



WORK PLACE CONFLICT AND CONFLICT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH STANDARD MODELS

V.Vineela

Department of Social Work, Kakatiya University

ABSTRACT

Workplace conflict is a perceived divergence of interests a belief that party's current aims are incompatible anytime where people work together. Conflict is a normal part of doing business conflicts normal and natural in any workplace but when it occurs there's tendency for morale to be lowered for absenteeism to increase and for productivity to decrease one research study estimated that managers spend at least 25% percent of their time responding to workplace conflicts handling and resolving conflicts that arise in the workplace is one of the biggest challenges managers and employees face.

There are many causes and reasons for conflict in a work setting they include poor communication where different communication styles lead to misunderstandings between employees or employer in their manager, a lack of communication drives conflict underground different values,

The process of recognising and dealing with disagreements in a way that is both just and effective is referred to as "conflict management." The objective is to reduce to a minimum the potential negative effects that can result from arguments and to maximise the chances of there being a positive end result. The fact that humans exist inherently predisposes them to engage in conflict. If we put in the effort to understand it and properly manage it, we can increase the satisfaction we get from our social interactions as well as the productivity they bring.

KEY WORDS: *Conflict management, conflict resolutions, problems with conflict.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Conflict management is one of the most essential issues in the conflict literature. It refers to behaviours which participants use when they are in conflict. Functional conflict, results in positive benefits to individuals, the group, or the organization (Schermerhon, Hunt, & Osborn, 2000). It contributes significantly to successful leadership and teamwork, improves product and service quality for customers, builds customer loyalty, reduces costs, and uses financial resources wisely (Tjosvold, Hui, & Law, 2001). It can also be valuable to an organization since it promotes innovative and creative problem solving, develops genuine harmony between individuals and clarifies issues for the benefit of the members and the organization (Schermerhorn et al., 2000). On the negative side, conflict works to the disadvantage of individuals, groups or organizations. For example, findings indicated that intrapersonal conflict had a direct negative impact on intragroup conflict and work satisfaction. Intragroup conflict had direct negative effects on work satisfaction and team performance effectiveness (Cox, 2003). Furthermore, destructive conflict diverts energies, hurts group cohesion, promotes interpersonal hostilities, and overall creates a negative organizational climate for workers. It can also decrease work productivity and job satisfaction and contribute to absenteeism and job turnover (Schermerhorn et al., 2000). The literature on conflict management indicates that authors merely concentrated on how the conflict is managed. People react to and cope with conflict in a variety of ways. Morrison (1998), for instance suggests that people react to a potential conflict in one of four main ways: fight (dealing with it aggressively); flight (being unassertive and fleeing the situation); freeze (doing nothing and, therefore, remaining passive); being assertive (talking through the situation). Rahim and Magner (1995) suggest that people may select from five styles in handling conflicts: avoiding (the person, issue, the situation), accommodating (giving in), compromising (both parties make adjustments), competing (forcing to satisfy one's desires) and collaborating (problem solving). Skjørshammer (2001) revealed that when in conflict, professionals use three major behavioural approaches to handling the situation: avoidance, forcing, and negotiation/ compromise, usually in that order. Gobeli, Koenig and Bechinger (1998) classify the conflict management approaches as withdrawal/avoidance, imposing/forcing, compromising/give and take, smoothing/ harmonizing, and confrontation/problem solving. They also observed the conflict management approaches in terms of their effectiveness. Results revealed that both confronting and give and take approaches have beneficial effects on the success of the organization. Smoothing, withdrawal, and forcing all have negative effect. Generally, the results suggest that management should lessen frequently make use of the dysfunctional management styles-withdrawal, smoothing, and forcing and promote more frequent use of functional management styles- give and take and problem solving. De Dreu, Evers, Beersma, Kluwer, & Nauta's (2001) argue that conflict management is a function of high and low concern for self, combined with high and low concern for



others. High concern for self and low concern for others results in a preference for forcing, focused on imposing one's will on others. Forcing involves threats and bluffs, persuasive arguments and positional commitment. Managing conflict in this way can sometimes be an alternative conflict strategy. It involves the use of formal or informal positional power (Skjørshammer, 2001). Low concern for self and high concern for others results in preference for yielding, which is oriented towards accepting and incorporating others' will. It involves unilateral concessions, unconditional promises and offering help. Low concern for self and others results in a preference for avoiding which involves reducing the importance of the issues and attempts to suppress thinking about the issues. Avoiding conflict simply pretends that the conflict does not really exist and hopes that it will go away (Schermerhorn et al., 2000). It means not to talk about an issue publicly, attempt to smooth over conflicts and minimize discussions about the issues in dispute (Chen & Tjosvold, 2002; Skjørshammer, 2001). High concern for self and others produces a preference for problem solving which is oriented towards an agreement that satisfies both own and others' aspirations as much as possible. The problem solving approach was found to be the most effective solution in handling conflict. In this pattern, recognition of disagreement exists, and then engaging in collaborative problem-solving to reach a solution to which the parties are committed (Gobeli et al., 1998) takes place. Here the problems are confronted and solved by means of a collaborative effort from all concerned (Cheung & Chuah, 1999). Intermediate concern for self, paired to intermediate concern for others results in a preference for compromising. Compromising conflict management suggests the determination of acceptable solutions in which conflicting parties have some degree of satisfaction with a 'give and take' attitude (Cheung & Chuah, 1999). In this strategy parties try to solve the conflict cooperatively (Tjosvold et al., 2001). The analysis of conflict management was explained by (Refik Balay Harran ,University Turkey Asia Pacific Education Review Copyright 2007 by Education Research Institute 2007, Vol. 8, No.2, 321-336.)

2) OBJECTIVES

To understand the conflict management.

To know the solutions to deal with conflict management.

To understand the standard models.

3) METHOD

Following an exhaustive search on the review of the relevant literature, I discovered several The following books and papers all described various aspects that were published in various international publications.

4) FINDINGS

Levels of Conflict

There are many different levels of human functioning that might be affected by conflict. Your "internal dialogue" is an example of the intrapersonal level of conflict that occurs in your thoughts when competing ideas or motives compete with one another. Aside from that, the fundamental concern in this context is social conflict, which can be defined as a conflict between people regardless of whether they are acting as individuals, as members of groups, or as representatives of organisations or nations. Conflict in interpersonal relationships arises when two persons in a relationship have wants, ambitions, or approaches that are incompatible with one another. It is common knowledge that a breakdown in communication is one of the primary causes of interpersonal conflict. Acquiring effective communication skills can be of great benefit in both avoiding and resolving such conflicts. At the same time, there are very genuine disparities that exist between individuals, and these differences cannot be overcome by any amount of increased communication.

A "Personality Conflict"

is when two people have very significant and irreconcilable differences in their motivations, values, or approaches to dealing with other people. For instance, if both partners in a relationship have a high desire for power and both want to be dominant in the relationship, there is no way for both parties to be pleased, and a power struggle will occur as a result of this dynamic. Interpersonal power battles frequently involve the employment of strategies such as the excessive use of rewards and punishments, deception and evasion, threats and emotional blackmail, as well as flattery or ingratiation. When power struggles are not resolved, they tend to resurface and become more contentious, eventually leading to the end of the partnership. Individuals who are interdependent within a social system can experience role conflict when there are significant discrepancies in the definitions, expectations, or obligations associated with their respective roles. When there is room for interpretation in an organization's role descriptions or when the lines between roles and duties aren't clearly drawn, there is potential for confusion and conflict. tension between the people concerned in the situation's interpersonal relationships. The problem is that the dispute is frequently misdiagnosed as an interpersonal conflict rather than a role conflict, which makes finding a resolution more difficult and leads in the wrong direction. Due to the nature of the disagreement, there is frequently a significant degree of emotional intensity.



Role Conflict

Individuals who are interdependent within a social system can experience role conflict when there are significant discrepancies in the definitions, expectations, or obligations associated with their respective roles. When there is room for interpretation in an organization's role descriptions or when the lines between roles and duties aren't clearly drawn, there is potential for confusion and conflict. Tension between the people concerned in the situation's interpersonal relationships. The problem is that the dispute is frequently misdiagnosed as an interpersonal conflict rather than a role conflict, which makes finding a resolution more difficult and leads in the wrong direction. Due to the nature of the disagreement, there is frequently a significant degree of emotional intensity. People are directly involved as individuals, and there is a strong inclination to personalise the conflict due to the close proximity of the parties involved.

Inter Group Conflict

Conflict that arises between collections of people, such as ethnic or racial groups, departments or levels of decision making within the same organisation, union and management, and so on is referred to as intergroup conflict. The struggle for limited resources is a frequent catalyst for conflict between different social groups, and societies have established a wide variety of regulatory instruments, including collective bargaining and mediation, as a means of resolving intergroup dispute in a manner that is less harmful to society. According to Fisher (1990), social and psychological factors play a very significant role in intergroup conflict. It is common for members of one group to form negative stereotypes (oversimplified views) about members of the other group, to scapegoat members of the other group for their own difficulties, and to engage in discrimination against members of the other group. These traditional signs of intergroup conflict can just as easily be seen in organisations as they are in the context of racial relations in community settings. When there is a threat to a group's identity, the potential for conflict between groups is heightened, and the conflict is more likely to escalate and become unresolvable. Both economically and socially, disruptive intergroup conflict can have extraordinarily high costs for a society. These costs can be quite significant.

Multi-Party Conflict

When different interest groups and organisations in a society have conflicting priorities regarding the management of resources and the formulation of policies, this can lead to multi-party conflict in the society. In most cases, these complicated disputes stem from the intersection of economic, value, and power dynamics. This level of complexity is frequently (Cormick et al., 1996; Grey, 1989) Resolving a problem that is beyond the grasp of traditional authoritative or adversarial procedures requires more collaborative techniques to forging consensus.

International Conflict

Conflict between governments on a global scale often takes the form of international conflict. Conflicts over values and power are frequently linked and often take precedence over competition for resources. However, competition for resources is clearly a factor. The disagreements are communicated through diplomatic channels in an ongoing game of give and take, or threat and counter threat, often with the highest stakes possible. The mechanisms of propaganda have the potential to lead to many of the same social and psychological distortions that are characteristic of interpersonal and intergroup conflict.

Methods of Conflict Resolution

There are many different ways to address the incompatibilities that exist, and this is true regardless of the level of conflict that is there. Depending on the method that is adopted, conflict can result in outcomes that are either destructive or creative. Both of these outcomes are possible. If we are able to creatively manage conflict, we will often be able to create fresh solutions that can appease all sides of the argument and meet their needs. In some cases, this will involve a more equitable distribution of resources or power than in the past, or the creation of a greater pool of resources or forms of influence than in the past. In other cases, it will involve both of these things. If both parties are interdependent, meaning that they each have some degree of independence and autonomy from which to influence the other, rather than if one side is largely dependent on the other, creative outcomes are more likely to occur. Interdependence means that each party has some degree of independence and autonomy from which to influence the other. According to Blake, Shepard, and Mouton (1964), there are three broad methods that the parties may take towards coping with their conflict: win-lose, lose-lose, and win-win. These strategies take into account the dependency that exists between the parties.

Win lose approach

The win-lose approach is all too common. People learn the behaviours of destructive conflict early in life – competition, dominance, aggression and defence permeate many of our social relationships from the family to the school playground. The “fixed pie” assumption is made, often incorrectly, that what one party gains, the other loses. The strategy is thus to force the other side to capitulate. Sometimes, this is done through socially acceptable mechanisms such as majority vote, the authority of the leader, or the determination of a judge. Sometimes, it involves secret strategies, threat, innuendo – whatever works is acceptable,



i.e., the ends justify the means. There is often a strong we-they distinction accompanied by the classic symptoms of intergroup conflict. The valued outcome is to have a victor who is superior, and a vanquished who withdraws in shame, but who prepares very carefully for the next round. In the long run, everyone loses.

Lose-Lose Strategy

The lose-lose strategy is best illustrated by avoiding or resolving conflict in the most superficial way possible and settling for the most superficial of concessions. In neither scenario does the inventive potential of finding productive solutions to conflicts get realised or explored. Since people generally believe that disagreement is unavoidable, why not try to find common ground or agree to disagree? how can we smooth over the issues in a way that is as painless as possible? Sometimes, this is indeed the truth of the case, and the expenses are less than what would be incurred in a win-lose method, at least for the one who would be considered the loser. Each side achieves some of its goals and accepts that they will only be partially fulfilled as a result. Neither side is aware that by tackling the dispute head-on and working together, they would have been able to come up with a solution that is more gratifying to them. Or, the parties could utilise this strategy to realistically share the few resources that are available to them, or to prevent a win-lose escalation and outcome.

Win-win

The technique known as "win-win" makes a conscientious and methodical effort to satisfy the requirements of both parties by employing a cooperative method of resolving conflicts. Instead of being viewed as a war that needs to be won, the conflict is regarded as a problem that needs to be solved. The contrast between we (both parties) and the issue is really crucial. instead of us (one party) versus them (the other party), as the opposition. Instead of putting more of an emphasis on plans that are geared to win, this approach takes into account the requirements and limitations of both sides. Prior to reaching a consensus on solutions that are mutually acceptable to all parties, the problem must first be fully defined and analysed, and then alternatives must be developed. The parties cooperate in order to achieve goals that are not only shared but also superior, in the sense that they can only be achieved if both parties work together. Instead than focusing on making compromises for the short term, there is more of an emphasis placed on the quality of the parties' long-term relationships with one another. Openness and candour are the defining characteristics of communication rather than secrecy and cold calculation. Both threatening behaviour and compulsion are prohibited. Given the comprehensive pool of resources already present in the connection, it is presumed that integrative agreements are doable and so proceed accordingly. Both attitudes and behaviours are shifting away from becoming more suspicious and antagonistic towards one another and instead moving in the direction of increasing trust and acceptance of one another. The win-win method calls for an extremely high level of patience as well as expertise in dealing with people and finding solutions to problems.

CONCLUSION

The process of recognising and dealing with disagreements in a way that is both just and effective is referred to as "conflict management." The objective is to reduce to a minimum the potential negative effects that can result from arguments and to maximise the chances of there being a positive end result. The fact that humans exist inherently predisposes them to engage in conflict. If we put in the effort to understand it and properly manage it, we can increase the satisfaction we get from our social interactions as well as the productivity they bring.

REFERENCES

1. Blake, R.R., Shepard, H.A., & Mouton, J. S. *Managing intergroup conflict in industry.*
2. Chen, G., & Tjosvold, D. (2002). *Conflict management and team effectiveness in China: The mediating role of justice.* *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 19, 557- 572.
3. Cheung, C. C., & Chuah, K. B. (1999). *Conflict management styles in Hong Kong industries.* *International Journal of Project Management*, 17(6), 393-399.
4. Cormick, G., Dale, N., Emond, P., Sigurdson, S.G. & Stuart, B.D. *Building consensus for a*
5. Cox, K. B. (2003). *The effects of intrapersonal, intragroup, and intergroup conflict on team performance effectiveness and work satisfaction.* *Nursing Administration Quarterly*, 27, 153-163.
6. De Dreu, C. K. W., Evers, A., Beersma, B., Kluwer, E. S., & Nauta, A. (2001). *A theory-based measure of conflict management strategies in the workplace.* *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 22(6), 645-668.
7. Deutsch, M. and Coleman, P. (eds.). *The handbook of conflict resolution: Theory and practice.*
8. Deutsch, M. *The resolution of social conflict: Constructive and destructive processes.* New
9. *Environment and the Economy*, 1996.
10. Fink, C.F. *Some conceptual difficulties in the theory of social conflict.* *Journal of Conflict*
11. Fisher, R.J. *Interactive conflict resolution.* Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1997.
12. Fisher, R.J. *The social psychology of intergroup and international conflict resolution.* New
13. Fisher, R.J. *Third party consultation: A method for the study and resolution of conflict.* *Journal*



14. Gobeli, D. H., Koenig, H. F., & Bechinger, I. (1998). *Managing conflict in software development teams: A multilevel analysis*. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 15, 423-435.
15. Gray, B. *Collaborating: Finding common ground for multiparty problems*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1989.
16. Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1973. Houston, Texas: Gulf, 1964. Jossey-Bass, 1989.
17. Katz, D. *Nationalism and strategies of international conflict resolution*. In H.C. Kelman
18. Kriesberg, L. *Constructive conflict: From escalation to resolution*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998.
20. Mack, R.W. & Snyder, R.C. *The analysis of social conflict – Toward an overview and*
21. Morris, J. H., & Sherman, J. D. (1981). *Generalizability of an organizational commitment model*. *Academy of Management Journal*, 24, 512-526. *of Conflict Resolution*, 1972, 16, 67-94.
22. Rahim, M. A., & Magner, N. R. (1995). *Confirmatory factor analysis of the styles of handling interpersonal conflict: First-order model and its invariance across groups*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 122-132. *Resolution*, 1968, 12(4), 412-460.
23. Rinehart & Winston, 1965, pp. 356-390.
24. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000.
25. Schermerhorn, J. R., Hunt, J. G., & Osborn, R. N. (2000). *Organizational behavior (7th ed.)*. New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc.
26. SkjØrshammer, M. (2001). *Co-operation and conflict in a hospital: Interprofessional differences in perception and management of conflicts*. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, 15(1), 7-18.
27. *sustainable future: Putting principles into practice*. Ottawa: National Round Table on the synthesis. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 1957, 1, 212-248.
28. *The Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, edited by Marvin Dunnette (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976). Another valuable contribution in this field is the work by Robert Blake and Jane Mouton in *The Managerial Grid* (Houston: Gulf Publishing, 1964, 1994). **TKI PROFILE & INTERPRETIVE REPORT**.
29. Tjosvold, D., Hui, C., & Law, K. S. (2001). *Constructive conflict in China: Cooperative conflict as bridge between east and west*. *Journal of World Business*, 36(2), 166-183.
30. Wong, A., & Tjosvold, D. (2002) *Commitment and conflict management for relational marketing in China*. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 24(1), 88-105. *ork: Springer-Verlag, 1990*.