

Wise reasoning: Technical manual

© Igor Grossmann
2012

Citations:

Grossmann, I. (2012). Wise reasoning: Technical manual. Waterloo, Ontario: University of Waterloo.

Grossmann, I., Na, J., Varnum, M. E.W., Park, D. C., Kitayama, S. & Nisbett, R.E. (2010). Reasoning about Social Conflicts Improves into Old Age. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 107(16), 7246-7250. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1001715107

Grossmann, I., Karasawa, M., Izumi, S., Na, J., Varnum, M. E. W., Kitayama, S., & Nisbett, R. E. (2012). Aging and wisdom: Culture matters. *Psychological Science*. doi: 10.1177/0956797612446025

Grossmann, I., Na, J., Varnum, M. E. W., Kitayama, S., & Nisbett, R. E. (2012). A Route to Well-Being: Intelligence Versus Wise Reasoning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*. doi: 10.1037/a0029560

TABLE OF CONTENT

GENERAL INFORMATION	2
SCORING	3
RATER TRAINING	3
INCREASING RELIABILITY DURING TRAINING	3
GENERAL NOTE ON CODING	3
DIMENSIONS	4
GENERAL FAQ	5
INTERGROUP CONFLICTS: STUDY MATERIALS	7
Tajikistan instruction	8
Chuuk instruction	10
Djibouti instructions	12
INTERGROUP CONFLICTS: CODE-BOOK	14
Resolution Examples	15
Certainty Examples	17
Other Examples	20
Comprehension of the Problem	21
Lack of Comprehension	22
INTERPERSONAL CONFLICTS: STUDY MATERIALS	23
‘interpersonal’ Script	24
INTERPERSONAL CONFLICTS: CODE- BOOK	28
HEADSTONE STORY	29
Resolution	29
Certainty	32
Compromise	35
Flexibility	38
Perspective	41
Change	44
ANGIE & GILL STORY	47
Resolution	47
Certainty	50
Compromise	53
Flexibility	55
Perspective	58
Change	60
BED STORY	63
Resolution	63
Certainty	65
Compromise	68
Flexibility	71
Perspective	73
Change	75

General Information

Scoring

In case the same coders are used across dimensions, it is advisable to avoid carry-over effects resulting from scoring the same participant across multiple dimensions. One possibility to address this issue is to change the direction of codes for some of the dimensions. In the present project, we used the scores from 1 to 3. On the following dimensions, higher score is indicated by “3” and lower score is indicated by “1:” Recognition of the limits of Knowledge / Taking Others’ Perspectives. On the remaining dimensions (Resolution / Compromise / Flexibility / Change) higher scores is indicated by “1” and lower score is indicated by “3.”

Rater Training

It is advisable to meet with coders multiple times per week for the period of the training session, to code about 40-50 stories in segments of 10. The desired inter-rater reliability should reach a Cohen’s kappa of at least .65. One should plan about 5 hours of instructional coding (broken up in then 30 min sessions), plus 10 hours for independent coding. Overall, one can plan about 1-2 month for intensive coder training.

Increasing Reliability during Training

The initial reliability between raters during the training phrase is likely to remain under Cohen’s $k = .65$ for the first few training segments. It is advisable to work intensively with coders to resolve the discrepancies during this phase in a joint discussion, referring to the code-book, and revising the reliability on the subsequent training segments.

General Note on Coding

At times, it may be difficult to distinguish between scores indicating “high” application of a reasoning rule vs. scores indicating “some” application of a reasoning rule. The following FAQ provides some general guidance related to these questions.

Finally, the present coding guide is grounded in common themes emerging from responses by American participants. Such themes may vary across cultures. Moreover, different dimensions may emerge (and some of the present dimensions may become irrelevant), depending on the nature of the discussion topics/stimuli. Researchers are advised to (a) define dimensions important for their hypothesis; (b) work intensively with the coders during the initial stage to discuss these apriori defined dimensions and possibly incorporate additional dimensions based on the common themes in participants’ responses.

Dimensions

Resolution

- Complete resolution: 1
- Partial resolution: 2
- No resolution: 3

Uncertainty/Recognition of the limits of Knowledge

- Certain: 1
- Partly certain: 2
- Uncertain: 3

Compromise

- Complete compromise: 1
- Partial compromise: 2
- No compromise: 3

Rigid application of a rule (one worldview or using different general ideas) / Flexibility

- Flexible: 1
- Somewhat flexible: 2
- Inflexible: 3

Taking Others' Perspectives

- No acknowledgement of others' perspective: 1
- Some acknowledgement of others' perspective: 2
- A great deal of acknowledgement of others perspective: 3

Change

- Recognizes or predicts lots of change: 1
- Predicts some change: 2
- Predicts no change: 3

General FAQ

Resolution dimension

What are we looking at? or which is more central in this research?

- a. Does a participant predict that a problem can be resolved completely, partially, or not at all?
- b. How much does a participant think it is important to resolve a problem?

Importance of resolving the conflict is most central. It can either manifest itself when participant predicts a resolution of the conflict – this can be interpreted as the person seeing conflict resolution as central for the future development of the relationship between the involved parties (hence, predicting it). Alternatively, high score on this dimension is indicated by the person suggesting that it would be important to resolve the conflict (even if it is unlikely).

In other words:

If the person predicts conflict resolution – high score

If the person clearly indicates that conflict resolution is important – high score

If the person does not predict conflict resolution and his statement can be somewhat interpreted as indicating the importance of conflict resolution – some

If the person does not predict conflict resolution and his statement does not indicate anything about the importance of conflict resolution - none

Compromise dimension

What are we looking at? or which is more central in this research?

- a. Does a participant predict that the people in a story will compromise fully, partially, or not at all?
- b. How much does a participant predict it is possible for the people in a story to compromise?
 - (a) and (b) is different.
 - (a) is looking at the difference between; (1) A participant predict they will fully compromise vs. (2) A participant predict they will partially compromise.
 - (b) is looking at the difference between; (1) A participant predicts that they possibly will fully compromise vs. (2) A participant predicts they most probably will fully compromise.
- c. How much does a participant think it is important for the people in a story to compromise?

It is B and C, similar to the conflict resolution above. See conflict resolution comments for the structure of coding and the rationale.

Flexibility dimension

What are we looking at? or which is more central in this research?

- a. Does a participant apply single rule or worldview to analyze the problem/situation, or does he/she apply multiple rules or worldview?
- b. Does a participant predict single or multiple outcome(s)?

We see those two issues as being on the continuum: single rule of how the conflict will unfold vs. predicting multiple outcomes. The emphasis is on the latter one.

In other words:

If the person predicts multiple outcomes – high score

If the person applies “multiple rules”, i.e. indicates multiple reasons why a conflict may unfold one way or another – high score [usually, this will be the same as a.)

If the person applies one rule, but predicts more than 1 outcome, but not more than 2 – some

If the person applies 2 “rules”, but predicts only 1 clear outcome – some

If the person applies one rule/ does not talk about rules at all, and predicts one way the conflict will unfold/does not predict anything – none

Taking others’ perspectives

What are we looking at?

- a. Does a participant analyze the problem/situation from the viewpoint of the people in a story?
- b. Does a participant put or immerse him/herself into a story to analyze the problem/situation.
- c. Does a participant take into consideration other (not others’) perspectives than the information he/she is given in a story?

It should be a combination of A and B. C can be used for flexibility, actually (I think it is closely related to the “rules” you mentioned).

In other words:

If the participant analyzes the problem/situation from the viewpoint of the people in a story – high

If the participant puts or immerses him/herself into a story to analyze the problem/situation – high

If there is some indication for A or B, but it is not very clear from what she is saying (e.g. participant singularly just mentions the context of the situation the other person is in – which can be interpreted as seeing the events from the people’s perspective; but the participant does not do it repeatedly, and does not indicate that he tries to look at events from their perspective or immerses him/herself in it) – some

If neither category seem to be used, mentions, and context information is not mentioned at all - none

Intergroup conflicts: Study materials

Tajikistan instruction

In the following long-term study, we are interested in how well people are able to predict events based on a limited amount of information. To explore this question, we will compare the responses of participants in the study with real events. You will be given several old newspaper articles and asked to read them carefully. After that you will be asked to think aloud about some questions. Your answers will be recorded, transcribed and compared with the real events.

To make sure your actual knowledge will **not** influence your responses, we tried to find articles about events taking place in countries which you are unlikely to be familiar with. Thus, we assume that all our participants will not be familiar with events in these countries.

After that the experimenter asks the participants to read the article. After the participants read the article the experimenter asks: "How much do you know about the events in the country / area, you read about?"

After that follows a short summary of the article by the experimenter:

You have been presented with a brief overview of current developments in Tajikistan. Due to the economic growth of Tajikistan many people from Kyrgyzstan immigrate to the country. Whereas Kyrgyz people try to preserve their customs, Tajiks want Kyrgyz to assimilate fully and abandon their customs.

The first question is, what do you think will happen after that?

Wait, till the participant starts to respond. Don't interrupt, if she/he does not answer immediately, even if the pause is very long! Don't ask any additional questions till the basic line of developments is fully presented by the participant

Anything else?

Again, wait for response

Why do you think it will happen this way?

Migration Problems in Central Asia

by Emomali Akilov

DUSHANBE, Tajikistan, May 18 – Though in recent times Tajikistan has not been a large player on the world stage, it once lay on the ancient silk route and held an important place in the global economy. However, new economic growth in the former Soviet Republic has been robust in recent years.

These positive developments have made Tajikistan an attractive destination for residents of its poorer neighbours. Since independence in 1990 Tajikistan has become prosperous and wealthy, compared to the other countries in the region. Growth is so strong that the country is experiencing labor shortages, despite relatively large scale immigration. Hence, one would expect that immigrants from neighbouring countries, like Kyrgyzstan, would find a warm reception here. The reality is slightly different.

Like Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan is also a landlocked and mountainous country. It shares borders with China, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan. Due to recent economic and political instability, waves of Kyrgyz have immigrated in recent years to neighboring states like Tajikistan. Kyrgyz immigrants bring with them a different language, different customs, and a distinct sense of identity which many of the Kyrgyz seek to preserve. The Kyrgyz immigrants say they came to Tajikistan seeking education, employment, and a better life.

But there are many Tajiks who feel that Tajikistan is already crowded enough. “If there must be immigration,” said Alikbek Machmetov – a local from Dushanbe, “those who come to Tajikistan should abandon their ways and adopt our customs, our values and our language.”

Recently the government of Tajikistan began to make attempts to stem the flow of immigrants, in response to growing anti-immigrant sentiment. However with 20% of the former population of Kyrgyzstan living within its borders, the question of how to deal with its newest residents is not one likely to go away any time soon.

(from “The Central Asian Observer”, Mai 18, 1994)

Chuuk instruction

In the following long-term study, we are interested in how well people are able to predict events based on a limited amount of information. To explore this question, we will compare the responses of participants in the study with real events. You will be given several old newspaper articles and asked to read them carefully. After that you will be asked to think aloud about some questions. Your answers will be recorded, transcribed and compared with the real events.

To make sure your actual knowledge will **not** influence your responses, we tried to find articles about events taking place in countries which you are unlikely to be familiar with. Thus, we assume that all our participants will not be familiar with events in these countries.

After that the experimenter asks the participants to read the article. After the participants read the article the experimenter asks: "How much do you know about the events in the country / area, you read about?"

After that follows a short summary of the article by the experimenter:

You have been presented with a brief overview of current developments in the economically disadvantaged Chuuk state, where huge crude oil resources have been discovered. Due to the governmental restrictions many interested firms cannot establish the required infrastructure for production. On the one side government tries to preserve the ancient laws. On the other side, there are also a huge number of people in Chuuk who would like to eliminate the regulations entirely.

The first question is, what do you think will happen after that?

Wait, till the participant starts to respond. Don't interrupt, if she/he does not answer immediately, even if the pause is very long! Don't ask any additional questions till the basic line of developments is fully presented by the participant

Anything else?

Again, wait for response

Why do you think it will happen this way?

“Black Gold” and Governmental Regulations in Central Pacific

by Joseph J. Anefal

BANABA, Mai 29 – Chuuk state is a small island nation located in the central tropical Pacific Ocean with Banaba as its capital and a population of about 53,000 people. Although a small nation, Chuuk state has many laws and regulations, especially ones that effect industry. These regulations are very comprehensive and traditional, some of which have been in place for over 40 years. According to the present government these regulations are still necessary to protect the environment and the health of the inhabitants. However, things change.

For decades, the island's economy has been based on fishing and support from the International Monetary Fund and other international sources. But recently the petroleum industry has discovered the island. As it turns out, the island possesses enormous crude oil reserves. Now, many companies like Morey Oil South Pacific, Royal Dutch Shell, and Exxon are trying to persuade the government to allow them to set up on-shore and off-shore drilling operations and to build oil refineries on the island. For now, Chuuk state laws would make it difficult for these companies to operate.

The oil companies are offering to pay large sums of money for the rights to extract oil from Chuuk territory, and many on this cash-strapped island see the discovery of oil as a boon for the country. There is now a movement among the islanders to eliminate the governmental regulations of industry entirely, so that Chuuk state can share the economic benefits of this unexpected discovery. The supporters argue that allowing foreign firms to set up operations will prove lucrative for Chuuk state, eliminating its dependence on international donors and allowing the government to undertake many new initiatives. “New schools, new housing and new independence!” proclaims Masao Urusemal. And he is not the only one, as the movement to deregulate industry is quickly gaining support among the islanders.

(from “The Independent Observer”, July 29 1995)

Djibouti instructions

In the following long-term study, we are interested in how well people are able to predict events based on a limited amount of information. To explore this question, we will compare the responses of participants in the study with real events. You will be given several old newspaper articles and asked to read them carefully. After that you will be asked to think aloud about some questions. Your answers will be recorded, transcribed and compared with the real events.

To make sure your actual knowledge will **not** influence your responses, we tried to find articles about events taking place in countries which you are unlikely to be familiar with. Thus, we assume that all our participants will not be familiar with events in these countries.

After that the experimenter asks the participants to read the article. After the participants read the article the experimenter asks: "How much do you know about the events in the country / area, you read about?"

After that follows a short summary of the article by the experimenter:

You have been presented with a brief overview on the current developments in Djibouti. Two ethnic groups: the Issa and the Afari have completely different perspectives on politics. Whereas one group tries to preserve the traditions, the other group wants to alter the society entirely. Both groups are very strong.

The first question is, what do you think will happen after that?

Wait, till the participant starts to respond. Don't interrupt, if she/he does not answer immediately, even if the pause is very long! Don't ask any additional questions till the basic line of developments is fully presented by the participant

Anything else?

Again, wait for response

Why do you think it will happen this way?

New Tensions in South-Eastern Africa

by Ismail Omar Guelleh

DJIBOUTI, Sept. 12 - Located in the Horn of Africa, Djibouti is bordered by Eritrea in the north and Ethiopia in the west and south. The remainder of the border is formed by the Red Sea and the Gulf of Aden. On the other side of the Red Sea, on the Arabian Peninsula, 20 km from the coast of Djibouti, is Yemen. Despite being bordered by states which have had hostilities with each other for years, Djibouti has largely been spared from bloody conflicts. However it has not been without troubles of its own.

Recently, a radical movement has sprung up among the Issa, one of the two main ethnic groups living in Djibouti. The movement, known as "Kishangi" advocates broad social and political change, seeking to alter almost all aspects of the society, including the values that have been dominant for generations. "We want to replace the existing political system with a new and different system, one which will bring us into the next century. The people are with us, and their voice will not be ignored" says Mouna-Hodan Ahmed, one of the leading figures of the new movement.

In opposition to this movement the Afari - the other major ethnic group - seek to keep in place existing traditions and institutions. The Afari are resistant to any change or reform of the system. "We are confident that this new movement among the Issa will not bring our country any further" says Reesom Haile, deputy Prime Minister and a member of the ruling party. Haile also described Ahmed as a "charlatan" and a "conman" and accused him of fomenting civil unrest.

Supporters of both sides are growing more vocal and the politics of this coastal state become more polarized each day. It is difficult to say what will happen next, as both the traditionalists and the radicals have strong support from the population and as conflict between the two sides seems to be worsening.

(from "The International Observer", September 12 1995)

Intergroup conflicts: Code-book

Resolution Examples

NO RESOLUTION & SOMEWHAT FLEXIBLE

They might change a little bit just to get in and fit in. You know? But then after a while, they'd probably be like, "I'm not changing the way I am and the way I believe because this is the way I was brought up." But if they go as young, then they might change, you know, they might go and change their ways because when you're young, you don't have a certain way that you are.

The participant in this example sees **no resolution** of the existing conflict. However, he is **somewhat flexible** in his application of a particular worldview to the existing problem. He is not particularly applying one worldview / rule, but also does not mention different rules/worldviews, which could lead to diff. outcomes.

NO RESOLUTION & NO CHANGE

Um, I would imagine that people would still immigrate and would try to keep their own culture and there would be lots of tension between the two groups.

This is an example of a short response, which **does not present a resolution** to the conflict and **does not recognize or predict change** in the future.

NO RESOLUTION & SOME CHANGE

My guess is that the current system would be maintained, and um, maybe there would be some more tension, some more struggle. Maybe there are still, I mean, still the other group would be very unhappy about it, but for now, I think for a while it would still, still remain. Um, maybe there...it's hard to believe that they can find real concerns, so I think it would just remain like that for a while. Maybe later, in the future, there's going to be, um, more active conflict.

The following example predicts a more active conflict in the future. The participant predicts **some change**. However, the participant **does not present a resolution** to the conflict.

COMPLETE RESOLUTION & NO COMPROMISE

I think that, um, there's going to be, you know, the two factions will work against each other. Ultimately I think that the people that support for the drilling will succeed. Whether it's the people on the island that succeed or the company that succeed by maybe getting around having to get permission from Chuuk, maybe going from the outside, perhaps.

This particular example shows that the problem can be **completely resolved, without a compromise** following this resolution.

RESOLUTION, SOMEWHAT FLEXIBLE & COMPROMISE

Well, I think they're going to unite together, and it's fine for you to have your customs. And it's like we are in this country: we have many religions and many customs, you know, many ways of doing things and not just, there isn't just one way of doing it. And um, they will be allowed to preserve but yet unite to come together and have a common language. But yet you can have your language at home, and it's fine to have multiple languages, and it's fine for this next door neighbor to learn your language too. And I think what's going to happen that we're going to be, it'll be a multiculture and not just one way of doing things.

In the following example, the participant presents a **compromise** and a satisfactory **resolution** of the present conflict. The participant is also **somewhat flexible** in his response— the response does **not include any rigid application of a single worldview**, although also does not analyze one or several rules/worldviews.

Certainty Examples

CERTAINTY OF KNOWLEDGE

An island of 53000 people eventually will not be enough. It may take a while if they're really very resistant, but I think that at some point, with enough money, those companies will be able to drill.

The participant is **certain** that the companies will “win”, thus eventually will be permitted to drill.

UNCERTAINTY

Um, it's anybody's guess, because like I said I never heard of this, so I don't know if this was successful and they're going to make schools and you know, things that are, would be good for the natives or whatever they are. But I don't know, I mean, it's a guess of what's going to happen.

In this response, the participant shows his uncertainty in his own knowledge. The participant clearly recognizes the limits of his own knowledge.

CERTAINTY & INFLEXIBLE

If they want to fit into the modern world, they need money, and to get money, they've got to have a product to sell. They have a product which they definitely can sell, and it's either that, or they stay as aborigines, and that's the decision they have to make.[...]

*Because that's the way everything in the world is going. They all want to advance, people want to fit in, everybody wants computers. And it's like Thomas Friedman's book, *The World is Flat*. The world is not like what it was three years ago. Uh, communication is instant, and it has flattened the world, and these people probably want to be a part of it. They don't want to be living in grass huts and going out and shooting some kind of an animal for food. They want to be the way other people are.*

If you read only the first paragraph, it seems like the participant simply does **not consider others' perspective**. However, reading the whole response, one can see that the participant may consider other's perspective, however is **inflexible is his application of rule/worldview** and is **certain in his own knowledge**. This example shows how important it is to judge holistically, thus reading the whole paragraph until the end and trying to understand the participant's response first.

CERTAINTY & INFLEXIBILITY

Because it just does. Uh, people have to get along with one another, and if these Kyrgyz people aren't happy in their own country and they want to go to someone else's country, then they have to be willing to, um, blend and to give up some of their things in order to stay in that country and to prosper. And they must learn the language.

This is a clear example, where one can find a very **certain response**, which is also **inflexible / applying on single worldview**.

CERTAINTY & INFLEXIBLE

So, I think whether the people want it or not, it's going to be crammed down their throat, and they will reap the result of it. Not for money, but they'll have no choice, because money buys what it wants, and people with money buy what they want. Whether you want to sell it or not, they buy what they want.

Why do you think it will happen that way? Past history, past history with other areas, past history of mankind with money, and this is how it's going to happen.

This response shows that the participant is **very rigid in the application of one single rule/worldview** and **very certain in his own knowledge**.

CERTAINTY & A GREAT DEAL OF ACKNOWLEDGING OTHERS' PERSPECTIVE

What do you think will happen after that? An argument. I mean a sincere argument. I mean, "You want to come to our country, do as we do, don't do as you've always done. Respect us. Respect us. And if we're good enough to live here, then accept our customs and language. Be part of us." I mean, that's the way I look at it.

Anything else? Well, it might get violent, and it could get violent. It depends on what kind of an attitude they've got, really. If they, it's a touch and go situation.

Why do you think it'll happen like that? Well, regular people want to keep their ways and like that. They're not going to share. "This is our country, we're going to do it our way. Don't come over here and tell us to change our country." I mean, that's the way I would look at it.

One more time, this difficult example shows that it is **crucial to read the response until the very end**. If one reads only the first paragraph and disregards the quotation marks, one can conclude that this participant is **not acknowledging other's perspective** at all, looking at the presented problem from his Western point of view. However, after reading the whole response, one can see that this participant actually **acknowledges a great deal of others' perspective**, but does **not recognize his limits of knowledge/ is very certain in his knowledge**. The Western point of view is a result of his failure to recognize his limits of knowledge. The participant tries to argue from the Tajik perspective. This

perspective, reflected through his eyes is “westernized”, as this participant is very certain that Tajiks will want to argue as Americans do.

UNCERTAINTY, FLEXIBILITY & PREDICTION LOTS OF CHANGE

What do you think will happen next? Um, well, there have been many examples of immigration in the world that was because of the, um, because of the difference in economic prosperity. If they assimilate well enough, it doesn't sound like the differences are so dramatic. It doesn't sound like they have a different religion, which is what caused the tension in Europe. And, uh, it could be something closer to what happened in the U.S., where the immigrants merged pretty well. It could be different, though. It sounds to me like it could be, uh, it could be like it's not going to, like nothing really, uh, the tension there will not be that dramatic. The immigration will probably be somewhat limited but would still continue, and the immigrants would take the jobs that the Tajiks are not willing to take right now, or where there's a shortage, just like it happened in immigration countries.

Anything else? Um, it could go the other way, too. It could go that there's going to be a kind of a right-wing anti-immigration government takeover in Tajikistan, and there's going to be all sorts of tension between the immigrants and the locals, and immigration would be, um...but I think history teaches that immigration doesn't stop, that there is balance in the economy, so I think immigration would continue.

Why do you think it would happen that way? Just based on, I mean, immigration always happens due to difference in balance of economies, though in this case it may be something short-term. It may change. Maybe Tajikistan would not continue to prosper, and then immigration stops.

The example shows how important it is to code the responses holistically, taking into account the whole response and not just single paragraphs or sentences. The participant is **uncertain/recognizes limits of his own knowledge**. The participant is aware of multiple outcomes and some contingencies to the problem. This is also the reason, why he scores high on **flexibility**. The participant also predicts **a lot of change**.

Other Examples

NO COMPROMISE & SOME CHANGE

What do you think will happen after that? Um, I think that the, uh, Tajiks will probably put restrictions on immigration. I think the article would indicate that the Kyrgyz are not willing to assimilate to Tajiks' customs and style.

Anything else? Um, perhaps there's some suggestion of a possible outcome in the article, but I can't hypothesize what that might be.

Why do you think it would happen like that? Uh, well the way the article reads I would expect that there would be some kind of outcome of the article suggesting maybe a solution. And I think that, you know, typically referring back to say what happens in U.S. society for example, what I'm familiar with, people would not want to drop their culture and customs and completely assimilate into the sort of melting pot society.

Looking at the first paragraph, one can see the participant's idea of **no compromise**. The Tajiks will just put restrictions on immigration, although he does not mention if the conflict will be resolved. In addition, the participant presents a description of a conflict becoming more active (an escalation). Thus, without explicitly stating it, he participant implicitly predicts **some change**.

INFLEXIBILITY

Because generally people aren't very understanding of other cultures, and immigrants are usually blamed for any kind of thing you could blame them for.

This is an example of a short response, which is **inflexible** in the application of a rule(s) / worldview(s).

A GREAT DEAL OF ACKNOWLEDGING OTHERS' PERSPECTIVE

You know, they fish and stuff like that, and uh, maybe the uh, kids do not have schools and stuff like that, I think that they would be reluctant to use that money if they probably don't need oil. [...]Um, especially not if they're a fishing community. They probably wouldn't want all that commotion to get there.

This response **fully acknowledges the perspective** of the Chuuk community, presented in the article.

Comprehension of the Problem

“Did the participant understand the problem?” YES (1) or NO (0)

Each of the three scenarios presents a conflict between two sides.

Tajikistan

The conflict is between the Kyrgyz immigrants, who want to keep their cultural identity and the native residents of Tajikistan, who want the immigrants to assimilate.

Chuuk

The conflict is between the government, who seeks to preserve traditional laws protecting the environment, and many in the population who want to lift these restrictions in order to enable oil to be extracted. This conflict may also be acceptably framed as a conflict between the government and oil companies who wish to drill for oil on Chuuk.

Djibouti

The conflict is between the Issa, an ethnic group who seeks to preserve the traditional structure of the society, and the Afari, an ethnic group who seeks radical change.

Lack of Comprehension

Below is an example of a participant who did not seem to understand the problems presented in the Tajikistan scenario and the Djibouti scenario.

Tajikistan

What do you think will happen after that? That's a difficult question to ask because it depends on the, I don't know what the laws involved are and what the flow of immigration is. It seems to me that if I were in any position of leadership in Tajikistan at this point, they have no option but to grow, and they have a wonderful sort of union, they're in the position to buy, so that's a good position for them. But Tajikistan could be getting the short order of everything if they're not careful. So my suggestion would be to the people running Kyrgyzstan at this point, Tajikistan rather, would be to come up with a system of selling as much as they can at a reasonable price, but with very, very distinct regulations on what they can and cannot do with the money. Otherwise they would both tear away the country.

Anything else? Yes, but the flow of immigrants, that's going to be a tough problem. There's no way they could handle that without killing the goose that's giving them the money. They need the immigrants. Uh, we're having a similar problem to a lesser extent of course. We have a very similar problem here now. There's no easy answer to it. They can't have their cake and eat it. They have something that people want to buy, and they have something they want to sell, and it's not going to go away. They have to be careful how they handle it. That's all.

Why do you think it will happen like that? Because that's the way the economy works. If there's something there to be had that's worth something, people want to buy it. The question is do we make money properly, or do we try to (??) or you know, things like that, and make sure that people on the ground get something themselves. That hasn't happened in the past. In Africa, the European countries and the United States made a fortune out of Africa. People in Africa made garbage. We have a long price to pay for that.

Djibouti

What do you think will happen after that? What I think will happen is that the new group that's looking to get the most out of it, despite the fact that the government is trying to do something effective. Um, I think that the people are going to take a beating on this, because this kind of oil, whatever it is, I assume it's oil, available, there's going to be blood spilled over it. It's going to be difficult. And North Africa especially has taken a beating. They've really taken a beating over the years. The people have taken incredible shellacking. It's going to happen again, I'm afraid. But I don't think there's any realistic way of solving it.

Why do you think it'll happen that way? Because there's a lust for oil everywhere.

Interpersonal conflicts: Study materials

'interpersonal' Script

In the following long-term study, we are interested in how well people are able to predict relationship development based on a limited amount of information. To explore this question, we will ask you to read several letters to an advice column in a newspaper. We were able to get in contact to the people in these letters, thus we know about the actual outcomes. After you read the stories you will be asked to think aloud about four questions. Your answers will be recorded, transcribed and compared with the real outcomes. To make sure your actual knowledge will not influence your responses, we removed any information, which may be indicative of the advice columns the letters have been selected from. Do you have any questions at this point?

If so, please be very convincing in your answers (look into subject's eyes, be short and precise in your responses). Please give the first story to the subject to read. Wait, till subject finishes reading the article.

Interview (to be repeated for each story)

Now, I will ask you four separate questions about the further development of the relationship.

Turn Audio System on. Place it at the appropriate distance from the subject. Before asking the 1st question, wait 2 seconds.

How did the story developed after this letter?

Wait, till the participant starts to respond. Don't interrupt, if she/he does not answer immediately, even if the pause is very long! Don't ask any additional questions.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Again, wait for response. Don't interrupt, if she/he does not answer immediately, even if the pause is very long!

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

Don't interrupt, if she/he does not answer immediately, even if the pause is very long! Ask this question; even if you think participant has already presented the answer (do not rephrase the question, e.g. 'I guess you already touched on this...').

What do you think should be done in this situation?

Don't interrupt, if she/he does not answer immediately, even if the pause is very long! Ask this question; even if you think participant has already presented the answer (do not rephrase the question).

In a long-run, do you see this conflict as a benefit (a) or as an obstacle (b) for the further development of relationship?

Mark the appropriate answer in the questionnaire Give 2 (it depends) for a response, in which subject says something about the limits of his information or presents several possible outcomes.

November 24, 2003

Dear A.:

My husband, "Ralph," has one sister, "Dawn," and one brother, "Curt." Their parents died six years ago, within months of each other.

Ever since, Dawn has once a year mentioned buying a headstone for their parents. I'm all for it, but Dawn is determined to spend a bundle on it, and she expects her brothers to help foot the bill. She recently told me she had put \$2,000 aside to pay for it.

Recently Dawn called to announce that she had gone ahead, selected the design, written the epitaph and ordered the headstone. Now she expects Curt and Ralph to pay "their share" back to her. She said she went ahead and ordered it on her own because she has been feeling guilty all these years that her parents didn't have one.

I feel that since Dawn did this all by herself, her brothers shouldn't have to pay her anything. I know that if Curt and Ralph don't pay her back, they'll never hear the end of it, and neither will I. What should I do about this?

-

March 5, 2002

Dear A.:

I am close friends with a couple I'll call "Angie" and "Gil." I met them at the same time and have always been unattached while they are a married couple. This didn't matter, and we hit it off right away.

The problem is, when Angie gets mad at Gil for whatever reason, she wants me to be mad, too. She thinks I should take sides, and this makes me uncomfortable because they are both my friends. Gil has never asked me to take sides with him.

Angie has gone so far as to request that I ignore any attempts by Gil to contact me if they are fighting. (He never does.) I feel bad for him and like I am betraying a friend by agreeing to do as she asks. I don't know how to explain to her that as they are both my friends, I would rather be left out of their arguments and not have to choose sides. Am I wrong to be friends with a couple? Is this inviting trouble because I am single?

-

August 17, 2004

Dear A.:

I am recently married, and every night my husband "tells" me when it's time for us to retire for the night. This can be anytime from 9:30 to 11:30 p.m.

If I tell him -- which is not often -- that I am ready for bed before he is, he gets upset.

However, if he is ready to go to bed, and I tell him I'd like to finish a book I'm reading or watch a little more TV, he gets upset.

When I try to talk to him about this, he says that married men and women should go to bed "together," period! But, it is always on his timetable. What about mine? Needless to say, we have both gone to bed angry.

How do we deal with this without both of us getting angry and resenting each other?

-

Interpersonal conflicts: Code- book

HEADSTONE STORY

Resolution

NO RESOLUTION

In the following examples, the participants see **no resolution** of the existing conflict because they predict that the conflict will not end. For example, participant 198 states “I don’t think there probably is an outcome” and that Dawn “probably bugs them about it,” showing how the participant believes the conflict will not end but will continue. Further, participant 14 predicts that the conflict won’t end and that it will actually “get worse” such that “it just worsened their relationship.” Thus, in both examples, participants predict the conflict to continue and/or worsen the current relationships such that there would be no resolution.

PID 198:

How did the story developed after this letter?

I think that Dawn’s brothers probably, she ended up having to pay for it by herself and she probably bugs them about it.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because if they, if they wanted to help they would have already given her money I think.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

I don’t think there probably is an outcome; I think that unless she accepts that they might not pay her back.

PID 14:

How did the story developed after this letter?

Well, I think that probably the brothers didn’t pay their part ad Dawn expected for the headstone and I think their relationship probably got worse.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Well, I think Dawn did something, she went ahead and bought this headstone without the permission of her two brothers, so I think that made this situation very difficult between them and uh, she did something they couldn’t afford, with the expectation that they would pay some portion of it without really coming to an agreement with them. So in a sense she kind of betrayed their trust and I don’t think they’re going to be very happy with her, and I don’t think they’ll pay. So I think it’s going to make their relationship worse.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

I think it just worsened their relationship.

SOME RESOLUTION

In the following examples, the participants see **some resolution** of the existing conflict because participants indicate that the conflict may end (a result of the conflict is predicted) but also acknowledging that there would still be disagreement, struggle, or dissatisfaction for the two brothers who are asked to help pay for the headstone. For example, participant 191 does predict that the brother's will help pay for the headstone and thus "keep peace in the family" but the participant also uses wording to describe the brother's decisions to pay as one where they would "buckle under" and give "up their own autonomy by going along with something they may or may not want to do." Thus, it is unclear as to whether there would be complete resolution since it is unclear as to whether all of the emotional distress in the conflict would be resolved on the brother's end. Participant 202 also predicts the conflict in a similar fashion where the brothers are predicted to pay Dawn but the participant also uses wording such as "break down" to describe the brother's decision to pay. Again, it is unclear as to whether the emotional/mental aspect of the conflict would be resolved since "break down" often implies that the brothers are making a decision against their own will/preferences.

PID 191:

How did the story developed after this letter?

How did it develop what? Oh, big family mix up. What happened is that, there were several possibilities. Do I say those? Well, I think Dawn has taken over the whole family. You don't know the relationships of each adult child to their parents. You don't know how conventional they think. These kind of things should be or to feel comfortable with. I think what's going to happen, I hate to say it, but I think these boys are just going to buckle under and do what Dawn wants to do, which I think is wrong.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

It happened because the dynamics of the family are that the males, these brothers have allowed their sister, and it seems to me only sister to make big decisions or to take things upon herself. And that most times they feel they have benefited, but in fact they gave up their own autonomy by going along with something they may or may not want to do.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

Well I think I just told you. I hate to say it I said, but I think they're going to swing toward Dawn's plan. Just to keep peace in the family.

PID 202:

How did the story developed after this letter?

I think they probably end up finally; the guys probably end up probably putting their share in. But you know they won't ever, or she won't never hear the end of it either. Where she's afraid she won't hear the end of it if they don't pay. So I'm sure they got hard feelings about it, but I'm sure at the end they'll break down and help pay for it.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because they're family and you're going to have hard feelings for a while, but hopefully you know, you're family you can work things out in the long run.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

What do you mean, final outcome, we don't know what the final outcome is. Either she went ahead and paid for it, but that's like the answer to the first question. Ok, I think yeah, I think the brothers will break down and help pay for it.

COMPLETE RESOLUTION

In the following examples, the participants see **complete resolution** of the existing conflict because participants predict an end result of the conflict, regardless of whether it is a positive or negative result. In both examples below, positive results are predicted such that participant 93 predicts a “compromise” between the siblings and that the “family eventually came together.” Participant 184 predicts that the brothers ended up paying such that “they all agreed to a certain amount of money, probably divided it equally in three parts,” indicating a complete resolution. (Especially since there was no wording that implied that the brother’s decision went against their will such as in *some resolution*).

PID 93:

How did the story developed after this letter?

Well I believe that the brothers contact with the sister Dawn and probably reached a compromise about how much they would pay for the headstone.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because I think that the brothers should pay something after all their parents should have a headstone I feel and although they didn't have any input into what was being decided about what it would look like or what was on it, somebody had to go ahead and do something after that period of time and it should be fair that they pay part of it at least.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

I think the brothers paid for part of it and that the family eventually came together.

PID 184:

How did the story developed after this letter?

Well I'm assuming since the gist of the letter is, well the siblings certainly probably talked more. I don't know about the other brother and whether or not he has a spouse. But I suspect since this spouse is asking, you know should Ralph pay and I won't hear the end of it. I don't know, to answer the question directly I bet the brothers ended up paying.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because you know, my take on this is that, well actually my family had a similar situation, and usually given that people recognize they have a long term relationship, even though sibling relationships can often be difficult, umm, \$600 or \$700 in this case for each sibling is not that money to pay for peace in the family would be my take on it.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

Sort of, is that kind of, assuming that's sort of a repeat of the initial question. The final outcome was that you know the sister or the wife of Ralph is writing this, so his sister bought the headstone and then they all agreed to a certain amount of money, probably just divided it equally in three parts.

Certainty

COMPLETE RECOGNITION OF LIMITS OF KNOWLEDGE

In the following examples, the participants **completely recognize their limits of knowledge** in terms of the existing conflict because they indicate that they do not have enough knowledge or facts about the conflict in order to make an accurate prediction. For example, participant 180 states how it “depends on the personalities of the people involved” and notes how the story they were given to read “doesn’t say how much she finally decided would be the price. This participant continues to emphasize how it all “depends” and thus indicates how he completely recognize how he doesn’t have enough information to make an accurate prediction but is just making a prediction because it “seemed like the most reasonable explanation.” Further, participant 191 states how “you don’t know the relationships...you don’t know how conventional they think” Either way, participants indicate that they don’t know enough about the conflict and thereby recognize their limits of knowledge completely.

PID 180:

How did the story developed after this letter?

Ok, kind of depends on the personalities of the people involved. First of all the person who’s speaking, the wife of Ralph, it’s not really her problem. It’s between Ralph and Kurt and Dawn. Dawn apparently is impatient to get this done, and the others have been dragging it out for six years or at least nothing’s been done for six years. And it doesn’t say how much she finally decided would be the price. It may be that Ralph and Kurt are perfectly fine with what she finally suggested so they need to get together with her and decide what they are willing to pay on it and how much she expects from them, it may be that there’s no problem. That it’s an agreement, if she paid way more than they are willing to add to it, it’s really between the three siblings. The wife, unless they ask for a mediator, really shouldn’t be getting involved.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

I don’t know that that’s how it happened, just that that seems the reasonable way for them to go about it. It really depends on the personalities of the people involved, which I don’t know. The only hint of personality here is in the person who’s speaking, the wife of Ralph. And she’s worried how this is all going to fall out. But I don’t know, I guess I just picked what seemed like the most reasonable explanation.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

Again it depends, if Dawn knew that they didn’t want to pay a whole lot and picked something that was reasonably within their range, it could very well have been they got together and said ok, fine and split it up. If Kurt and Ralph have been dragging their feet because they don’t want to pay anything or because it’s way too much, it’s likely this is going to go on for a long time, the arguments between everybody.

PID 191:

How did the story developed after this letter?

How did it develop what? Oh, big family mix up. What happened is that, there were several possibilities. Do I say those? Well, I think Dawn has taken over the whole family.

You don't know the relationships of each adult child to their parents. You don't know how conventional they think. These kind of things should be or to feel comfortable with. I think what's going to happen, I hate to say it, but I think these boys are just going to buckle under and do what Dawn wants to do, which I think is wrong.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

It happened because the dynamics of the family are that the males, these brothers have allowed their sister, and it seems to me only sister to make big decisions or to take things upon herself. And that most times they feel they have benefited, but in fact they gave up their own autonomy by going along with something they may or may not want to do.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

Well I think I just told you. I hate to say it I said, but I think they're going to swing toward Dawn's plan. Just to keep peace in the family.

SOME RECOGNITION OF LIMITS OF KNOWLEDGE

In the following examples, the participants **partially recognize their limits of knowledge** in terms of the existing conflict because although participants make firm predictions about the conflict, they still briefly indicate that they don't have enough information about the conflict. For example, participant 129 firmly states that he is making a reasonable prediction that the brothers and sister came to some agreement but he also briefly recognizes that he doesn't have enough information about the situation when he says "You don't know" as a response the third question, "What was the final outcome of the conflict?" Similarly, participant 38 seems to repeat the ideas within the story but the participant still recognizes that he "can't say what their relationship is because she hasn't even told them yet," indicating that the participant briefly recognizes their limits of knowledge and thus have a partial recognition.

PID 129:

How did the story developed after this letter?

Well the two brothers and their sister had to come to some agreement or understanding of how they were going to split the cost of the headstone for their mother.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because it seems reasonable. You're getting this story from not the daughter of the woman who died but the daughter-in-law, she's relating it. And I would say that the two brothers talking with their sister for something for their mother's grave, it seems reasonable to me that if the sister had already spent the money, ordered the headstone, that they would agree to divide the cost of it amongst the three of them.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

You don't know. I mean she's asking for advice of what she should do. What the wife should do as far as with her sister in law, her husband, and her brother in law.

PID 38:

How did the story developed after this letter?

Ok, she went ahead her own decision without confiding in anybody, although she realizes it could ruin her relationship with her two brothers. Because she went ahead and did

everything on her own without confiding in them. I really don't, I can't say what their relationship is because she hasn't even told them yet.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Probably because she was feeling guilty and she wanted to do something for her parents that she hadn't done. She put the money down without knowing if she was going to get any of that money back from her two brothers. Instead of just having a meeting and asking them how they felt about it.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

She would have two brothers that were upset with her, which would ruin the relationship between her and her two brothers.

NO RECOGNITION OF LIMITS OF KNOWLEDGE

The participant in this example sees **no recognition of their limits of knowledge** in terms of the existing conflict. Participant 183 seems to firmly believe that there will be a "great fight" therefore leading to problems within the family relationships. Participant 202 also sticks to the singular idea that the brothers will break down and help to pay for the headstone. In all, both participants seem to stand by their predictions without any indication that the participants think they don't have enough information about the situation to accurately make the predictions they made.

PID 183:

How did the story developed after this letter?

One great fight. The sister alienated herself from Ralph's wife and possibly from Kurt.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because I think a situation had been created where it's awfully hard for anybody to back out.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

A significant decrease in the family cohesion.

PID 202:

How did the story developed after this letter?

I think they probably end up finally; the guys probably end up probably putting their share in. But you know they won't ever, or she won't never hear the end of it either.

Where she's afraid she won't hear the end of it if they don't pay. So I'm sure they got hard feelings about it, but I'm sure at the end they'll break down and help pay for it.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because they're family and you're going to have hard feelings for a while, but hopefully you know, you're family you can work things out in the long run.

Compromise

COMPLETE COMPROMISE

In the following examples, the participants see **complete compromise** of the existing conflict because participant 12 and participant 92 both explicitly talk about the couple coming to a “compromise” that will help the family work out this problem. While some participants may explicitly use words such as “compromise” to indicate *complete compromise*, some participants may use terms such as “work things out” or “come to a mutual understanding” which also indicates a *complete compromise*. Furthermore, some participants may predict a negative outcome by stating that the couple “will not compromise.” In this case, we still code for *complete compromise* since the participant is mentally aware of the idea of compromise within the conflict, although he may choose to predict an opposite outcome.

PID 12:

How did the story developed after this letter?

Well, I imagine that Kurt and Ralph were approached by Dawn for their share of the headstone for their parents. And discussions.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because we know that Dawn ordered the headstone, and we know that she wanted assistance from her brothers in paying for the headstone, and we do not know what Kurt and Ralph had decided to do.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

I would think there would probably be some compromise reached, that Kurt and Ralph realize that its important to have some kind of headstone and although Dawn went ahead and picked it out and ordered it without them and confirming that they'd pitch in, they would probably pitch in somehow, even if not what she wanted ideally. But hopefully there was some kind of contribution.

PID 93:

How did the story developed after this letter?

Well I believe that the brothers contact with the sister Dawn and probably reached a compromise about how much they would pay for the headstone.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because I think that the brothers should pay something after all their parents should have a headstone I feel and although they didn't have any input into what was being decided about what it would look like or what was on it, somebody had to go ahead and do something after that period of time and it should be fair that they pay part of it at least.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

I think the brothers paid for part of it and that the family eventually came together.

PARTIAL COMPROMISE

In the following examples, the participant sees **partial compromise** of the existing conflict because the participant seems to be thinking about the idea of compromise although they don't explicitly state it. However, the participants use of the word "arrangement" makes it unclear as to whether the participant is really thinking about compromise (as compared to if they used the phrase "mutual agreement"). Thus, this example was coded as *partial compromise* due to the vagueness of what the wording "arrangement" means. In general, the fact that the participant explicitly stated that the "arrangement" would be a decision "fair to both of them," seems to hint towards compromise such that each person within the conflict would be able to benefit in some way

PID 10:

How did the story developed after this letter?

Well, the story was the husband, the wife, and the sister and brother, what I think happened is that they probably paid for it. It doesn't say how much the total bill was but they probably came to some sort of arrangement with the sister where they would pay at least some towards the headstone.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Well because its seems right that the brothers should also contribute something and I can't imagine anyone giving them advice to just totally not pay anything for it, and so, it seems like that would be the right thing to do.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

Well, that they came to, to some kind of arrangement that seemed fair to both of them, to all three of the siblings, but that they were also able to express their frustration, somebody would go out and do something without getting permission from everybody.

NO COMPROMISE

In the following examples, the participants see **no compromise** of the existing conflict because each participant shows no indication that they thought about compromise or that compromise is a possible outcome. Both participants make firm predictions that the Dawn will end up paying for the headstone herself and her brothers will not pay her and will tell her to "get bent" (PID 211). In all, there is no indication that the participants are thinking about compromise as a possibility within this conflict.

PID 137:

How did the story developed after this letter?

My guess is that she contacted her siblings and based on what her husband said they didn't pay her and she's now having a complete family squabble and her husband is siding with her brother and sister which makes it worse.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because I'm taking the lead from the husband who is saying that he foresees this going on and since he knows the characters I just trust that that would be where it would go.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

That she ended up eating the cost of the headstone.

PID 211:

How did the story developed after this letter?

I believe that Kurt and Ralph told her to get bent because they probably either didn't have the money, otherwise they would have done it sooner. And Dawn's going to be stuck with a bill period. She should be stuck with a bill if she went ahead without their ok.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Why? Because that's human nature, these two brothers aren't going to put up with that. I don't know what their relationship is, but if my sister spent money on my behalf without telling me first she wouldn't get a dime.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

I think she footed the bill herself and she was bitter toward her brothers after that, which she shouldn't be. She took it upon herself; she should have had them cremated anyway, why waste the space in the ground.

Flexibility

FLEXIBLE

The participants in these examples exhibit **flexibility** because the participants indicate how they both recognize the possibility of multiple outcomes, including that the brothers could pay, they could not pay, one brother could pay, or that the brothers will only pay for a given amount. Thus, these participants show *flexibility* in their world views by presenting various general ideas as to what outcomes could occur (rather than predicting only one outcome).

PID 60:

How did the story developed after this letter?

I suspect there was probably some vigorous discussion between the brothers and sister that went ahead and got the headstone without their definite agreement on it. They had thought about it, but they hadn't really said that they were going to do it and they should have a certain price or something like that. It depends on how close the brothers and sisters were. I can see there being a great deal of tension and the brothers just saying we're not going to pay for that or we'll pay for a certain amount, but certainly you went over the amount that we expected and you know we'll pay what we feel is fair but not as much as you want us to pay.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Well just because the brothers really hadn't been in on the final decision and I think that depending on their circumstances it sort of sounded that since they said Dawn is determined to spend a bundle on it, it sounded like the brothers weren't expecting to or didn't want to spend that much on it and so they would be willing to go in, but on a much lesser quality headstone or whatever it was they were referring to.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

A great deal of hard feelings and again depending on family relationships, it could have been that they would come to some sort of an agreement and let that be it. I've known some families where people just can't come to an agreement and they just don't speak with each other or have an association with each other because of a problem that they can't solve and it to me sounds pathetic but it does happen.

PID 98:

How did the story developed after this letter?

It could have developed in several, it could have several outcomes. Did you want me to explain it? Either the boys, the brothers paid her back, reimbursed the sister and then there was resentment on perhaps even the wife's part. Maybe just the wife's part or there could have been resentment on all three or the brothers could have refused to pay and the sister's feelings may have been hurt or she may have accepted it or maybe one brother would have paid. So I mean I don't know.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Just because of how human nature, people respond generally people, some people feel a sense of entitlement and others don't and you know people hate being put in a sense of

being obligated or some people feel that they're obligated to do something when the feeling isn't realistic, it's human nature.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

Well I mean the absolute final outcome would be they die and you know they just forget about the stone was made and either hated each other or the final outcome is they just dealt with it.

SOMEWHAT FLEXIBLE

The participants in these examples exhibit **some flexibility** because they both describe two possible outcomes of the situation (usually the two outcomes described are polar opposites of each other, for example, one clearly positive and one clearly negative outcome). For example, participant 16 describes two opposing outcomes that either there would be a compromise or there would be a "falling out" between the siblings. Participant 236 also describes two different outcomes, either the siblings will not talk to each other for a while or that the sister Dawn would yell at her brothers to give her money. Thus, participants exhibiting *complete flexibility* describe more than two outcomes which tend to show the participants understanding of the complexity of the situation; participants exhibiting *some flexibility* tend to only describe two possible outcomes that are opposites of each other and thus lack acknowledgement of such complexity.

PID 16:

How did the story developed after this letter?

After the, probably they bickered some more and some ultimatum may have been laid down. You know, probability that the fellows chipped in, but not as much as maybe the letter who writes the letter, in order to avoid too much, to continue on so this thing. She can urge her husband to do the thing, because we know nothing about their finances. To keep the peace. That's about all I can think of what happened afterwards.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

As I said? Well, it seems about the only way to keep the peace, it ought to keep this thing from festering forever.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

I already got that in the first one. Some compromise was reached, the other alternative would be that the family just had a complete falling out and nobody bought anybody more headstones at all.

PID 236:

How did the story developed after this letter?

I guess the sister kept, I mean was real determined about getting her parents a headstone. Probably got worse, probably like you know what that was too much for a headstone, probably escalated to the brothers and sisters arguing all the time about her getting her money back.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because I know, or maybe they might have wanted she had on there. Or they might have wanted to put their own little two cents into what should have been written on there. So therefore they felt ok well you paid for it, this is how you want it done, that's your responsibility. We're not paying you back.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

She got her parents a headstone. I mean you mean between the people in it or just? I mean I feel she probably went off for a while and just yelling back and forth about her yelling give me my money. Or they probably ended up not talking for a while.

INFLEXIBLE

The participant in this example exhibits **inflexibility** because he does not seem to be thinking about any other possible outcome of the conflict besides that there will be a fight (PID 183) or that Dawn will have to pay for the headstone herself (PID 198). The participants firmly describe a single viewpoint without recognition of other possible outcomes and thus these examples are coded as *inflexible*.

PID 198:

How did the story developed after this letter?

I think that Dawn's brothers probably, she ended up having to pay for it by herself and she probably bugs them about it.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because if they, if they wanted to help they would have already given her money I think.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

I don't think there probably is an outcome; I think that unless she accepts that they might not pay her back.

PID 183:

How did the story developed after this letter?

One great fight. The sister alienated herself from Ralph's wife and possibly from Kurt.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because I think a situation had been created where it's awfully hard for anybody to back out.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

A significant decrease in the family cohesion.

Perspective

LOTS OF PERSPECTIVE

In the following examples, the participants take a **lot of perspective** when they describe their predictions of the existing conflict because they continuously use first person to indicate that they are taking the perspective of the people within the conflict (PID 236). The participant doesn't explicitly state that he is taking the perspective of the brothers but instead just goes right into using "I" and "we" and "you" within his predictions (such as "We're not paying you back" (PID 236)). Participant 173 shows a lot of perspective taking by indicating understanding on how people have different ways of grieving while also using first person tenses such as "our parents" and "we need to be able to honor them." In this way, the participants take a lot of perspective by relating themselves directly to the positions that the siblings are in within this conflict.

PID 173:

How did the story developed after this letter?

How did the story develop after this letter, umm, I suspect that the relationship between them could be strained because it explains that Dawn has paid money. She feels that her brothers should be responsible in paying his portion and his brother will think that maybe first maybe she should have checked with him first. And one of the things that sometimes can cause strained relationships is money. And in this particular case it could be something that strains the relationship.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

It happened as I said because what happens is that people sometimes have a different way of grieving. Somebody might believe that ok, umm, our parents have died and this what this we need to do to be able to honor them. Another person might think that if they have died there isn't anything that needs to be done. Umm, it could also mean that the other person might not have the financial means or it could also mean that it might not be important to the brother. So it's what happens is that usually people have different perspectives of what is it that is very important to them. So when it gets to that point that is when it can create conflicts. And also I think it happened this way because when Dawn started the project she should have perhaps maybe involved her brother. And if she had involved her brother, her brother would have felt that perhaps he is part of the decision making process in trying to get this thing done.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

The final outcome of this conflict unless the final. Oh, ok the final outcome of this conflict is that they might not be on speaking terms.

PID 236:

How did the story developed after this letter?

I guess the sister kept, I mean was real determined about getting her parents a headstone. Probably got worse, probably like you know what that was too much for a headstone, probably escalated to the brothers and sisters arguing all the time about her getting her money back.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because I know, or maybe they might have wanted she had on there. Or they might have wanted to put their own little two cents into what should have been written on there. So therefore they felt ok well you paid for it, this is how you want it done, that's your responsibility. We're not paying you back.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

She got her parents a headstone. I mean you mean between the people in it or just? I mean I feel she probably went off for a while and just yelling back and forth about her yelling give me my money. Or they probably ended up not talking for a while.

SOME PERSPECTIVE

In the following example, the participant exhibits **some perspective taking** when they describe their predictions of the existing conflict such that they both use first person as in *a lot of perspective taking* but the participants only indicate using first person in *one instance only*. For example, participant 72 states that Ralph thought “well you know this is my parent and I need to pony up and pay my fair share,” indicating that the participant is taking *some perspective* since they use first person tense this one time but not multiple times as in *a lot of perspective taking*. Participant 184 similarly indicates *some perspective taking* because they make a quick reference that the participant’s “family had a similar situation,” thereby indicating that this participant can relate to the conflict-situation and may be taking the perspective of the story characters but it is not clear since the participant only makes this *one* short reference.

PID 72:

How did the story developed after this letter?

I'm sure there was some tension when they had to come to some type of conclusion about whether they should pay the fair share of the headstone so there was maybe some conflict and some raised voices.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

The writer, the author of the letter seems to be pretty firm in her feelings and it seems like she's not going to back down, so and she's kind of outside the loop as she's the sister in law I think. So kind of puts them in a pickle.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

I would hazard to guess that eventually Ralph thought well you know this is my parent and I need to pony up and pay my fair share.

PID 184:

How did the story developed after this letter?

Well I'm assuming since the gist of the letter is, well the siblings certainly probably talked more. I don't know about the other brother and whether or not he has a spouse. But I suspect since this spouse is asking, you know should Ralph pay and I won't hear the end of it. I don't know, to answer the question directly I bet the brothers ended up paying.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because you know, my take on this is that, well actually my family had a similar situation, and usually given that people recognize they have a long term relationship, even though

sibling relationships can often be difficult, umm, \$600 or \$700 in this case for each sibling is not that money to pay for peace in the family would be my take on it.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

Sort of, is that kind of, assuming that's sort of a repeat of the initial question. The final outcome was that you know the sister or the wife of Ralph is writing this, so his sister bought the headstone and then they all agreed to a certain amount of money, probably just divided it equally in three parts.

NO PERSPECTIVE

When participants exhibit **no perspective taking**, they do not talk about the conflict or results of the conflict using first person words or statements, nor do they use examples which relate their own personal life or experiences with the couple from the story. Most participants do not take the perspective of the siblings because of this distinction.

PID 183:

How did the story developed after this letter?

One great fight. The sister alienated herself from Ralph's wife and possibly from Kurt.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because I think a situation had been created where it's awfully hard for anybody to back out.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

A significant decrease in the family cohesion.

Change

LOTS OF CHANGE

In the following examples, the participants predict a **lot of change** within the existing conflict because they both describe either: *big* changes within the conflict or *multiple* changes within the conflict. In some cases participants may predict *big* changes such as “compromise” (PID 93). This is considered *lots of change* since a compromise within the given context can be seen as a significant change since the story is all about a conflict and being able to resolve the conflict is seen as a big change. In the same way, participant 184 also falls under the category of having *lots of change* since the participant predicts that the brothers end up paying for some of the headstone due to an agreement between the siblings to do so (which is a significant change to the previous conflict that the story was based on).

PID 93:

How did the story developed after this letter?

Well I believe that the brothers contact with the sister Dawn and probably reached a compromise about how much they would pay for the headstone.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because I think that the brothers should pay something after all their parents should have a headstone I feel and although they didn't have any input into what was being decided about what it would look like or what was on it, somebody had to go ahead and do something after that period of time and it should be fair that they pay part of it at least.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

I think the brothers paid for part of it and that the family eventually came together.

PID 184:

How did the story developed after this letter?

Well I'm assuming since the gist of the letter is, well the siblings certainly probably talked more. I don't know about the other brother and whether or not he has a spouse. But I suspect since this spouse is asking, you know should Ralph pay and I won't hear the end of it. I don't know, to answer the question directly I bet the brothers ended up paying.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because you know, my take on this is that, well actually my family had a similar situation, and usually given that people recognize they have a long term relationship, even though sibling relationships can often be difficult, umm, \$600 or \$700 in this case for each sibling is not that money to pay for peace in the family would be my take on it.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

Sort of, is that kind of, assuming that's sort of a repeat of the initial question. The final outcome was that you know the sister or the wife of Ralph is writing this, so his sister bought the headstone and then they all agreed to a certain amount of money, probably just divided it equally in three parts.

SOME CHANGE

In the following example, the participants predict **some change** within the existing conflict. For participant 72, the conflict is “resolved” such that Ralph will pay Dawn. However, the fact that the participant described that there would be tension about this choice, leading to raised voices, indicates that some aspects of the original conflict may not have changed (such as the emotional conflicts felt internally within the siblings). Participant 180 falls under *some change* because they describe multiple changes, some of which oppose each other. Thus, although the participant does describe multiple changes (showing *flexibility*), the fact that some of these described changes are in opposition to each other causes this to be coded as *some change*.

PID 72:

How did the story developed after this letter?

I'm sure there was some tension when they had to come to some type of conclusion about whether they should pay the fair share of the headstone so there was maybe some conflict and some raised voices.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

The writer, the author of the letter seems to be pretty firm in her feelings and it seems like she's not going to back down, so and she's kind of outside the loop as she's the sister in law I think. So kind of puts them in a pickle.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

I would hazard to guess that eventually Ralph thought well you know this is my parent and I need to pony up and pay my fair share.

PID 180:

How did the story developed after this letter?

Ok, kind of depends on the personalities of the people involved. First of all the person who's speaking, the wife of Ralph, it's not really her problem. It's between Ralph and Kurt and Dawn. Dawn apparently is impatient to get this done, and the others have been dragging it out for six years or at least nothing's been done for six years. And it doesn't say how much she finally decided would be the price. It may be that Ralph and Kurt are perfectly fine with what she finally suggested so they need to get together with her and decide what they are willing to pay on it and how much she expects from them, it may be that there's no problem. That it's an agreement, if she paid way more than they are willing to add to it, it's really between the three siblings. The wife, unless they ask for a mediator, really shouldn't be getting involved.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

I don't know that that's how it happened, just that that seems the reasonable way for them to go about it. It really depends on the personalities of the people involved, which I don't know. The only hint of personality here is in the person who's speaking, the wife of Ralph. And she's worried how this is all going to fall out. But I don't know, I guess I just picked what seemed like the most reasonable explanation.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

Again it depends, if Dawn knew that they didn't want to pay a whole lot and picked something that was reasonably within their range, it could very well have been they got

together and said ok, fine and split it up. If Kurt and Ralph have been dragging their feet because they don't want to pay anything or because it's way too much, it's likely this is going to go on for a long time, the arguments between everybody.

NO CHANGE

In the following examples, the participants predict **no change** within the existing conflict because both participants explicitly state that there wasn't any outcome to the conflict. Participant 179 describes how everything was "still up in the air" while participant 198 states that they "don't think there probably is an outcome." Such statements show how neither participant believed that there would be any change to the current situation (this includes statements to the first two questions as well). Thus, when coding *no change*, it must be clear that the participants predict that the conflict will continue and/or stay the same and that the tense relations between the siblings will not change.

PID 179:

How did the story developed after this letter?

Dawn went ahead and ordered the headstone on her own without consulting her two brothers Ralph and Kurt and Dawn thought that her two brothers should help her pay for the headstone and Ralph's wife decided that the two brothers should not have to pay their, or what the sister, sister Dawn thought was part of their share of the cost for the headstone, the \$2,000. So I guess that was the end of the story right there. It was kind of up in the air, Dawn had paid for it. Ok.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

I think because Dawn went ahead and ordered it, ordered the headstone without consulting her brothers about the total cost after she had a quote and she didn't really consult with her two brothers before she ordered it, so then the sister-in-law thought well the two brothers shouldn't have to pay.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

There really wasn't. Well the final outcome was that everything was still up in the air, the sister Dawn paid the total cost and the two brothers at that point hadn't paid anything.

PID 198:

How did the story developed after this letter?

I think that Dawn's brothers probably, she ended up having to pay for it by herself and she probably bugs them about it.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because if they, if they wanted to help they would have already given her money I think.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

I don't think there probably is an outcome; I think that unless she accepts that they might not pay her back.

ANGIE & GILL STORY

Resolution

NO RESOLUTION

In the following examples, the participants see **no resolution** of the existing conflict because they predict that the conflict will not end but that “they continued their relationship much the same way they have now” (PID 118) or that the letter writer “would have just probably accepted the friendship the way it is” (PID 167). It is evident that while participants may predict some level of change in the conflict, such as in PID 167’s description that the letter writer would “probably let Angie know her feelings,” for there to be **no resolution**, it must be clear that participants believe that there will be no specific end result of the conflict.

PID 118:

How did the story developed after this letter?

I think they continued their relationship much the same way they have now.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because I don’t think Angie is willing to change and since Gill is not willing to change and I think the person writing the letter enjoyed being friends with them, so.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

That she could be more assertive in saying that she doesn’t want to hear Angie’s problems with Gill.

PID 167:

How did the story developed after this letter?

I think that the person who’s writing the letter feels, would have just probably accepted the friendship the way it is, even though it’s difficult.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

I don’t know. People who like each other tend to put up with things they don’t like about people or relationships if they are worthwhile.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

I guess that the person who wrote the letter probably let Angie know her feelings and even though it didn’t change things much.

SOME RESOLUTION

In the following examples, the participants see **some resolution** of the existing conflict because the participant's predictions are quite vague as to whether the actual conflict ended or not. Participant 186 describes how the letter writer may have said something to Angie and that "they remained friends," indicating a possible resolution, but also emphasizes how Angie would "continue to ask the author...to do these things" and that Angie "probably didn't respond well to [the letter writer's] request," indicating lack of resolution of the conflict. Thus, the participant's prediction is too vague as to be determined *complete resolution* or *no resolution* and thus it is coded as *some resolution*. Furthermore, participant 148's response is also quite vague such that he only describes how the letter writer was able to talk to Angie about the issue at hand. Although it seems the participant is implying that the conflict will resolve as a result of these talks, this statement is not explicitly made and therefore can only be seen as *some resolution* since the response is quite vague.

PID 148:

How did the story developed after this letter?

I think this person talked to Angie and told her that she wants to be left out of their arguments and not to choose sides.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Well because she said she's uncomfortable that she has to take sides. She wants to continue to be friends with them but she is friends with both of them. She wants to be left of out of their arguments. She doesn't want to have to choose sides and so she knows how she feels. And she just needs to voice her feelings.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

I think the final outcome is that the single person talked to Angie and told her that she'd like to be left out of the arguments and not to choose sides and that she wants to friends with both of them but doesn't want to be in their fights.

PID 186:

How did the story developed after this letter?

Angie continued to ask the author that, to do these things and I think the author might have finally lightly said something to them.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

I think that's probably because that's the way I would handle it.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

Angie probably didn't respond very well to my request, but they remained friends.

COMPLETE RESOLUTION

In the following examples, the participants see **complete resolution** of the existing conflict because participants predict an end result of the conflict, regardless of whether it is a positive or negative result. In the following two cases, both participants see the conflict as resolving positively, such that the couple and the letter writer “worked it out” (PID 107) and again that “the letter writer and Angie sat down, had a talk, [and] worked things out” (PID 138). Thus, both participants predict that the conflict will completely end such that there is no other disagreement, struggle, or dissatisfaction still present.

PID 107:

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Let's see. I think judging from the fact that she wrote the letter and that she says that they're both her friends I don't think she wants to lose a friendship to either of them. And I don't think it would be possible to stay friends with one of them at a time because the other one would always be around so I think she would be motivated to try to patch things up with both of them. I think the fact that Angie respects her opinion enough to try to get her to take her side I think means that they're good enough friends to where she would have an incentive to actually want to work out the situation.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

I think they worked it out. Ultimately and they talked to each other and they kind of figured out that this person didn't want to be in the middle of the argument I think.

PID 138:

How did the story developed after this letter?

It's really hard for me to say how it developed because I don't think I have enough information about these three people. But I have an idea of how it should work it out. So I'll just be optimistic and say that the letter writer and Angie eventually had a talk and the letter writer was able to persuade or to get Angie to look at things from the letter writer's point of view. And that then caused Angie to sort of become aware of what she had been doing and to see that it wasn't the best way to go and therefore Angie would there after for the most part refrain from asking the letter writer to take her side, Angie's side versus Gill.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Well I'm not sure it did happen that way, but that's the way I think it should happen and like I said I guess I'll just be an optimist and assume that the letter writer and Angie were both reasonable people who could sit down and talk to each other and assuming that's true then I think they worked it out.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

Well if you stick with the scenario that I've laid out then everything is ok. The letter writer and Angie sat down, had a talk, worked things out, and then all three people went on you know continued their sort of three sided friendship after that.

Certainty

COMPLETE RECOGNITION OF LIMITS OF KNOWLEDGE

In the following examples, the participants **completely recognize their limits of knowledge** in terms of the existing conflict because they indicate that they do not have enough knowledge or facts about the conflict in order to make an accurate prediction. For example, participant 138 emphasizes that he thinks it is “really hard...to say how it developed” because they don’t “have enough information about these three people.” In his response to the second question, he continues to emphasize his lack of knowledge, despite his decision to make a prediction anyways, by saying, “Well I am not sure it did happen that way, but that’s the way I think it should happen.” Furthermore, participant 219 also displays recognition of his limits of knowledge by making statements such as “there’s not tons of information...so [my prediction] could be way off.” In this manner, complete recognition of limits of knowledge is seen when participants explicitly make statements that show how they realize there is not enough information provided to correctly predict the outcome of the conflict.

PID 219:

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

I’m not sure. There’s not tons of information about Angie and Gill in here, but I could see Angie being the type of person that tries to end the friendship when told hey, I don’t want to take sides between you and your husband. But like I said there’s not a lot of info, so that could be way off. I could see that being it or I could see the writer getting what she wants and being left out. I honestly can’t, don’t have a preferred. Well I have a preferred ending, but I don’t have an ending that seems more likely than the other to me.

PID 138:

How did the story developed after this letter?

It’s really hard for me to say how it developed because I don’t think I have enough information about these three people. But I have an idea of how it should work it out. So I’ll just be optimistic and say that the letter writer and Angie eventually had a talk and the letter writer was able to persuade or to get Angie to look at things from the letter writer’s point of view. And that then caused Angie to sort of become aware of what she had been doing and to see that it wasn’t the best way to go and therefore Angie would there after for the most part refrain from asking the letter writer to take her side, Angie’s side versus Gill.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Well I’m not sure it did happen that way, but that’s the way I think it should happen and like I said I guess I’ll just be an optimist and assume that the letter writer and Angie were both reasonable people who could sit down and talk to each other and assuming that’s true then I think they worked it out.

SOME RECOGNITION OF LIMITS OF KNOWLEDGE

In the following examples, the participants **partially recognize their limits of knowledge** in terms of the existing conflict because although participants make firm predictions about the conflict, they still seem to implicitly indicate that they don't have enough information about the conflict. For example, participant 156 predicts that the letter writer would confront Angie but that the direction of the situation would "depend upon the person referred to as Angie." Thus, the participant slightly indicates that he doesn't have enough information to make a prediction because he doesn't know enough about Angie to guess the outcome of the conflict. Further, participant 65 believes that the letter writer should "back away" from the conflict but when asked to predict the final outcome, he states that he "doesn't know if the final outcome has been decided." In this way, although he don't explicitly state that he doesn't have enough information which would make his recognition very clear (and thus qualify as *complete recognition of their limits of knowledge*), he exhibits *some recognition of their limits of knowledge* because he says that he doesn't know how the conflict will end.

PID 156:

How did the story developed after this letter?

It sounds like the person who is referred to as I is has a lot of common sense so I think maybe she might have actually spoken to the female Angie and expressed her desire to be left out of any disagreements that they're having probably.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

She said it was making her uncomfortable and that I think that her preference was that she would rather be left out and not have to choose sides. And I think that's probably what she did.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

Well that would depend upon the person referred to as Angie if she's willing to respect the person referred to as I then it would have a good outcome.

PID 65:

How did the story developed after this letter?

It develops because she doesn't know them as well as she thought that she did. And she shouldn't take sides after they're married and having their disagreements. It's their problem. It's not her problem. She should back away from it.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

I think it happened because she didn't really know them that well as two separate people, and sometimes, when two separate people become one, so to speak, things change.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

The final outcome? Well I don't know if the final outcome has been decided.

NO RECOGNITION OF LIMITS OF KNOWLEGE

The participant in this example sees **no recognition of their limits of knowledge** in terms of the existing conflict because his prediction is briefly but firmly stated that “they continued their relationship much the same way they have now.” There is no indication or feeling that the participant thinks they don’t know enough about the conflict to make a prediction because he clearly has strong feelings about the exact way the conflict will develop.

PID 118:

How did the story developed after this letter?

I think they continued their relationship much the same way they have now.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because I don’t think Angie is willing to change and since Gill is not willing to change and I think the person writing the letter enjoyed being friends with them, so.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

That she could be more assertive in saying that she doesn’t want to hear Angie’s problems with Gill.

Compromise

COMPLETE COMPROMISE

Despite lack of concrete examples, if participants had seen **complete compromise** of the existing conflict then they would have likely explicitly talked about the married couple and the letter writer as coming to a “compromise” where they were able to work out their problems such that each member of this group of three gave up something so that they could all solve the conflict. Some participants may explicitly use words such as “compromise” to indicate *complete compromise*, some participants may use terms such as “work things out” or “come to a mutual understanding” which also indicates a *complete compromise*. Furthermore, some participants may predict a negative outcome by stating that the couple “will not compromise.” In this case, we still code for *complete compromise* since the participant is mentally aware of the idea of compromise within the conflict, although the participant may choose to predict an opposite outcome.

PARTIAL COMPROMISE

In the following examples, the participants see **partial compromise** of the existing conflict because the participants don’t predict an *explicit* compromise. However, the participant 154 does seem to recognize the need for a “mutual agreement” between the three people and participant 107 describes how the three people will “hash things out.” Thus, both participants seem to show that they recognize the possibility of a compromise through phrases which imply compromise but neither participant clearly predicts a complete compromise (or non-compromise as described above).

PID 154:

How did the story developed after this letter?

The subject is going to have to explain to both Gill and Angie what the terms of their friendship are. And that’s going to probably and that’ll require her to inform Angie that she’s not going to take sides and to inform Gill that she’s friends with both of them.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because there has to be a resolution Angie appears to be instituting a conflict for the subject between herself Angie and Gill. So the subject has only three choices. One is to take Angie’s side, two is to take Gill’s side, or I guess there are four choices you could leave them alone or if you wanted to continue being friends than you have to make it clear that you’re friends with both of them equally.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

Actually you’d have to make friends with them in a manner that is mutually acceptable. Doesn’t have to be equal but they all have to know what the deal is. What’s the question again? The final outcome is going to be mutual agreement on the terms of their friendship. And that might include a mutual agreement to not be friends anymore. But whatever happens it’ll have to be a mutual agreement.

PID 107:

How did the story developed after this letter?

I think ultimately she would call Angie and Gill maybe, well first I think she would try to talk to Angie separately since she seems to be the one that gets the most angry about things. And she would try to kind of convince her that they're both her friend and that there is never even, that she should get in the middle because she doesn't want to alienate one of her friends by taking a side in an argument. So I think she would try to explain that to Angie and then hopefully after that they could all meet together and kind of hash things out and then get past that. I think ultimately they would talk it out and kind of get past the situation.

NO COMPROMISE

In the following examples, the participants see **no compromise** of the existing conflict because each participant shows no indication that he thought about compromise or that compromise is a possible outcome. Both participants make firm predictions that the letter writer will either “stay friends with both [Angie and Gill]” (PID 101) or that the relationship will stay “much the same way they have now” (PID 118). Thus, neither participant hints that they recognize the possibility that the three people in the story may compromise, work together, or mutually agree.

PID 101:

How did the story developed after this letter?

*Well he should have take them and said hey this is, I'm not going to get involved in your arguments. You two f*** straighten it out. I'm going to be friends with both of you.*

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Probably he's got a sympathetic ear to listen to her complaining and so she turns to him, probably doesn't have anybody else to turn to.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

That, that's something that, how did it settle. Hopefully he stayed friends with both of them, maybe not quite as close.

PID 118:

How did the story developed after this letter?

I think they continued their relationship much the same way they have now.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because I don't think Angie is willing to change and since Gill is not willing to change and I think the person writing the letter enjoyed being friends with them, so.

Flexibility

FLEXIBLE

The participants in the following examples exhibit **flexibility** because the participants indicate that he knows of multiple possible outcomes of the given conflict. Participant 191 describes how the outcome may result in termination of the friendship or in an understanding on the part of Angie. Further, participant 154 predicts that the letter writer has three choices: “take Angie’s side...take Gill’s side...leave them alone...[or] continue being friends.” Thus, these participants show *flexibility* in their world views by presenting various general ideas as to what outcomes could occur (rather than predicting only one outcome).

PID 191:

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

Well seeing as I don't know for sure, it will either go one of two ways. Can I say that? One is the friendship will end. And nothing will really be understood or resolved. Or her friend is the kind of person who can be objective, look at herself and say you know you're right. I'm going to stop doing this, and you know, if you see it happening please don't, try not to make, try to let me know, but I'm responsible for what I do in relation to you and my husband.

PID 154:

How did the story developed after this letter?

The subject is going to have to explain to both Gill and Angie what the terms of their friendship are. And that's going to probably and that'll require her to inform Angie that she's not going to take sides and to inform Gill that she's friends with both of them.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because there has to be a resolution Angie appears to be instituting a conflict for the subject between herself Angie and Gill. So the subject has only three choices. One is to take Angie's side, two is to take Gill's side, or I guess there are four choices you could leave them alone or if you wanted to continue being friends than you have to make it clear that you're friends with both of them equally.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

Actually you'd have to make friends with them in a manner that is mutually acceptable. Doesn't have to be equal but they all have to know what the deal is. What's the question again? The final outcome is going to be mutual agreement on the terms of their friendship. And that might include a mutual agreement to not be friends anymore. But whatever happens it'll have to be a mutual agreement.

SOMEWHAT FLEXIBLE

The participants in these examples exhibit **some flexibility** because they both describe two possible outcomes of the situation (usually the two outcomes described are polar opposites of each other, for example, one clearly positive and one clearly negative outcome). In PID 141, one prediction is for the letter writer to distance herself from the

couple whereas the second option described is for her to terminate the friendship with Angie. Similarly, in PID 238 describes only two possible outcomes but the prediction is less clear since the participant seems to change his mind about what will happen, rather than recognizing that he is stating two possible outcomes. Specifically, participant 238 first predicts that Angie won't react well when confronted by the letter writer and that they may not be friends for a little while. Then the participant changes his answer in the third question by stating that Angie wouldn't respond too hard and would get over it. Thus it is seen how participants exhibiting *some flexibility* tend to only describe two possible outcomes that are usually opposites of each other and thus lack acknowledgement of the complexity of *lots of flexibility*.

PID 141:

How did the story developed after this letter?

What I think is going to happen is that the friend and I don't know if it's a man or a woman. Is probably going to have to tell Angie that it has to stop and will not be a party to this anymore because of the friendship with both people and I'll just say it's a she. She cannot be placed in this position.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because it's an impossible situation, you know if she distances herself I think she's going to be able, there's a better chance of maintaining a relationship with both of them. I think the alternative is eventually maybe she's going to have to terminate the friendship with both if Angie continues to do this.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

Well I would like to think that Angie respects her friend and not put her in the middle anymore, however she sounds pretty stubborn and I think it's going to terminate. I guess ultimately I think it's going to terminate the friendship.

PID 238:

How did the story developed after this letter?

I would imagine that it would be after she got a response that she confronted the female of the couple and expressed that she didn't want, you know that she was put in an awkward situation, that she didn't feel it was fair and probably, Angie probably didn't really appreciate that. Probably got kind of shitty about it and I don't know. Maybe she stopped being friends with her at least for the time being.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

For the most part just based on this lady being unreasonable to begin with and I guess that's about it, I mean she's unreasonable about that situation, most likely she's going to be unreasonable when she's confronted about it.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

I would assume that she got a response saying that that's not fair you need to tell this other girl that you're going to refuse to take sides and not to include her in their fights and I think she probably expressed that to the woman Angie and I would think probably she probably didn't respond to hard or initially, maybe eventually she got over it and kind of apologized.

INFLEXIBLE

The participants in these examples exhibit **inflexibility** because, for example, participant 90 does not seem to be thinking about any other possible outcome of the conflict besides that the conflict is not the letter writer's problem since it is between Angie and Gill. In participant 75's response, they seem to refuse to make a prediction and just settle on saying that there was no outcome. Thus, with these singular viewpoints the responses of these two participants were coded as *inflexible*.

PID 90:

How did the story developed after this letter?

I don't know what the big problem is because Angie wants her to be on her side, she doesn't mention that she does agree with this and get on her side. Why would she feel that she's taking sides? Gill doesn't ask her for any help. She thinks that she gives it but because how could she give him aid or comfort him or go on that side if he never asks for it and she wouldn't contact and say well you need help because she doesn't give it to Angie. So why would she feel bad at all? I mean he doesn't ask for it and she doesn't appear to give it to Angie. So I don't see a problem unless she does. It doesn't say in here that she gives Angie aid or gets mad at him because she is that's her problem. If Angie and Gill have an argument then its Angie's the one that's angry. Whoever this person is she's not involved in it, she doesn't show anger toward Gill and the only one who's angry with Gill is Angie, not this other person.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

It's the other person who things that she's got a problem, but she doesn't have a problem. I mean Angie's the one. I mean it sounds kind of screwy to me, but she thinks Angie is angry at her because she doesn't feel hard feelings towards Gill. I don't see a problem at all. She's in this other person's mind because she doesn't show me she's angry or being cold or some reaction toward Gill at all. The only one who's angry with Gill is Angie, not this other person.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

Probably nothing. I mean she's not reacting towards Gill. The only one who's reacting towards Gill is Angie. So it's Angie's problem.

PID 75:

How did the story developed after this letter?

I need more information. How do I predict what happened? Well I don't think anything happened, I think Angie and Gill are still married and actually are still friends.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

I don't know.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

There was none. There was no outcome. It's unresolved.

Perspective

LOTS OF PERSPECTIVE

In the following examples, the participants take a **lot of perspective** when they describe their predictions of the existing conflict because they continuously use first person to indicate that they are taking the perspective of the people within the conflict (PID 131, PID 85). Participant 131 directly places himself into the perspective of the letter writer by saying “next time Angie gets mad at Gill and wants me to be mad too [] I would tell Angie...” Participant 85 makes their perspective taking a little more explicit such that they state that “If I were him I would be confused to.” Thus, *lots of perspective* may be coded regardless of whether participants implicitly or explicitly recognize that they are putting themselves into the perspective of the story characters.

PID 131:

How did the story developed after this letter?

Hmmm, well I guess that the next time Angie gets mad at Gill and wants me to be mad too I should I would tell Angie that I'm not going to take sides because I like them both.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because I don't want to have this go on that way so that's why I would tell her that.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

Well I suppose Angie might be mad at me then and maybe she wouldn't have anything to do with me anymore, but that's the way it has to be.

PID 85:

How did the story developed after this letter?

I don't know, I think that person umm feels like confused and doesn't know what to do. And just umm walking on eggshells you know, not taking any sides or doing anything because she's confused, she doesn't know what to do. Umm, he wasn't doing anything at this point. It just developed that he was just confused because he felt uncomfortable, he felt uncomfortable because they're both his friends.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because what I predicted is gonna happen. Why I predicted that he's gonna leave them alone for a while because he's uncomfortable. Because that's what he said. He said it makes me uncomfortable because they are both my friends and Gill never asked him to take sides. So, if I were him I would be confused too, I wouldn't know what to do. I mean this guy is very nice and the woman wants him to take sides and to be mad too at him when he's making Angie mad and he doesn't want to.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

I think he said I would rather be left out of their argument and I think he just would ignore it completely and doesn't take sides and ignored what Angie wants and just he left out of it; mind his own business.

SOME PERSPECTIVE

Despite the lack of concrete examples, if participants had exhibited **some perspective taking** when they described their predictions of the existing conflict, they would have likely used phrases or terms that suggested that they were thinking from a first person perspective (as in *lots of perspective taking*) but that these terms/phrases were not used clearly enough as to make this determination completely. In other words, the way the participant uses such terms/phrases may not be clear enough to make the distinction as to whether they are using them from a first person perspective so as to take the perspective of one of the story characters.

NO PERSPECTIVE

As illustrated by the example response below, **no perspective taking** occurs when participants visibly show that they are not able to put themselves into the viewpoint of the story characters.

PID 118:

How did the story developed after this letter?

I think they continued their relationship much the same way they have now.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because I don't think Angie is willing to change and since Gill is not willing to change and I think the person writing the letter enjoyed being friends with them, so.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

That she could be more assertive in saying that she doesn't want to hear Angie's problems with Gill.

Change

LOTS OF CHANGE

In the following examples, the participants predict a **lot of change** within the existing conflict because they both describe *big* changes within the conflict (as well as *multiple* changes within the conflict). In both responses, the participants predict the significant change of having the friend's relationship end (which itself would initiate many other changes in the characters' lives). Furthermore, participant 187 offers the prediction that Angie and Gill may have divorced/broken up, further emphasizing the use of these *big* changes. (In other words, *lots of change* may be coded for when participants uses qualitatively large changes as well as quantitatively large changes).

PID 31:

How did the story developed after this letter?

I think that I would have told her to drop the friendship; I think that's what happened. I think that the individual saw what was happening and decided best to pull back from the relationship because the Angie was getting him or her too much into their personal life, and it's not. You know when you bring a third person into your personal life that makes a person feel really awkward.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

I think Angie wants to always win. She's one of those individuals who has to win, who has to be right all of the time. So I think that she was a little upset when this individual told them that they don't want to get involved.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

I think that the person, the narrator of this story just dropped the relationship.

PID 187:

How did the story developed after this letter?

I don't know. Angie has problems. It looks like it would be a difficult friendship to maintain. I think Angie is unstable, possibly jealous and it's just going to be difficult for all three of them to remain friends. I think at some point they probably had a falling out.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Well, like I said the biggest thing seems to be that Angie seems jealous and somewhat unreasonable. It doesn't say specifically that I saw what the gender of the writer was, although presumably it's a woman because Angie seems to expect a deserved friendship with her or something. And just in my experience opposite sex friendships always require an extra level of care if they're going to be maintained and it's virtually impossible if there's a partner in the relationship trying to undermine things. You know, I'm not optimistic for the long-term friendship here.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

Well, probably the final outcome is Angie and Gill broke up or divorced and the friend was not able to maintain a friendship with either of them as a result.

SOME CHANGE

In the following example, the participants predict **some change** within the existing conflict because while the participants both predict change, the changes that they predict are not necessarily *big/significant* or *multiple*. For example, participant 121 predicts how the letter writer may become “better friends with Gill than with Angie.” While this may seem like a *big* change, it is still unclear as to whether this change caused any further changes in the state of the conflict or whether other aspects of the conflict remained despite this one change. Moreover, participant 148 describes how the letter writer would talk to Angie and tell her “she’d like to be left out of the arguments and not to choose sides.” Again, while this is predicting change such that the letter writer would confront Angie, Angie’s response to this confrontation is not detailed so it is unclear whether the change described by the participant would lead to more changes in terms of the initial conflict.

PID 121:

How did the story developed after this letter?

Probably at some point this situation happened again and this person who wrote the letter probably went against Angie’s wishes and talked to Gill about it and I’m guessing if Angie found out about that that would be a pretty big problem in the friendship and probably the person ended up better friends with Gill than with Angie.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because apparently it’s a big deal to Angie that the person who wrote the letter take her side with her, but the person who wrote the letter clearly has a problem with doing that and if push came to shove I think the person would side with Gill just because Gill wasn’t pressuring this person.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

I think it probably happened as I said and during one argument the person decided with Gill or contacted him and became less good friends with Angie than with Gill.

PID 148:

How did the story developed after this letter?

I think this person talked to Angie and told her that she wants to be left out of their arguments and not to choose sides.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Well because she said she’s uncomfortable that she has to take sides. She wants to continue to be friends with them but she is friends with both of them. She wants to be left of out of their arguments. She doesn’t want to have to choose sides and so she knows how she feels. And she just needs to voice her feelings.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

I think the final outcome is that the single person talked to Angie and told her that she’d like to be left out of the arguments and not to choose sides and that she wants to friends with both of them but doesn’t want to be in their fights.

NO CHANGE

In the following example, the participant predicts **no change** within the existing conflict because the participant explicitly predicts that the conflict will continue. Participant 78 suspects “the letter writer continued to feel frustrated and Angie continued to ask the letter writer to take sides,” thus making it clear that the participant predicts that the conflict will continue and stay the same and that the tense relations between the friends will not change.

PID 78:

How did the story developed after this letter?

Angie continued to ask the letter writer to take sides against Gill and Gill never contacted her and she continued to ignore attempts by Gill to contact her.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because I don't see any reason for it to change.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

The letter writer continued to feel frustrated and Angie continued to ask the letter writer to take sides.

BED STORY

Resolution

NO RESOLUTION

In the following examples, the participants see **no resolution** of the existing conflict because they predict that the conflict will not end but that it will either “stay the way it is” (PID 207) or it will continue further into a fight (PID 120) which would cause the conflict to continue. It is evident that while participants may predict some level of change in the conflict, such as in PID 120’s description of the conflict getting worse and “turning into a fight,” for there to be **no resolution**, it must be clear that participants believe that there will be no specific end result of the conflict.

PID 207:

How did the story develop after this letter?

I don’t think that there’s a point that would ever be resolved.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because I think this man is so set in his ways that he’s going to tell his wife what time to go to bed, he’s probably going to stay set in his ways and telling his wife what time to go to bed. And if she’s the type of woman that married that type of man, she’s probably just going to do it. Even though it makes him angry.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

There would be none because it will just stay the way it is.

PID 120:

How did the story develop after this letter?

I think that the woman in question probably didn’t say much and ended up feeling kind of resentful after a while.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Just because from the tone of the letter she seems like somebody who would not say anything just to keep the peace in the marriage.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

I think that probably after this letter she probably ended up trying to confront her husband and it turned into a fight.

SOME RESOLUTION

In the following examples, the participant sees **some resolution** of the existing conflict because the participant indicate that the conflict may end (a result of the conflict is predicted) but also acknowledging that there would still be disagreement, struggle, or dissatisfaction for either the husband or wife. For example, in PID 134, the participant seems to first predict a result of the conflict, such that the wife will “put her foot down” and get her way in the end. However, it is clear that the husband will not agree with the wife’s actions of “violating his rules” but is instead forced to “deal with it.” Thus, while

the behavioral aspect of the conflict is resolved by the wife deciding she will do what she wants, the emotional/internal aspect of the conflict still seems to be in conflict.

PID 134:

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

My guess is that the wife puts her foot down and keeps her foot down and the husbands mad and it just gets to a point where the wife is like whatever, you're just going to have to deal with it and ultimately the husband has to deal with it because the wife decides hey I'm not going to go to bed always when my husband wants me to go to bed. And you know she can force the issue, you know. He's not going to physically compel her, I hope not to go to bed at a certain time. And she kind of violates his rules and life goes on.

COMPLETE RESOLUTION

In the following examples, the participants see **complete resolution** of the existing conflict because the participants predict an end result of the conflict, regardless of whether it is a positive or negative result. Participants may predict the conflict to resolve itself through a negative result, for example, through a divorce or "break up" (PID 184). In addition, participants may predict a positive result such that the couple "compromises," or works out their conflict such that the conflict ceases to be a problem (PID 212). Either way, it is crucial that the conflict is predicted to end *completely* such that there is no other disagreement, struggle, or dissatisfaction still present as when there is *some resolution* (see above).

PID 184:

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

Statistics will tell you they get divorced in a few years. I actually suspect if you know, again I hate to do this, because I'm hedging a direct question, but I suspect if this isn't resolved that they will break up. If this is resolved then it's just you know, if they're recently married then it's just adjusting to couples adjusting or a couple adjusting.

PID 212:

How did the story develop after this letter?

Now see this is difficult because it so depends on people's personalities that he really don't have information on. But so, I don't know how it developed after this. It all depends on how they interact. Umm, my guess is either they get divorced eventually or they work it out, umm, so I'll say that they figure something out.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because they don't want to get divorced.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

The final outcome is they have compromise and actually discuss and accept what the other person says as far as whether they're ready to go to bed or not. They don't have to go to bed at the same time if they don't want to.

Certainty

COMPLETE RECOGNITION OF LIMITS OF KNOWLEDGE

In the following examples, the participants **completely recognize their limits of knowledge** in terms of the existing conflict because they indicate that they do not have enough knowledge or facts about the conflict in order to make an accurate prediction. Participants may explicitly state that they do not have enough information to predict, for example by saying “there’s not enough history to tell, get a good sense about how it turns out” (PID 124). Participants may still make a prediction even after they say this but it is important to note that this was said before their prediction because it indicates that they recognize their limits of knowledge. Furthermore, participants may not explicitly state their recognition of their limits of knowledge but instead just repeat that they “don’t know” or that they can’t “say with any certainty” what the outcome of the conflict will be (PID 138). Either way, participants indicate that they don’t know enough about the conflict and thereby recognize their limits of knowledge completely.

PID 124:

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

There’s not enough history to tell, get a good sense about how it turns out you know there’s path A where they have many other similar struggles you know for years and gradually get get better and more respectful and more understanding. There’s path B where he’s expecting things from her that she can’t either hear or stand and vice a versa and they split up. I don’t see her staying around without progress because this has happened over probably months and she’s writing about it.

PID 138:

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Well again I don’t know exactly what’s gonna happen, but since I’ve sort of taken a less optimistic view of things I’ll just to be consistent I guess I’ll predict that umm they have trouble in the marriage and the reason is because the husband seems to want to be the dominant person who calls the shots and the wife has indicated she’s not happy with that. So I guess I’ll just predict that because they seem to have fundamentally different views of who makes decisions and how decisions are made and that kind of thing that ultimately you’ll have major problems getting along.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

I don’t know, again I don’t know, I don’t feel that I can say with any certainty, but since I’ve already sort of chosen the way I’m gonna go I’ll say that their marriage eventually breaks down and they get divorced, but who knows.

SOME RECOGNITION OF LIMITS OF KNOWLEDGE

In the following examples, the participants **partially recognize their limits of knowledge** in terms of the existing conflict because although participants make firm predictions about the conflict, they still briefly indicate that they don't have enough information about the conflict. In PID 180, the participant makes several guesses about what may happen but also repeats three times that "she doesn't say" and that "it doesn't say" in terms of what the wife wants out of the conflict. In this way, the participant seems to have *some* recognition of their limits of knowledge but not as thoroughly as the examples of *complete recognition*. Further, in PID 2, the participant seems to predict that the conflict would end in divorce but when asked about the final outcome, the participant realizes that it is "hard to say" because "you don't know what flexibility if any is in this person." Even with these phrases that indicate they recognized their limits of knowledge, the participant still sticks with their initial prediction of divorce in the final sentence.

PID 180:

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

I would say either this blew up into something major because if he's doing just that he's probably also being very over controlling in other things. Or if he's halfway decent and she really wants to make this work, they talked about it and if necessary got someone else to help and he might have at least seen what is he's doing. And they could have come up with some compromise, depends on what she wants. She doesn't say. I mean she wants to resolve it, but she doesn't say, is she willing to set a specific time they both go to bed together or how much is he willing to compromise. It doesn't say, but generally I would think that that kind of do it my way and don't have your own say it's probably a bad indication right from the beginning.

PID 2:

How did the story develop after this letter?

Well this particular situation can lead to really serious consequences, and eventually a divorce because it's kind of an untenable situation long term. So I think unless they get an understanding that they both have to be free in this situation to go to bed whenever one or the other feels and then this would have a positive outcome if they would agree to give each other the freedom, then eventually this would smoothen out.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Well, I think most married couples would know that you cannot be that intolerant to the other partner long term, you know even if you start out this way, this isn't going to last.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

The final outcome of that? Well, it's hard to say because you don't know what flexibility if any is in this person. But if they were to go on like this they would get divorced.

NO RECOGNITION OF LIMITS OF KNOWLEGE

The participant in this example sees **no recognition of their limits of knowledge** in terms of the existing conflict. The prediction of this participant remains firmly stated as “divorce.” There is no indication or feeling that the participant thinks they don’t know enough about the conflict to make a prediction because they clearly have strong feelings about the exact way the conflict will develop.

PID 211:

How did the story developed after this letter?

They got divorced.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because I tell you right now the husbands not going to change and she’s not going to change either. Both of them seem unbendable and unable to reach compromise. He’s kind of controlling and she’s going to get tired of it and just leave him.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

They got divorced, he went to bed at his time and she went to bed at her time.

Compromise

COMPLETE COMPROMISE

In the following examples, the participants see **complete compromise** of the existing conflict because each participant explicitly talks about the couple coming to a “compromise” that will help the couple “work this out” (PID 143, 148). While some participants may explicitly use words such as “compromise” to indicate *complete compromise*, some participants may use terms such as “work things out” or “come to a mutual understanding” which also indicates a *complete compromise*. Furthermore, some participants may predict a negative outcome by stating that the couple “will not compromise.” In this case, we still code for *complete compromise* since the participant is mentally aware of the idea of compromise within the conflict, although they choose to predict an opposite outcome.

PID 143:

How did the story develop after this letter?

Well this particular situation can lead to really serious consequences, and eventually a divorce because it's kind of an untenable situation long term. So I think unless they get an understanding that they both have to be free in this situation to go to bed whenever one or the other feels and then this would have a positive outcome if they would agree to give each other the freedom, then eventually this would smoothen out.

I think the couple had to come to some sort of a compromise where their not always doing what the husband wants. I'm not sure exactly what that compromise is going to be, there probably are several different ways that they can resolve it. But hopefully they'll actually come to a compromise that works.

PID 148:

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Well they're recently married so they don't really know what married life is really all about and I mean they're going to be married many, many years I hope. So they're going to have to work this out or they're going to get divorced. So I think and they need to talk to other couples see what they do. I mean they're young. They're immature. The husband has unrealistic expectations. But when you're newly married everybody has unrealistic expectations. So I think and she really wants to work with this so I think they will slowly learn to compromise. They both learned to compromise. Especially the husband learned to compromise more with his bedroom expectations.

PARTIAL COMPROMISE

In the following examples, the participants see **partial compromise** of the existing conflict because each participant doesn't predict an explicit compromise. However, each participant does seem to briefly talk about the possibility of the couple working things out. In PID 49, the participant predicts the need for couple's therapy so that someone could act as the mediator between the husband and wife in order to promote understanding and to help the couple "work this out." In PID 212, this participant also acknowledges that there is a possibility of "working it out" but without further details or predictions. Thus, both participants seem to show that they recognize the possibility of a compromise through phrases such as "work it out" but neither participant firmly predicts a complete compromise (or non-compromise as described above).

PID 49:

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

Um, I don't know. From the tone of the letter I feel like you almost need a third party to sort of help you work this out. Help the husband understand why his timeline is not necessarily her time table for, and that perhaps she also would have to contemplate the idea that going to bed together is a priority for him. So there needs to be, I mean hate to say something like couple's therapy over something like this, but I feel like it would almost require the two of them sitting down and just talking about how they feel about the situation and sometimes that's best if you have a mediator.

PID 212:

How did the story develop after this letter?

Now see this is difficult because it so depends on people's personalities that he really don't have information on. But so, I don't know how it developed after this. It all depends on how they interact. My guess is either they get divorced eventually or they work it out, umm, so I'll say that they figure something out.

NO COMPROMISE

In the following examples, the participants see **no compromise** of the existing conflict because each participant shows no indication that they thought about compromise or that compromise is a possible outcome. Both participants make firm predictions that the man will "continue to ignore what his wife is expressing" (PID 154) or that they "still go to bed angry" (PID 170). In both predictions, neither the wife nor the husband is described as giving up part of their wants/needs in order to account for the want/needs of their partner.

PID 154:

How did the story developed after this letter?

The male will continue to ignore what his wife is expressing to him. He'll continue to boss her around, he's not going to change. She'll get more and more frustrated and inevitably she will find herself going to bed at night angry umm and she will probably stick it out for the rest of her life unfortunately.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because men don't change, they don't listen, they don't understand what the other people are feeling or thinking, maybe they're not programmed to and I think the ladies generally feel the emotions a lot more than the guys do and try to express to them, but generally don't hit the right buttons and don't seem to understand that men just don't understand the feelings that they're expressing.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

The final outcome will be the man will feel superior, he will continue to direct what time they go to bed and she will begrudgingly consent.

PID 170:

How did the story developed after this letter?

The married woman writing in about her husband's opinion of what time she should go to bed.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Maybe they didn't talk about that before they got married.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

They probably still go to bed angry together.

Flexibility

FLEXIBLE

The participant in this example exhibits **flexibility** because he indicates that he knows of multiple possible outcomes of the given conflict. One option described is that the wife will give into demands, the second being that each partner would do whatever they want, and the third option being that the partners compromise. Thus, this participant shows *flexibility* in his world view by presenting various general ideas as to what outcomes could occur (rather than predicting only one outcome).

PID 1:

How did the story developed after this letter?

Well there are two choices: either she can give in to his demands and go to bed with him because that's what he expects, for them to go to bed together. Or three choices I guess. Or she can simply say she's going to bed when she's ready to and he can go to bed when he's ready to. Or that their choice can maybe be some kind of compromise. That maybe she could read in bed, god forbid they should have a television in the bedroom and watch television in the bedroom while he's sleeping. That's the choices I see.

SOMEWHAT FLEXIBLE

The participants in these examples exhibit **some flexibility** because they both describe two possible outcomes of the situation (usually the two outcomes described are polar opposites of each other, for example, one clearly positive and one clearly negative outcome). In PID 124, one prediction is for the couple to become more understanding of each other whereas in the second prediction the couple will split up. Similarly, in PID 180, one prediction is that the man will continue to control his wife whereas in the second prediction the couple may compromise and resolve their issues. Thus, while participants exhibiting *complete flexibility* describe more than two outcomes which tend to show the participants understanding of the complexity of the situation, participants exhibiting *some flexibility* tend to only describe two possible outcomes that are opposites of each other and thus lack acknowledgement of such complexity.

PID 124:

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

There's not enough history to tell, get a good sense about how it turns out you know there's path A where they have many other similar struggles you know for years and gradually get get better and more respectful and more understanding. There's path B where he's expecting things from her that she can't either hear or stand and vice a versa and they split up. I don't see her staying around without progress because this has happened over probably months and she's writing about it.

PID 180:

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

I would say either this blew up into something major because if he's doing just that he's probably also being very over controlling in other things. Or if he's halfway decent and

she really wants to make this work, they talked about it and if necessary got someone else to help and he might have at least seen what is he's doing. And they could have come up with some compromise, depends on what she wants. She doesn't say. I mean she wants to resolve it, but she doesn't say, is she willing to set a specific time they both go to bed together or how much is he willing to compromise. It doesn't say, but generally I would think that that kind of do it my way and don't have your own say it's probably a bad indication right from the beginning.

INFLEXIBLE

The participant in this example exhibits **inflexibility** because he does not seem to be thinking about any other possible outcome of the conflict besides that they two people get divorced. The participant firmly describes his single viewpoint that the couple will get divorced and thus lack acknowledgement of other possible outcomes or general ideas about the direction of the conflict.

PID 211:

How did the story developed after this letter?

They got divorced.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because I tell you right now the husbands not going to change and she's not going to change either. Both of them seem unbendable and unable to reach compromise. He's kind of controlling and she's going to get tired of it and just leave him.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

They got divorced, he went to bed at his time and she went to bed at her time.

Perspective

LOTS OF PERSPECTIVE

In the following examples, the participants take a **lot of perspective** when they describe their predictions of the existing conflict because they continuously use first person to indicate that they are taking the perspective of the people within the conflict (PID 110). The participant doesn't explicitly state that they are taking the perspective of the couple but instead just go right into using "I" and "we" and "you" within their predictions (such as "I may come to bed a little earlier" (PID 110)). Participant 192 shows a lot of perspective taking by talking about her own husband and how she would react if the husband were to treat her in a similar way as described in the story. In this way, this participant also takes a lot of perspective by taking the time to think about how she would act when placed in the situation of the conflicting couple from the story.

PID 192:

How did the story developed after this letter?

I don't know, this guy seems really weird so. I think he's just s guy. He's the kind of person who just wants things going his way, so I feel no matter how much this woman tries to try and explain to him, that you know, they could go to bed together, but if she wants to stay awake, or if they could kind of work things out, like if she needs to go to bed, he needs to go to bed too. And if he wants to go to bed, she'd go to bed too. If they can both work out a compromising kind of solution it would work, but I just don't think this is kind of guy who would listen to that. I mean I personally if my husband wanted to go to bed and I'm doing something else, I would, but at the same time I'd expect him to go to bed with me when I want to go to bed too.

PID 110:

How did the story developed after this letter?

Well the woman says we have to end up agreeing that we both will be equal in this and have, and if we tell each other when we're going to bed we're gonna have to share in doing that or else we should just each of us as individual people go to bed when we feel like it and sometimes it will be at the same time.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Cause those are this kind of problem is an easy one especially for recently married people. They have some feeling that I guess they always have to be ready for sex in case one or the other wants it, but then they're not being individuals so before very long they just have to learn when I'm tired I'll go to bed and when you're tired you go to bed and I may come to bed a little earlier than I expect or you may do that but we have to be both separate individuals on this.

SOME PERSPECTIVE

In the following example, the participant exhibits **some perspective taking** when he describes his predictions of the existing conflict when he uses the phrase "our bodies." Since it is unclear whether the participant uses this phrase from a first person perspective

(as in *lots of perspective taking*), the participant does use the word “our” which is inclusive of the participant who is spoke the phrase and thus exhibits *some perspective taking*.

PID 111:

How did the story developed after this letter?

Uhh, the wife got her own room or she gave her husband his own room. Somebody was sleeping on the couch.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because no one has, our bodies don't work that way. You don't just because the one person's tired, doesn't make the other person tired at the same time, it's just not possible.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

Umm, the wife finally stood up for herself and said look I'm not ready to go to bed, you're not my parents, I'm an adult, I will go to bed when I want to or when I don't want to and that's the end of it and yeah. That's what I'd do anyway.

NO PERSPECTIVE

When participants exhibit no perspective taking, they do not talk about the conflict or results of the conflict using first person words or statements, nor do they use examples which relate their own personal life or experiences to the married couple in the story. Most participants do not take the perspective of the couple because of this distinction (thus no examples are given here since most instances fall under this category).

Change

LOTS OF CHANGE

In the following examples, the participants predict a **lot of change** within the existing conflict because they both describe either: *big* changes within the conflict or *multiple* changes within the conflict. In some cases participants may predict *big* changes such as “divorce” (PID 17). This is considered *lots of change* since a divorce within the given context can be seen as a significant change since the couple is married and a divorce seems to indicate that all ties would be severed. In other cases, participants may describe *multiple* changes within the conflict, such as “talking to the husband more,” “talking to other couples,” “working out their going to bed routine,” and “learning to compromise” (PID 148). In this example, the participant predicts several changes to occur. While this participant describes several *related* changes, such that each change builds upon the previously predicted change, some participants may describe several *unrelated* changes because they are describing several possible outcomes (and thus exhibit flexibility). In this case, a *lot of change* encompasses predictions of change that can be either related or unrelated.

PID 17:

How did the story developed after this letter?

Well, he sounds so rigid and that he needs to have control, you know to say that make a statement that married men and women should go to bed together period, doesn't leave much room for discussion.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because it takes two to have a dialogue, and although it's hard to tell, well she did say that she tried to talk to him about this and he comes back with a very black and white statement. There's no grays for him it looks like, you know, he's not willing and it takes two.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

Divorce. Not good, they stayed angry at each other and it kept, you know, it's something that happens everyday unfortunately, not a good sign.

PID 148:

How did the story developed after this letter?

I think the wife talked to the husband more and maybe even talked to some other couples about what they do and I think they worked out their going to bed routine so that they're both more happy with it. I think the husband's going to have to give. He's not going to get his way all the time.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Well they're recently married so they don't really know what married life is really all about and I mean they're going to be married many, many years I hope. So they're going to have to work this out or they're going to get divorced. So I think and they need to talk to other couples see what they do. I mean they're young. They're immature. The husband has unrealistic expectations. But when you're newly married everybody has

unrealistic expectations. So I think and she really wants to work with this so I think they will slowly learn to compromise.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

That they both learned to compromise. Especially the husband learned to compromise more with his bedroom expectations.

SOME CHANGE

In the following example, the participant predicts **some change** within the existing conflict because while the participant predicts change, such that “it turned into a fight,” after the wife “confronted her husband,” the change predicted is neither *big/significant* nor are there *multiple* separate changes described. In fact this participant initially predicts the wife will “probably not say much,” thereby showing a lack of change which further illustrates how this example was coded as *some change*.

PID 120:

How did the story developed after this letter?

I think that the woman in question probably didn't say much and ended up feeling kind of resentful after a while.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Just because from the tone of the letter she seems like somebody who would not say anything just to keep the peace in the marriage.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

I think that probably after this letter she probably ended up trying to confront her husband and it turned into a fight.

NO CHANGE

In the following examples, the participants predict **no change** within the existing conflict because both participants explicitly state that they believe that the conflict will continue. Participant 162 suspects “they continued to have the conflict” and “continued to be frustrated with each other.” Similarly, in PID 207, the participant states that there would be no final outcome and that “it will just stay the way it is.” Thus, when coding *no change*, it must be clear that the participants predict that the conflict will continue and stay the same and that the tense relations between the couple will not change.

PID 162:

Why do you think it happened as you said?

I'm more conflicted on this one. What doesn't look good is the fact that the husband seems so unaware of not negotiating around when they go to bed together. I mean its fine for him to believe that they should go to bed together, but what's lurking his wife is that they're not negotiating around it at all. Now, there could be some reason why he's assuming his needs are primary, such as his work schedule or something that's not included in the story. If that's the case, there may be more grounds on resolving this than at first glance.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

I suspect they continued to have the conflict, but you know, stay together, and continue to be frustrated with each other.

PID 207:

How did the story developed after this letter?

I don't think that there's a point that would ever be resolved.

Why do you think it happened as you said?

Because I think this man is so set in his ways that he's going to tell his wife what time to go to bed, he's probably going to stay set in his ways and telling his wife what time to go to bed. And if she's the type of woman that married that type of man, she's probably just going to do it. Even though it makes him angry.

What was the final outcome of this conflict?

There would be none because it will just stay the way it is.