics were conducted on employees’ conflict management styles, their values, their organizational justice perceptions and their perceived organization based self-esteem. The possible minimum score for each dimension of variables was 1 and the maximum score was 5, where the mid score was 2.5. The descriptive statistics results of employees’ conflict management styles, values, organizational justice perceptions and their perceived organization based self-esteem are summarized in Table 1.

Descriptive statistics were conducted on employees’ conflict management styles with respect to five dimensions; which were “integrating”, “compromising”, “obliging”, “dominating” and “avoiding”. According to the results, integrating conflict management style revealed the highest mean scores (3.96) with a standard deviation of .50. Then, it was followed by compromising
conflict management style ($M = 3.85, SD = .65$). The obliging conflict management style showed the third highest mean (3.42) with a standard deviation of .62. Avoiding conflict management style showed the fourth highest mean scores (2.80) with a standard deviation of .97. And, dominating conflict management style revealed the lowest mean score (2.34), with a standard deviation of 1.01.

Descriptive statistics were also conducted on employees’ values with respect to four dimensions; which were “conservative values”, “openness to change values”, “self-enhancement values” and “self-transcendence values”. According to the results, self-transcendence values revealed the highest mean scores (4.30) with a standard deviation of .49. Then, it was followed by conservative values ($M = 4.20, SD = .56$). The openness to change value showed the third highest mean (3.87) with a standard deviation of .67, which was followed by self-enhancement values ($M = 3.27, SD = .87$).

Afterwards, descriptive statistics were conducted on employees’ organizational justice perceptions with respect to three dimensions; which were “distributive justice”, “procedural justice” and “interactional justice”. According to the results, interactional justice revealed the highest mean scores (3.34) with a standard deviation of .85. Then, it was followed by distributive justice ($M = 3.18, SD = .98$). The interactional justice showed the lowest mean (2.91) with a standard deviation of 1.02.

Finally, descriptive statistics were also conducted on employees’ perceived organization based self-esteem (OBSE). The possible minimum score for each dimension was 1 and the maximum score was 5. According to the results, the mean score of employees’ OBSE was 4.16, with a standard deviation of .58.
Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Employees’ Conflict Management Styles, Values, Organizational Justice Perceptions and Their Perceived Organization Based Self-Esteems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflict Management Styles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromising</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obliging</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominating</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Values</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-transcendence</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to change</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-enhancement</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization Based Self-Esteem</strong></td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 237

Hypothesis Testing

Pearson’s r correlation coefficient was computed to test the hypothesis 1 to hypothesis 3. The results are summarized in Table 2.

**H1**: Human values are correlated with exhibiting conflict management styles

According to the results, there were positive correlations between conservative human values and compromising conflict management styles ($r = .24, n = 237, p < .01$), between conservative human values and integrating conflict management styles ($r = .22, n = 237, p < .01$), between conservative human values and obliging conflict management styles ($r = .20, n = 237, p < .01$) as well as between conservative human values and avoiding conflict management styles ($r = .16, n = 237, p < .05$).
According to the results of self-enhancement human values, there were positive correlations between self-enhancement human values and dominating conflict management styles \((r = .45, n = 237, p < .01)\), between self-enhancement human values and avoiding conflict management styles \((r = .22, n = 237, p < .01)\), as well as between self-enhancement human values and compromising conflict management styles \((r = .17, n = 237, p < .01)\).

According to the results of openness to change human values, there were positive correlations between openness to change human values and integrating conflict management styles \((r = .19, n = 237, p < .01)\), and between openness to change human values and dominating conflict management styles \((r = .13, n = 237, p < .05)\).

According to the results, there was also a positive correlation between self-transcendence human values and integrating conflict management styles \((r = .35, n = 237, p < .01)\).

Therefore, it can be claimed that human values are positively correlated with exhibiting conflict management styles, thus Hypothesis 1 was accepted.

**H2: Organizational justice perceptions of employees are positively correlated with exhibiting cooperative conflict management styles**

According to the results, there were positive correlations between distributive organizational justice and integrating conflict management styles \((r = .25, n = 237, p < .01)\), between procedural organizational justice and integrating conflict management styles \((r = .21, n = 237, p < .01)\), as well as between interactional organizational justice and integrating conflict management styles \((r = .19, n = 237, p < .01)\).

Therefore, it can be claimed that organizational justice perceptions of employees are positively correlated with exhibiting conflict management styles, thus Hypothesis 2 was accepted, too.

**H3: Having high organization based self-esteem is positively correlated with exhibiting cooperative conflict management styles**

According to the results, there was a positive correlation between having high organization based self-esteem and exhibiting integrative conflict management style \((r = .29, n = 237, p < .01)\), however, there was a negative correlation between having high organization based self-esteem and exhibiting avoiding conflict management style \((r = -.13, n = 237, p < .05)\).

Therefore, it can be claimed that having high organization based self-esteem is positively correlated with exhibiting cooperative conflict management styles, thus Hypothesis 3 was accepted, too.
Table 2. Correlations of Values, Conflict Management Styles, Organizational Justice and Organization Based Self-Esteem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Conservative Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Self-Enhancement Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Openness to Change Value</td>
<td></td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Self-transcendence Value</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Integrating Conflict Management Style</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Obliging Conflict Management Style</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dominating Conflict Management Style</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Avoiding Conflict Management Style</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Compromising Conflict Management Style</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Interactional Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Organization Based Self-Esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.31**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *=p<.05, **=p<.01, N=237
H4: Employees’ conflict management styles would be predicted by their values, organizational justice perceptions and their perceived organization based self-esteem.

In order to test the hypothesis 4, stepwise multiple regression analysis was conducted with employees’ values (conservative, openness to change, self-enhancement and self-transcendence), organizational justice perceptions (distributive, procedural and interactional) and their perceived organization based self-esteem as the independent variables; and their conflict management styles (integrating, compromising, dominating, obliging and avoiding) as the dependent variables.

Firstly, stepwise multiple regression analysis was conducted with values, organizational justice and organization based self-esteem as the independent variables, and integrating conflict management style as the dependent variable in order to evaluate whether all the independent variables were necessary to predict integrating conflict management style. At step 1, self-transcendence human value entered into the regression model and was significantly related to integrating conflict management style \[F (1,235) = 62.62, p<.001\], meaning that it explained 12% variation in showing integrating conflict management style. Distributive justice entered into the equation at step 2 of the analysis and it was significantly related to integrating conflict management style \[F (2,234) = 23.88, p<.001\], meaning that 5% of the variance of integrating conflict management style could be accounted for distributive justice. Finally, organization based self-esteem (OBSE) entered into the equation at step 3 of the analysis and it was also significantly related to integrating conflict management style \[F (3,233) = 19.62, p<.001\], meaning that 3% of the variance of integrating conflict management style could be accounted for OBSE. Thus, in total these three variables (high self-transcendence value, high distributive justice and high OBSE) explained 20% of the variance of integrating conflict management style. Table 3 presents a summary of stepwise regression.
Table 3. Stepwise Regression Analysis Summary of Self-transcendence, Distributive Justice and Organization Based Self-Esteem, Predicting Integrating Conflict Management Style (N = 237)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-transcendence value</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-transcendence value</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-transcendence value</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Based Self-Esteem</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: p (Sig.2-tailed), *p < .05; **p < 01

Secondly, stepwise multiple regression analysis was conducted with IVs and obliging conflict management style as the dependent variable. The significant predictor variable was conservative human value [F (1,235) = 9.52, p<.01], meaning that it explained 4% variation in showing obliging conflict management style. Table 4 presents a summary of stepwise regression.

Table 4. Stepwise Regression Analysis Summary of Conservative Value, Predicting Obliging Conflict Management Style (N = 237)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative value</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: p (Sig.2-tailed), *p < .05
Thirdly, stepwise multiple regression analysis was conducted with IVs and dominating conflict management style as the dependent variable. At step 1, self-enhancement human value entered into the regression model and was significantly related to dominating conflict management style \([F (1,235) = 59.08, p<.001]\), meaning that it explained 20% variation in showing dominating conflict management style. Procedural justice entered into the equation at step 2 of the analysis and it was significantly related to dominating conflict management style \([F (2,234) = 33.29, p<.001]\), meaning that 2% of the variance of dominating conflict management style could be accounted for procedural justice. Finally, self-transcendence human value entered into the equation at step 3 of the analysis and it was also significantly related to dominating conflict management style \([F (3,233) = 23.86, p<.001]\), meaning that 1% of the variance of dominating conflict management style could be contributed by low self-transcendence human value. Thus, in total these three variables (high self-enhancement and procedural justice, and low self-transcendence value) explained 23% of the variance of dominating conflict management style. Table 5 presents a summary of stepwise regression.

Table 5. Stepwise Regression Analysis Summary of Self-enhancement Value, Procedural Justice and Self-transcendence, Predicting Dominating Conflict Management Style (N = 237)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-enhancement value</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-enhancement value</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-enhancement value</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-transcendence value</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* p (Sig.2-tailed), *p < .05; **p < .01
Fourthly, stepwise multiple regression analysis was conducted with IVs and compromising conflict management style as the dependent variable. The significant predictor variable was conservative human value \([F (1,235) = 13.86, p<.001]\), meaning that it explained 6% variation in showing compromising conflict management style. Table 6 presents a summary of stepwise regression.

Table 6. Stepwise Regression Analysis Summary of Conservative Value, Predicting Compromising Conflict Management Style (N = 237)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>(R^2)</th>
<th>(\Delta R^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.06 ** 5.6**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative value</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: p (Sig.2-tailed), **p < 01*

Fifthly, stepwise multiple regression analysis was conducted with IVs and avoiding conflict management style as the dependent variable. At step 1, self-enhancement human value entered into the regression model and was significantly related to avoiding conflict management style \([F (1,235) = 12.20, p<.001]\), meaning that it explained 5% variation in showing avoiding conflict management style. Organization based self-esteem (OBSE) entered into the equation at step 2 of the analysis and it was also significantly related to avoiding conflict management style \([F (2,234) = 9.25, p<.001]\), meaning that 2% of the variance of avoiding conflict management style could be contributed by low OBSE. Thus, in total these two variables (high self-enhancement and low OBSE) explained 7% of the variance of avoiding conflict management style. Table 7 presents a summary of stepwise regression.
Table 7. Stepwise Regression Analysis Summary of Self-Enhancement Value and Organization Based Self-Esteem, Predicting Avoiding Conflict Management Style (N = 237)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-enhancement value</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-enhancement value</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization based self-esteem</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: p (Sig.2-tailed), *p < .05; **p < .01

Discussion

This study aimed to get insight into the roles of values, organizational justice perceptions and the perceived organization based self-esteem on Turkish employees’ conflict management styles. It was found out that integrating, compromising, obliging and avoiding conflict management styles were the most common strategies to employ indicated by the participants. In addition, self-transcendence and conservative values were the most common ones stated by the participants. As for the organizational justice perceptions, interactional and distributive justice perceptions revealed the highest scores. Finally, it was found out that organization based self-esteem scores of the participants were very high.

Considering the results of this study, it can be claimed that people who have different values can exhibit different conflict management styles. For instance, the results of the current study showed that there were positive correlations between conservative human values and compromising conflict management styles and between conservative human values and integrating conflict management styles. These findings can be evaluated by Schwartz’s (2012) theory. While explaining conservative value, he pointed out that these people care about security. For these people, attaching importance to having harmony and stability in social, private and interpersonal relationships may produce sense of safety. They also care about conformity and emphasize being self-restraint in interaction with close others, and show self-
discipline, politeness and loyalty. Besides, these people also emphasize on tradition to show respect, commitment, and acceptance to their customs and their religious rules (Schwartz, 2012). Similarly, Kim and Markus (1999) argued that in collectivist cultures like Turkey, individuals sacrifice their own opinions and prefer to conform their group’s view in order to preserve group harmony. Since the violation of the group view can bring about some concerns and the loss of status, it can be claimed that conservative employees are more prone to show compromising and integrating conflict management styles. Finally, these finding can be evaluated by taking Gungor, Karasawa, Boiger, Dincer and Mesquita’s (2014) study into account. They found out that relatedness strongly predicted relational well-being among Turkish people, which may indicate that getting along with others is primary concern in interpersonal relationships. For that reason, they may prefer compromising conflict management styles.

In this study, it was also found out that there were positive correlations between self-enhancement human values and dominating conflict management styles, and between self-enhancement human values and avoiding conflict management styles. These findings can also be evaluated by Schwartz’s (2012) theory of values. He claimed that people who dignify self-enhancement value are more likely to emphasize on achievement and to look for obtaining social approval by personal success. Similarly, they are also more motivated to have control or dominance over people and resources, as well as they overrate attaining social status and prestige. By taking Schwartz (2012) into account, it can be claimed that employees who dignify self-enhancement values are more prone to show dominating or avoiding conflict management styles.

Besides, there was a positive correlation between openness to change human values and integrating conflict management styles, and a positive correlation between self-transcendence human values and integrating conflict management styles. People who give importance to openness to change values are self-directed, who hold independent thought and action, and control their lives. Besides, they care about having excitement and challenge in life (Schwartz, 2012). Therefore, it can be claimed that integrating conflict management styles can be used more frequently by these people.

All in all, understanding the relationship between values and conflict management styles can enrich the repertoires of both employees and managers for being able to manage the conflicts functionally. Otherwise, by producing a sense of frustration among individuals, ineffectively
managed conflicts may decrease the employees’ affective commitment to the organizations (Jameson, Bodtker, & Linker, 2010), which may eventually lead to the failure of organizations.

Stepwise regression analyses were used to predict employees’ conflict management styles by means of their values, organizational justice perceptions and their perceived organization based self-esteem. The results revealed that self-transcendence human value, distributive justice and organization based self-esteem predicted around 20% of integrating conflict management styles. These findings of the study supports the importance of what Hofstede, Hofstede and Minkov (2010) indicated on the role of culture. They argued that cultures with social inequality are called large-power distance and people in those cultures may show dependence with authority figures as compared to those with social equality where interdependence in relationship is common. Thus, people in a large-power distance culture are more prone to obey powerful people and show obliging or avoiding conflict management styles. Similarly, Cameron and Quinn (2006) also indicated that in those cultures, greater emphasis is placed on clear organizational structure, standardized rules and procedures. Therefore, the employees are expected to rely on conformity to the rules and on predictability, and they may prefer obliging or compromising conflict management styles.

The findings of the study can be employed in personnel recruitment process, where values, organization based self-esteem and conflict management strategies may give clues in hiring the optimum candidate. Then, they may contribute to the trainings of the managers, especially for manifesting behaviors that increase employee self-esteem, for setting positive organizational justice perceptions among the employees and coaching in coping with conflicts among employees. Finally, the results may shed light on building work groups where optimum harmony can be fulfilled.

This research also has some limitations. Firstly due to time constraints this research was conducted on a small sample size and convenient sampling method was used. Therefore our results of this study is unlikely to be generalizable to Turkish employees. Data gathering by online survey can also be another limitation. Due to time constraints, the sample group was composed of employees working on both public and private sectors. But future studies can be done by generating a broader sample groups from private and public sectors and the consequences can be compared between these two groups. Besides, future studies can also be done by taking gender, job tenure and educational statues of participants as independent variables.
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Appendixes

Appendix A

Table A. Distribution of Participants' Gender, Marital & Educational Status and Job Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Educational Status</th>
<th>Job Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(38.4%)</td>
<td>(61.6%)</td>
<td>35.02%</td>
<td>64.98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=237

Appendix B

Table B. Distribution of Participants Age Tenure and Job Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Job Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>34.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=237, Tenure refers to the duration of work experience in current job. Job tenure refers to the duration of total work experience in career.