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Introduction

There has been no shortage of definitions and studies on the topic of conflicts, though in different magnitudes and dimensions. Despite the divergent meanings that the term has acquired, several common themes underline most of the definitions. All the definitions are the outcomes of different studies conducted in different parts of the world on the nature of different kinds of conflicts. Diversified views on conflicts have paved the way for forging different conclusions regarding the dimensions, outcomes, sources, and opportunities related to conflicts in different destinations.

Both the literature of conceptual and analytic or empirical studies are relevant and mandatory in this study. Apart from that conceptual framework elicited in the previous chapter, more conceptual literature related to the evolution of the phenomenon of conflicts in organisations is analysed here. Empirical literature is also enclosed in this chapter along with conceptual literature for reviewing the entire literature. In fact the empirical studies are invariably following the very conceptual basement of the topic.

2.1 Definition and characteristics of Conflicts

The earlier literature available on conflicts are focussed on social conflicts. Eminent Greek philosopher Plato (427–347 B.C.) was of the opinion that tension within society is natural, and therefore some conflict is inevitable. He termed it as social conflict. However, he felt that if a proper balance of the parts could be obtained, social conflict would be at a minimum. Each segment of society must know the part it must play and be guided in such a fashion that all segments work together in harmony (Plato, ‘The Republic’, edited by Schellenberg, 1996). Plato suggested that such a balance of the parts could be obtained only with appropriate leadership. He pointed out that the needs of the society could be satisfied if private property was eliminated. To satisfy the needs of society, he particularly felt the
necessity for eliminating private property for those who would provide political leadership. Plato believed that the leaders could not do their job properly if they were motivated by private interests.

Aristotle (384–322 B.C.), believed that Plato’s philosophy called for “extreme unification” or communism was neither practical nor possible. This is not to say that Aristotle saw much usefulness of social conflict. On the contrary, although he disagreed with Plato on the form of the government, he shared Plato’s sympathy for the need of order in the state. Both Plato and Aristotle stressed that an absence of conflict is a sine qua non for the attainment of the just form of life. To them, “strife or conflict is a sign of imperfection and unhappiness. Order marks the good life and disorders the opposite. Conflict is a threat to the success of the state and should be kept at an absolute minimum, and removed altogether if possible” The conclusion is that both of the classical philosophers assigned social conflict a pathological status. The emphasis is on viewing conflicts as dysfunctional or bad.

The seventeenth-century social contract theories of Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679) and John Locke (1632–1704) suggested that the purpose of the government is to establish order in social relations, without which there would be constant violence between human beings. Hobbes considered “human beings as egotistical, the dupes of error, the slaves of sin, of passion, and of fear. Persons are their own enemies, or the enemies of others, or both” (edited by Lourenço & Glidewell, 1975). He took the position that the Sovereign who is a monarch and is granted absolute and permanent power to control social conflict should control human beings. Whatever the Sovereign decides becomes the law, and all the citizens must abide by it. Since they have given him the right and power to make them, they cannot object to his laws. This is the only way to control social conflict effectively.

Locke was critical of Hobbes’s disposition for the political order, called as the Leviathan, which is empowered with absolute control. According to Locke, government is to be organized by the people through their common consent and its duty was the preservation of lives, liberties, and estates. Although Locke disagreed with Hobbes on the type of government he considered appropriate, he concluded that government should control conflict. While there are some differences in their
approaches to social theory, those differences are at times not so great. The conclusion is that both Hobbes and Locke had an extraordinary sensitivity to the dangers of social conflict. They sought, to control it as much as possible through government. Not only did these men not see a growth or re-constructive potential in social conflict, but they considered it a flaw in the body politics. Though neither man insists that all conflict is to be removed, it is clear that this is their intention. It can be observed that the made the forecast of the evolution of a mechanism of managing conflicts which are dysfunctional. Another important fact is that the importance of individuals in promoting social conflicts is envisaged here.

The nineteenth century theories of G.W.F. Hegel (1770–1831) and Karl Marx (1818–1883) are focusing on another aspect of conflicts. Hegel’s philosophy is dominated by the concepts of the dialectic, which has, over the years, developed four different meanings such as (1) arriving at the truth, (2) dialogue or debate, (3) process of ascertaining the unrestricted truth, and (4) process of change through the conflict of opposing forces. Hegel’s dialectic asserts that every finite concept of thesis, or the first doctrine bears within itself its own opposite antithesis, or the second doctrine. To overcome the opposition, one must reconcile the opposing concepts by coming to a third position called synthesis, or the third doctrine. The dialectical method thus effects a synthesis of opposites. The synthesis in turn becomes a new thesis, and the dialectical process continues until a fully developed synthesis or the Absolute Idea is reached. Each stage in this process relates back to the previous idea but results in broadened knowledge.

Marx saw human history as full of conflict between classes of bourgeoisie (business class) and proletariat (working class), which is the mechanism of change and development. Marx was a revolutionary who wanted the capitalists to relinquish their power. He and his associate Engels were quite candid about their opinion on revolution. They closed The Communist Manifesto with the following words: “The Communists openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communist revolution. The proletariats have nothing to lose but their chains. Workingmen of all countries, unite!” The key to Marx’s dialectic, therefore, is associated with class conflict rooted in economic disparities. Marx believed that this
class struggle between haves and have-nots, would ultimately lead to a classless society devoid of repression where human beings are, for the first time, truly free. This new society would be free from conflict, and the individuals would be perfectly reconciled to themselves and their fellows. The conclusion of the philosophy of Hegels and Marx is that change and conflicts are complementary to each other. Change causes conflicts and vice versa. However their focus is on class conflicts which is another form of organizational conflicts.

John Dewey (1922-1957) who was profoundly influenced by Darwin’s theory of evolution and Hegel’s dialectic process. For Dewey, “Conflict is the gadfly to thought. It stirs us to observation and memory. It instigates us to invention. It shocks us out to sheep-like passivity, and sets us at noting and contriving.” He observed that when the relationship between human beings and environment is interrupted by obstacles or conflict, individuals must use their intelligence to readapt through a change in their accustomed modes of conduct and belief. In other words, an individual should examine a conflict situation to discover the various actions possible and choose the one that is most effective. The observation of Dewey is that conflict causes behavioural changes in individuals and these changes make a new pattern of organizational structure and design. The significance of Dewey is that the relation between conflict and change in attitude is indirectly exposed in his observation.

Charles Darwin (1809–1882), a naturalist, formulated the “theory of evolution,” which indicated that biological species survive and grow by confronting environmental challenges. He indicated that “all nature is at war, one organism with another, or with external nature. Seeing the contented face of nature, this may at first be well doubted; but reflection will inevitably prove it is true.” This observation called for a reexamination of the classical views of the role of social conflict in human development. Darwin (1871) and his followers recognized the role that environmental conflict plays in human growth, which led to the development of the doctrine of “the survival of the fittest.” By him. Darwin said: “Man has no doubt advanced to his present high condition through a struggle for existence consequent on his rapid multiplication; and if he is to advance still higher, it is to be feared that he must remain subject to a severe struggle. Otherwise, he would sink into
indolence, and the more gifted men would not be more successful in the battle of life than the less gifted”.

The conclusion of Darwin’s findings is that the growth of human beings is a function of their response to conflict with the environment. If conflict were altogether absent, as appears to be the ideal in much of classical philosophy, the progress of human beings would be retarded. The evolutionary emphasis on the essential role of conflict in human development is a pennant of the nineteenth century. Through Darwin, it found its way into virtually all facets of science.

Georg Simmel (1908-1955) a classical sociologist made a significant contribution to the study of the various forms of conflict. His general hypothesis was that a certain amount of conflict is as essential to the proper functioning of groups, as are stability and order. He believed that in small groups such as the marital couple, “a certain amount of discord, inner divergence and outer controversy, is organically tied up with very elements that ultimately hold the group together; it cannot be separated from the unity of the sociological structure”.

The conclusion of the findings of Simmel is that innate drive for differences and deviations are there in every human being. These conflicting state makes them united with what want to keep along. The significance of these findings is that it shows the transformation of the view about conflicts from the traditional way of the eighteenth century to the behaviourist and interactionist way of the nineteenth century.

Elton Mayo’s (1933) conducted studies on psychological factors that contribute to enhance human relations in organizational context. The objective of the study was to expose the factors that contribute to the human relations movement. His findings emphasized the need for cooperation for enhancing organizational effectiveness. To him, conflict was an evil and should be minimized or, if possible, eliminated from organizations altogether. The conclusion of his studies is that. ordinary employees are largely governed by a “logic of sentiment,” which is of a different order from managers’ rational appraisal of the situation in terms of costs and efficiency. Conflict with management was thus an aberration that threatened the
effectiveness of organizations. Through his revelations Mayo pointed that traditional view on conflicts is more relevant than other views.

'Talcott Parsons’s (1949) through his studies formulated structural-functional theory which considerably influenced social science thought. The objectives of his studies were to find out the factors that affect the stability of the society through conflicts. His findings are based on the assumption that society is inherently stable, integrated, and functional. The important finding is that, conflict is to be viewed to be abnormal and dysfunctional. His model is an equilibrium model. His findings are supporting that of Elton Mayo.

Coser (1956) argued that though the term conflict is used in specific ways or example as the opposite to cooperation and as the opposite to competition, it represents a particular species of struggle. These definition seem to be adhering to interpersonal conflicts in a social context. Though competition is the mild form of conflict this view is fundamentally opposing the previous general conviction that conflict processes have different pattern and structure than competition.

Dahrendorf (1959) in the studies related to social conflicts, in a contrasting note, advocated the use of the term conflict in a more general sense. According to him "All relations between sets of individuals that involve an incompatible difference of objectives". Is the adequate definition of conflicts. This observation implies the significance of interpersonal and inter group conflicts focusing on the behaviourist view of conflicts.

(Mack, 1965) in his studies stated that conflict, competition, tensions, disputes, opposition antagonism, quarrel, disagreement, controversy, violence, conflict resolution, mode of resolution etc. are synonymously and commonly used for the term conflicts. He reiterated that all of these terms represent the same concept of dissonance. Recent views seem to be agreeing that a broad definition has the advantage of incorporating the phenomena from psychological antagonism to overt struggle in any contexts.

Pondy (1967) in his studies pointed out that the word conflict' has been used in the literature to describe different situations such as antecedent conditions of conflict behaviour, affective states of individuals, cognitive states of individuals, and
various types of conflict behaviour. It is easy to cite situations in which most people would agree that there is a conflict. When it comes to what exactly constitutes conflict in the general sense, there are many different views.

Fink (1968) through his studies noted that the many different uses of the term 'conflict' in the literature reflect the many different conceptual frameworks for studying conflicts. The main objective of Fink’s studies was to classify social and related conflicts. Fink's survey provides a number of different classifications used in the study of social conflict he cites an eighteen level classification derived from Chase (1951), which begins with personal quarrels, family versus family, and feuds between clans, passes through racial and religious conflicts, and culminates with cultural conflicts, cold war, and East versus West. He compares this finding with similar classifications, which distinguish fewer levels. Though much of Fink's paper is devoted to the terminological and conceptual clarification regarding the study of social conflict, he concludes that "..scientific knowledge about social conflict has not yet moved to a level of analytical precision superior to that of common sense". Of the plenty of terms in common usage are cited in support of this point, none of them has the precise definitions regarding conflicts. Fink's survey provides a number of different classifications used in the study of social conflict the conclusion of his studies is that common sense is superior to other factors in classifying conflicts. This finding has clear implication of the importance of psychological factors such as perception and attitude on understanding conflicts.

Patchen (1970), conducted studies with the objective of classifying conflicts and its implications and scope on conflict negotiation process. He identified that four types of models are possible such as (1) Negotiation models, which are used to predict whether two parties will reach agreement, and what the terms of that agreement might be;(2) Cognitive models, which attempt to explain how parties try to influence one another in terms of cognitive elements, including subjective utilities and perceived probabilities;(3) Learning models, which focus on interaction as a learning process;(4) Reaction process models, which describe each action in terms of a reaction to the last action of the other party, according to various characteristics of each party. The relevance of this study is that it provided the concerned agencies
with appropriate instruments that are based on systematic classification of the negotiating process.

Deutsch (1973) conducted his studies on the process of conflict situation in which conflicts occur. His exploratory studies revealed that a conflict exists whenever incompatible activities occur. His findings reveal that no matter what definition someone follows, it must be clearly understood that social conflicts are all around us and that they are inherent in human relations. Therefore, it is not a question if a conflict situation is given or not because that is a fact that is almost inherent all the time. The abstract of his studies shows that his findings are supporting the interactionist view on conflict that is characteristic of the twentieth century. In addition to this, the influence of the behavioural or psychological elements that are inherent in every human being in creating a conflict situation, though not intentionally, is hinted in his studies.

Thomas (1976) conducted his studies on the classification of conflicts with respect to the conflict events and the context of the conflicts. The main objective of his studies was to categorise conflicts on the basis of the reasons that lead to conflicts and the background of that reasons. His findings have revealed that more set of variables are needed to classify conflicts than that are commonly selected for the purpose. He pointed out that many classifications are possible focusing on different variable. Accordingly Thomas divided his findings in to two areas into two areas, centred around two general models of conflict. one is a process model, and the other is a structural model. The process model focuses upon the sequence of events within a conflict episode, and is intended to be of use when intervening directly in the stream of events of an on- going episode. The structural model focuses upon the conditions which shape conflict behaviour in a relationship, and is intended to help in restructuring a situation to facilitate various behaviour patterns. The conclusion of the findings of Thomas is that it provides one with such tools and methods that is effective and efficient in the interventions for handling conflicts.

Rahim et al. (1981) classified intrapersonal conflicts into two categories such as goal conflicts and role conflicts. Kahn et al. (1994) identified four types of role conflict—intrasender, inter sender, interrole, and intrarole conflicts. Role overload is
a complex form of conflict that combines aspects of intersender and intrarole conflict. Two types of role overload are quantitative and qualitative. Kahn et al. presented role conflict through a series of events or a role episode. A concept related to role conflict is role ambiguity, which refers to the lack of understanding of what expectations or prescriptions exist for a given role. The consequences of role conflict include job dissatisfaction, lack of job involvement, lower organizational commitment, tension and anxiety, propensity to leave organizations, lack of confidence in the organization, and inability to influence decision making.

Kurt Lewin defined intrapersonal conflict as a situation in which opposing and simultaneously occurring forces of about equal strength occur in a person. The three types of this conflict are approach–approach conflict, approach–avoidance conflict, and avoidance–avoidance conflict. Perceived incompatibilities or incongruencies frequently occur when an organizational participant is required to perform a role or task that does not match his or her expertise, interests, goals, and values. Role conflict occurs when the focal person is expected to perform incompatible or inconsistent role expectations communicated by his or her role senders. Sigmund Freud in his psychoanalytic theory stated that frustration is the main intrapersonal conflict. This implies the significance of the three classifications of intrapersonal conflicts with regard to the basic drives and aspirations of individuals.

Pruitt & Rubin (1986) through the findings of their studies suggest that conflict means perceived divergence of interests, or a belief that the parties’ current aspirations cannot be achieved simultaneously. This suggestion supports the general definition of conflicts in that conflicts are simply the dissonances and divergences. However, the role of perceiving a conflict with a conflicting situation is the indication of the role of personal variables in generating conflicts irrespective of the context.

Putnam & Poole (1987) in their studies, put forward the following definition that conflict is the interaction of interdependent people who perceive opposition of goals, aims, and values, and who see the other party as potentially interfering with the realization of these goals. This definition highlights three general characteristics
of conflicts such as interaction, interdependence, and incompatibility of goals. However, the above mentioned definitions and opinions are invariably focusing on social conflicts. Conflicts in organizations are the part of same definitions that streamline with the systems approach of organizations. This approach apparently regards the society as an organization which is the part of a common major system.

Kriesberg (1988) in his studies suggested that there is a distinction between potential and emergence conflicts. The first type refers to all situations, which fit to the definition of social conflict mentioned above. The relevant point is, as long as the involved parties do not see any difference in their objectives this conflict is only potential, latent. Nevertheless, the situation underlies a dispute and persists regardless of the partisan's awareness of it! Emergency occurs when at least one of the adversaries becomes believing there are incompatible goals. Moreover the difference between competition and conflict can be differentiated by the objectives sought by the concerned parties in the two processes. His finding states that though both are forms of struggle, competition is continuous and impersonal. On the other hand conflict is intermittent and personal Competition is defined by seek for the same ends desired by the adversaries, something that they not possess yet. Conflict is necessarily conscious and often about maintaining the living standards. The conclusion of this finding is that the definition of competition is clearly different from that of conflicts in that the two have distinctly deviating objectives.

Studies focusing on several classifications of conflicts have also been pointing out different views and dimensions. Some survey papers regarding the issue concentrate on the stages of a conflict, others on structural or affective aspects, or on the outcomes. Guetzkow and Gyr (1954) suggested two dimensions of conflict which are useful for managing conflict. One consisting of disagreements relating to task issues and the other consisting of emotional or interpersonal issues which lead to conflict. These two dimensions of conflict have been given a variety of labels e.g., substantive and affective conflicts (Guetzkow & Gyr, 1954), task and relationship conflicts (Pinkley, 1990; Jehn, 1997), cognitive and affective conflicts (Amason, 1996), and task and emotional conflicts (Ross & Ross, 1989).
Pondy (1967) in his studies identifies three conceptual models to deal with the major classes of conflicts in informal organizations. One is Bargaining model which refers conflict among interest groups aiming for possessing scarce resources. The second one is Bureaucratic model which refers conflicts between a superior and a subordinate, or along any vertical dimension in the organizational hierarchy. Third one is the Systems model which refers conflict among parties in a lateral or functional relationship.

Fink's survey (1968) provides a number of different classifications used in the study of social conflicts. He cites an eighteen level classification which begins with personal quarrels, family versus family, and feuds between clans; passes through racial and religious conflicts; and culminates with cultural conflicts cold war and East versus West. Fink populated this scheme with examples of each of the fifteen combinations, and then groups these fifteen into six main types. The six types include role conflicts, competition, class conflicts, minority conflicts and international conflicts. This finding has the relevance of categorizing conflicts with the personal, natural, structural and geographical criterions.

Putnam & Poole (1987) in their studies review conflicts from a communicational perspective. His findings state that communication is treated as one of the five components of conflict situations; the others being actor attributes conflict issues, relationship variables (trust, power, interdependence) and contextual factors (organizational norms, history of conflict). The review is partitioned according to the level at which conflict occurs such as interpersonal; bargaining and negotiation, inter-group and inter-organizational. The interpersonal analysis focuses on dyadic conflict between constituents with asymmetric power division, while the bargaining and negotiation level covers aspects of coalition formation. The later could be viewed as intra-group conflicts. The conclusion of these findings is that conflicts can be systematically classified in accordance with the contextual and structural backgrounds. This classification is relevant since it is less complicated and technical to be followed in pursuit of conflict management. The conclusion of these surveys is that it is traditional to partition the space of conflicts according to the organisational level at which they occur, Another method is looking whether the relationship between the parties involved is horizontal or vertical with regards to an
organizational hierarchy. These classifications clearly reflect the divisions used in social psychology, where empirical studies are necessarily restricted to particular levels.

Several studies on the characteristics of conflicts are focusing on the structural and functional features of conflicts... Mitchell (1981), for example, suggested three factors that define the composition of a conflict: (1) the underlying conflict situation, (2) conflict attitudes, and (3) conflict behaviour. This finding is relevant in the case that the subjective factor like conflict attitude has been included in the components of conflicts. These subjective factors combined with the other two components constitute the composition of conflicts completing a cycle of conflicting episode.

Kriesberg (1982) in his studies offered 4 elements of a conflict namely (1) issues of contention (2) the party characteristics (3) the relations between the struggling parties, and (4) the means used to conduct the conflict. According to him, given the variables of consciousness and emergency, there are three possible combinations regarding to the issues of contention. First, a conflict can be realistic. That means all people involved are common about the justification and occurrence of a current conflict. Second, a conflict can be unrealistic, what is meant by an obviously existing struggle, which is not being felt like that by the participants. Finally, the situation can be built up by false conscious. Like many neighbourhood disputes, these types lack of underlying basis, are fought without realistic objectives to be reached. Furthermore, there are another variables defining a conflict. The first of them depends on the degree of organisation, including the boundary clarity, as well as the pure size of the group involved and the length of the dispute. The second mentioned is always a question of power, the costs to maintain this coercion, and the difference in the extent. The last variable depends mostly on the degree of regulation and institutionalization within a struggling group. The conclusion is that the main characteristics of conflicts are purely physical in nature.

Baron (1990) after reviewing a number of recent definitions of conflict, concluded that although definitions are not identical, they overlap with respect to the following elements:
1. Conflict includes opposing interests between individuals or groups in a zero-sum situation;

2. Such opposed interests must be recognized for conflict to exist;

3. Conflict involves beliefs, by each side, that the other will thwart (or has already thwarted) its interests;

4. Conflict is a process; it develops out of existing relationships between individuals or groups and reflects their past interactions and the contexts in which these took place; and

5. Actions by one or both sides do, in fact, produce thwarting of others’ goals

These five elements are particularly useful in conceptualizing a zero-sum conflict situation. In nonzero-sum (i.e., positive-sum and mixed-motive) conflict situations some of the preceding elements may not be present. For example, say that two managers who respect each other’s judgment disagree on their plans to enhance market share for a product. Although each manager believes that his or her plan is better than the other, each is of the opinion that the plan prepared by the other manager has some potentials for enhancing the product’s market share. This conflict does not necessarily involve beliefs by each manager that the other will thwart (or has already thwarted) his or her interests.

Research by Jehn (1994, 1995), Amason (1996) or De Dreu and Weingart (2003) provides evidence that the double-edged effect is attributable to different dimensions of conflicts. Research has shown conflict to be multidimensional (e.g. Amason, 1996; Cosier and Schwenck, 1990; Jehn, 1995; Van de Vliert and De Dreu, 1994). Thus, it is possible for one dimension of conflict to enhance effectiveness whereas another hinders consensus and commitment between group members. Jehn (1995) distinguished between two kinds of intragroup conflict: task conflict and relationship conflict. Task conflict is a perception of disagreement among group members or individuals about the content of their decisions, and involves differences in viewpoints, ideas and opinions. Examples of task conflict are conflicts about the distribution of resources, about procedures or guidelines, and about the interpretation of facts. Relationship conflict is a perception of
interpersonal incompatibility, and includes annoyance and animosity among individuals. Examples of relationship conflict are disagreements about values, personal or family norms, or about personal taste. The conclusion is that conflicts are multidimensional arising out from either tasks or emotions.

Byrne and Carter’s (1996, 2000) in the Social Cube of ethno-political conflict escalation illustrates that six social forces—such as demographics, economics, history, politics, psycho-culture, and religion interactively and simultaneously combine to produce multiple relationships. These patterns patterns form inter-group behaviour through time and context. The implication of this finding is less material and more academical as far as the conflict process is concerned.

Regarding the dynamics of conflicts there are concepts focused on the generation and activation period. Bradshaw (2003) suggested that every conflict follows, more or less, a certain time pattern, called Dynamic. This time path is made up of certain phases. The phases are Beginning, Escalation, Stalemate and Termination or Settlement. Kriesberg explained that the dynamic state is in which the parties involved get aware of the struggle situation. Therefore, the conflict shifts from latent to emerge. In the second phase of escalation, the dispute has increasing impact on the participants and the increasing amount of energy is spent to keep the action going on. A conflict turns into Stalemate when the parties are not able to increase their investments any more, and the situation reaches a plateau. The last phase of Termination, or Settlement refers to the decreasing process going on in this stage. It usually leads to an End. It must be noted that other models with other emphasises exist. The relevance of this concept is that the four phases can have a cyclic pattern starting from any phase at any time in the forward and reverse order.

2.2 Organizational Conflicts

The classical organization theorists (Fayol, 1916/1949; Gulick & Urwick, 1937; Taylor, 1911; Weber, 1929/1947) did not seem to appreciate different impacts that conflict can have on organizations. They implicitly assumed that conflict was detrimental to organizational efficiency and therefore should be minimized in organizations. They prescribed organization structures, rules and procedures, hierarchy, channel of command, and so on so that organization members would be
unlikely to engage in conflicts. This approach to managing organizations was based on the assumption that harmony, cooperation, and the absence of conflict were appropriate for achieving organizational effectiveness. Obviously these theories are supporting the traditional view of conflicts.

Frederick W Taylor (1911) and his associates put forward that the functioning of an organization would improve if the principles of scientific management were implemented. Some of these principles involved the following:

1. The development of a true science of work that involves determining a fair day’s work.
2. Scientific selection and progressive development of workers.
3. Fitting of workers to their respective tasks.
4. Constant and intimate cooperation of managers and workers.
5. Provision of means to encourage each person to the utmost utilization of his or her capacity.
6. Development of organization structures to control the various phases of production.

Taylor particularly insisted that the conflicts between labor and management would disappear if these principles were applied. Although scientific management led to significant advancement in industrial efficiency, it was not without opposition. During the later part of his life, Taylor was subjected to much criticism on this issue. The opposition from organized labor was due to their belief that scientific management resulted in speedup of the workers. The unions also objected to the scientific determination of wages without resorting to collective bargaining. The conclusion is that scientific management did not make any provision for the effective management of conflict between individuals and groups in an organization.

Henry Fayol (1916/1949) to whom today’s organization theory is greatly indebted to advocated through his studies that the managerial functions, such as planning, organizing, command, coordination, and control, are applicable to all sorts of organized human endeavor. Although Fayol’s approaches to management were broader and more systematic than those of Taylor, both of them, as well as other
classicists such as Gulick and Urwick (1937) and Mooney and Reiley (1939), saw organizations from a closed-system perspective. They implicitly assumed that conflict was detrimental to organizational effectiveness. They prescribed mechanistic organizational structures with clear lines of authority, hierarchical structures, division of labor, and so on, which would encourage harmony and cooperation and suppress or eliminate conflict among members. In this concept also the traditional view of conflicts is incorporated.

Max Weber (1929/1947), a distinguished German sociologist, proposed a structure of organization that he called bureaucracy and believed it to be the most efficient form of organization. Bureaucratic organizations must follow several fundamental principles:

1. A well-defined hierarchy of authority.
2. Division of work based on functional specialization.
3. A system of rules covering the rights and duties of employees.
4. A system of procedures for dealing with work situations.
5. Impersonality in interpersonal relationships.
6. Selection of employees and their promotion based on technical competence.

Weber left no room for conflict or deviance in his model of bureaucracy. Although he was aware of some of the dysfunctions of bureaucracy, he maintained that bureaucratic structures were appropriate for organizational effectiveness. In this theory of Weber also, the traditional view on conflicts is observed.

Mary Parker Follett (1926/1940) put forward strong behavioral orientation to management and organization in the 1920s which placed her several decades ahead of her time. It was for the first time when the concept of constructive conflicts is put forward by her in an organization. She noted the value of constructive conflict in an organization: she opined “We can often measure our progress by watching the nature of our conflicts. Social progress is in this respect like individual progress; we become spiritually more and more developed as our conflicts rise to higher levels” (Follett, 1926-1940, ). She strongly advocated the need for an integrative problem-solving method for managing organizational conflict. She believed that other
methods of handling conflict, such as suppression, avoidance, dominance, and compromise, were ineffective in dealing with conflict. The concept of Follet is regarded as a milestone in the history of the theories on organizational conflicts due to the importance it paid to functional conflicts and integrative conflict handling style.

2.2.1 Neo-Classical View of Organizational Conflict

As discussed before, the studies of Elton Mayo (1933) during the 1920s and 1930s, led to the human relations movement. This movement emphasized the need for minimization or elimination of conflict for increasing organizational effectiveness. Conflict to Mayo was neither inevitable nor economic. It was a result of the maladjustment of a few men on the labor side of the picture. Even after Hawthorne experiments, he remained firm in his conviction that conflict was an evil, a symptom of the lack of social skills. Cooperation, for him, was symptomatic of health as it was commented by Baritz.

Lewin (1948), Likert (1967), and Whyte (1951) supported human relations theory. The conclusion is that Taylor, Fayol, Weber, and Mayo intended to reduce conflict for enhancing organizational efficiency, but they followed different routes. Whereas Taylor, Fayol, and Weber attempted to reduce conflict by altering the technical structural system of the organization, Mayo attempted to accomplish this by altering its social system. Thus, it can be observed that the classical organization theorists, with the exception of Follett, did not incorporate a conflict variable into their models. These theorists viewed conflict as undesirable, detrimental to the organization. Ideally it should not exist. The classicists did not, however, explicitly state that conflict should be eliminated from organizations. They, of course, implicitly assumed that conflict was not desirable for an organization and should be minimized. This approach to organization and management dominated the literature during the first half of this century.

2.2.2 The Modern View of Organizational Conflicts

Litterer (1966) in his studies argued that the preceding view of classical organization theorists is similar to the view of others on the handling of tension within people. A fundamental position of many who analyzed individual behavior
was that individuals were motivated by a desire for tension reduction. Therefore the prescription in both therapy and organization design was to take steps or make arrangements which would reduce tension within individuals. More recently it has become accepted that tension is normal, even desirable, with the thought growing that “healthy” personalities actually seek to increase tension. This modern concept advocates the need for emotionally matured organisation.

Whyte (1967) stated that harmony is an undesirable goal for the functioning of an organization. The objective should not be to build a harmonious organization, but to build an organization capable of recognizing the problems it faces and developing ways of solving these problems. Since conflicts are an inevitable part of organizational life, it is important that conflict resolution procedures be built into the design of organizations. The preceding line of reasoning is important in understanding the shift in conceptualization of conflict in organizations. Taking the lead from Litterer and Whyte, it can be concluded that “healthy” organizations seek to increase intraorganizational conflict. It does not necessarily signify any organizational weaknesses implied by the classical organization theorists or human relationists. Nightingale (1974) also observed that conflict becomes an instrument of social change and influence rather than a symptom of a breakdown in social relationships. In fact, conflict behaviors must occur from time to time in order to demonstrate the will and capacity of action.

Robbins (1974) presented three philosophies of organizational conflict:

1. The philosophy of conflict of the classicists, or traditionalists, discussed earlier in this chapter, was based on the assumption that conflict was detrimental to an organization and, as such, must be reduced or eliminated.

2. The classical stage was followed by the behaviorists’ philosophy, which can best be described as the recognition that conflict is inevitable in organizations. Behaviorists accept the presence of conflict and even occasionally advocate the enhancement of conflict for increasing organizational effectiveness. But they have not actively created conditions that generate conflict in organizations.

3. The philosophy of conflict of the interactionists is the third philosophy, which differs significantly from the previous two. It is characterized by the following:
A. Recognition of the absolute necessity of conflict;

B. Explicit encouragement of opposition;

C. Defining conflict management to include stimulation as well as resolution methods; and

D. Considering the management of conflict as a major responsibility of all administrators

It can be concluded that the integrationist approach is similar to the pluralist theory, which looks upon conflict as a means of generating agreements and of creating agreed upon terms of collaboration.

Miles (1980) has summarized the significance and functions of organizational conflict quite forcefully. Although some theorists have regarded excess organizational conflict as the antithesis of “organization,” others have begun to stress the function of conflict as a vital seed from which organizational processes, such as activation and motivation, feedback and control, power balance and coalition formation, growth and innovation, and even the institutions for channeling and resolving disputes germinate. These functions and dysfunctions reveal both the centrality of conflict in organizational life and the complexity associated with its management. It can be concluded that both of these features make it absolutely essential that managers and organizational designers understand the context in which organizational conflict occurs and the variety of techniques available for use in its management.

McDonald (1972) in his studies emphasized that though the present attitude toward conflict is that it is essential for attaining and maintaining an optimum level of organizational effectiveness, the dysfunctional consequences of conflict failed to comprehend fully the functional aspects of conflict. He stresses on the dysfunctional aspects of conflict at top management, and prescribed comprehensive criteria for executive selection to reduce the likelihood of such conflict. The conclusion is that the strategy may be able to reduce conflict, but it may also reduce the effectiveness or creativity of the top management group.
A study by Thomas & Schmidt (1976, p. 318) sponsored by the American Management Association (AMA) shows that middle and top managers have a lively and growing interest in learning more about both the prevention and management of conflict. Some of the findings of this study are:

1. The chief executive officers, vice presidents, and middle managers spend about 18 percent, 21 percent, and 26 percent of their time, respectively, in dealing with conflict.

2. The respondents felt that their ability to manage conflict has become more important over the past 10 years.

3. They rated conflict management as equal to or slightly higher in importance than the topics taught in AMA programs (which include planning, communication,

The implication of this study is that it emphasizes the essentiality for professional conflict management in organizations.

Rahim & Bonoma, (1979) through their studies concluded that organizational conflict as legitimate, inevitable and a positive indicator of effective organizational management. They reiterated that conflict within certain limits is essential to productivity. Conflict can be functional to the extent to which it results in the creative solution to problems or the effective attainment of subsystem or organizational objectives that otherwise would not have been possible. Little or no conflict in organizations may lead to stagnation, poor decisions, and ineffectiveness. On the other hand, organizational conflict left uncontrolled may have dysfunctional outcomes. Therefore, the abstract of their theory is that moderate level of conflict may encourage stagnancy, mediocrity, and groupthink. At the same time but too much conflict may lead to organizational disintegration. The preceding discussion leads to the conclusion, that too little or too much conflict are both dysfunctional for an organization’s effectiveness. A moderate amount of conflict, handled in a constructive manner, is essential for attaining and maintaining an optimum level of organizational effectiveness. A moderate amount of substantive or task-related conflict, is appropriate for attaining and maintaining an optimum level of
organizational effectiveness. But affective or emotional conflicts are undesirable and should be avoided. These observations are supporting the modern view of conflicts.

De Bono (1986) conducted studies on social conflict with an objective to equate conflict resolution with total elimination of conflict. He uses a new word, “confliction,” to mean generating or creating conflict. He invented another word, de-confliction, which is the opposite of confliction. De-confliction does not refer to negotiation or bargaining or even to the resolution of conflicts. De-confliction is the effort required to evaporate a conflict. Just as confliction is the setting up of a conflict so de-confliction is the opposite process: the demolition of the conflict. This book is about de-confliction. (De Bono, 1986, p. 5) De Bono’s approach to total elimination of conflict is no different from the approaches of the classicists. This approach to dealing with conflict is completely out of tune with modern thinking.

Studies of Roloff (1987) suggests that organizational conflict occurs when members engage in activities that are incompatible with those of colleagues within their network, members of other collectivities, or unaffiliated individuals who utilize the services or products of the organization. One can broaden this definition by conceptualizing conflict as an interactive process manifested in incompatibility, disagreement, or dissonance within or between social entities (i.e., individual, group, organization, etc.). Calling conflict an interactive process does not preclude the possibilities of intra individual conflict, for it is known that a person often interacts with self. Obviously, one also interacts with others. Conflict may occur when:

1. A party is required to engage in an activity that is incongruent with his or her needs or interests.

2. A party holds behavioral preferences, the satisfaction of which is incompatible with another person's implementation of his or her preferences.

3. A party wants some mutually desirable resource that is in short supply, such that the wants of everyone may not be satisfied fully.

4. A party possesses attitudes, values, skills, and goals that are salient in directing his or her behavior but are perceived to be exclusive of the attitudes, values, skills, and goals held by the other(s).
5. Two parties have partially exclusive behavioral preferences regarding their joint actions.

6. Two parties are interdependent in the performance of functions or activities.

   This definition is much more inclusive, which implies that conflict can relate to incompatible preferences, goals, and not just activities. It should be recognized that in order for conflict to occur, it has to exceed the threshold level of intensity before the parties experience any conflicts.

   Neuhauser (1988) is another academician who believes that organization conflict is destructive. He pointed out in his studies that “Conflict is a major source of increased stress and decreased productivity for all managers and employees in any department of any organization. It almost always ends up affecting the quality of services received by customers”. One of the major problems with these observations is that these studies emphasized the dysfunctions of conflict in organizations. But neglected to consider the consequences of creating conflict free organizations. Hence the conclusion of this findings is that it is impossible to eliminate conflict from organizations. Moreover, an attempt on the part of managers to eliminate all conflict, in the long run, will affect individual, group, and organizational productivity.

   A recent study (Schwenk, 1990; S Schweiger, Sandberg, & Ragan, 1986) shows that managers of for-profit organizations consider conflict in decision making to be unpleasant, and high conflict decisions are associated with low quality. However, the study also shows that although the managers of not-for-profit organizations consider conflict to be unpleasant, they believe that high-conflict decisions are positively associated with high quality. One possible explanation of the perception of this relationship between conflict and quality is that the managers of not-for-profit organizations are required to deal with decisions in which the needs of various groups and individuals are to be satisfied. Presence of conflict in the decision-making process possibly enables the administrators to do just that. The implication of this study is that the managers of for-profit and not-for-profit organizations may respond to conflict situations differently. It appears that managers of for-profit organizations may deny the existence of conflict and deal with it
through avoidance, suppression, or compromise. This will probably lead to
groupthink, a concept discussed. The study concluded that, managers of for-profit
organizations are in particular need of training in conflict management.

2.3 Theoretical Literature Paradigms on Conflict Disciplines

Patchen (1970) surveys models of bargaining theory and notes that the more
complete models include wider concerns than bids and outcomes, including how
participants influence each other's behaviour, and factors such as the cost of various
actions and the cost of delaying agreement. Bargaining theory is an attempt to
produce descriptive models of bargaining processes, and is especially concerned
with commerce and politics. As far as the conflicts are concerned, bargaining theory
frequently makes use of the joint outcome space (Thomas, 1976) as a tool for
illustrating how the parties perceive the options in a conflict. Moreover, there may
be possibilities not perceived by the participants, which provide better resolutions.
Bargaining theory does not indicate how these might be found, concentrating instead
on the process of bidding and counter-bidding.

Rapoport (1974) defined Game Theory as the theory of rational decision in
conflict situations. Participants are regarded as players, and game theory examines
the strategies used by the players in the process of trying to achieve particular
outcomes. In contrast to the joint outcome space, game theory often makes use of
the payoff matrix. Limitations of game theory include the restricted sets of available
actions, and the assumption that the payoffs for any action are known with certainty
by all players. However, game theory does produce some useful information about
the kinds of strategy that can be used to induce cooperation and how various
strategies reward the players (Axelrod, 1984).

Keeney & Raiffa, (1976) defined Decision Theory a prescriptive approach to
decision making, via analysis of sets of pre-specified alternatives. The interesting
problems in this context are concerned with resolving multiple conflicting
objectives. Decision theory assumes a single entity is making a choice, in contrast to
conflict where there is more than one entity, each with a different perspective. It has
a role in conflict resolution in helping participants to evaluate bids, to justify such
evaluations, and to persuade the other participant(s) that a solution is satisfactory.
Group Decision Making is the normative study of how individual preferences can be combined into a group decision. Luce & Raiffa defined the problem as that of finding a method, or welfare function, for combining individual preference rankings into a social preference, which satisfies properties such as fairness and representativeness. Work on group decision making extends decision theory to cope with more than one decision maker.

2.4 Root Causes of Conflicts in Organisations

Reasons and sources for conflicts for conflicts have been proved to be wide enough for endless discussions as emancipated in researches and studies all over the world. The number and range of potential sources of conflict suggested by scholars are substantive. Most of the findings are either theoretical conceptualizations or rigorous empirical research papers. However, the sources of conflicts are widely searched and studied in different contexts. Conflicts in this regard are taken as interpersonal, intrapersonal, organizational, political and military.

Deutsch (1969) after completing his studies listed the issues involved in conflicts of control over resources such as preferences and nuisances where the tastes or activities of one party impinge upon another, values where there is a claim that a value or set of values should dominate, beliefs when there is a dispute over facts, information, reality, and the nature of the relationship between the parties. The findings reveal that all of the factors are at the micro level related to the context of the conflicts.

Raven & Kruglanski (1970) and Deutsch (1973), conducted studies with the objective of the differentiation between manifest and underlying conflicts. Part of the problem is that the causes of a conflict are not necessarily reflected in its manifestation. He provided the respondents with the opportunity to make a distinction between manifest and underlying conflict related to personal and impersonal conflict. The result shosed that the manifest conflict appeared to be impersonal such as children quarrelling over a toy, while the underlying conflict may be personal. The children might be using the toy as an excuse to quarrel because they really do not like one another. Deutsch termed these as displaced conflicts or pseudo conflicts.
Dahrendorf (1976) states that in many of the studies, it is observed that the causes of conflict emphasized by scholars are at the macro-structural level rather than at the micro- or business level, where these sources were typically interpreted as prerequisites for conflict to develop.

Dyson (1976), Collaros & Anderson (1969) after their studies found that heterogeneous teams (in terms of skills and abilities) experience more conflict, at first, in their interaction processes. Although such heterogeneity may be necessary to reach creative problem solutions, too much diversity of expertise may inhibit those who feel more or less knowledgeable. On the other hand, homogeneous groups are more likely to make high risk decisions, which is a phenomenon generally known as 'shift-to-risk' or 'risk-shift'. This is closely related to group-think. They suggested that where task accomplishment depends on smooth, conflict-free, coordinated efforts among the members then homogeneous membership should prove more productive. If the creative solution of a complex problem is more important than speedy, smooth interaction, then a heterogeneous group is more desirable. The indication is that the differences in ideas create conflicts beyond an optimum level. Below that level it may make creativity through functional conflicts.

The studies of Skinner or Watson (1978) suggest that aggression is learned through lifetime, reinforced by classical and operational conditioning (the build up of stimulus-response-associations). Very popular for a long time was the Dollard-Doob-Hypothesis, better known as Frustration-Aggression-Theory (FAT). If someone feels frustration it leads inevitably to aggression. Frustration is usually initiated by an interference with goal-directed behaviour. The advantage of this sympathetic theory lies in its ability to explain complicated processes like the class struggles described by K. Marx. The big danger of the theory is to take aggression as a simple stimulus-response-phenomenon. The relevance of this theory is that it emphasizes the psychological aspect of conflict generation.

Pood & Thomas,(1980), Hewstone &Brown,(1986), studied and examined that the less communication there is, the fewer opportunities there are for conflict. If conflict is a communicational activity, then this is absolutely true. However, they suggested that disagreements, and competitive and violent behaviours are not
actually conflicts but are communicational responses to conflict. Examples of extreme conflict involving very little communication can be found in inter-racial prejudice. This finding states that interaction between individuals from different groups will reduce inter-group tension. It nevertheless contains elements of truth for particular types of group. It has also been observed that a decrease in communication may serve to intensify a conflict. They point out that if a party uses communication to manipulate or control another party or is suspected of doing so, then trust is reduced and the communications from that party cease to be believed, or even listened to. This pattern has been observed in labour relations. Such breakdowns in communication allow the conflicting parties to maintain distorted stereotypical views of one another, and to feed their hostility. Thomas cites the examples of the maintenance of army morale by preventing fraternisation with the enemy. The implication of this observation is that the intensity of communication plays a critical role in the generation of organizational conflicts.

The model suggested by Hobbs (1980) sees conflict as a result of competing sovereignties. The so-called Power Politics follows the attitude states strive by nature to expand their own power. As a result, it is impossible to trust norms and regulations because a kind of superior controlling mechanism, standing above the norms, is observed. The result is the conflict behaviour. The conclusion is that attitude of the individual plays a critical role in generating conflicts in organizations.

Maltz and Kohli (1980) conducted a study regarding the conflict frequency and source of the conflicts that the marketing executive had with other areas in the organization. The findings showed that it seemed to occur with more intensity with Sales (38%), followed by Informatics, Finance and Production/Operations. In the interviewee’s point of view, the most powerful area in the company is Sales (38% mentioned it). Marketing itself (24%), Finance (14%) and Production/Operations (13%) were also mentioned as a powerful area. Sales was cited as the one with more conflict (22%), followed by Finance (18%), Production/Operations (17%), Marketing (16%) and Informatics (11%). Therefore, it was concluded that marketing executives feel a greater degree of conflict with Sales and also cited it as the area with the greatest power. This finding was in accordance with that of Jung (2003) who stated that conflict is clearly associated with power. It is also noted that
conflicts are more frequent in areas where contact with executives is more intense, that is, in the marketing area itself or where relationship is close, such as in Sales. In order to understand the reasons for conflicts, interviewees were asked to indicate in each alternative his/her best answer, The highest average found referred to communication problems, which reiterated statement that language barriers are basic sources of perceived conflict. Other important reasons are different expectations, problems with organizational structure and power and status. It is worth mentioning that salary comparison, within the items listed, is the one that least generated conflicts. Hence it can be concluded that communication barriers are one of the main sources of organisational conflicts. There are many other sources of conflicts are also found.

Bass (1980) conducted a study with the objective of establishing the relationship between group size and possibility for the occurrence of conflicts. He points out that in larger groups, the patterns of interactions are vastly more complex, and this has a number of implications. The first of these is that in large groups cliques are likely to form, both because of communication barriers and there are differences of opinion. In particular, minority views often lead to cliques which are then likely to conflict with and compete with the rest of the group. Larger groups mean less talking time per person and each person has to maintain more relationships. Members of larger groups feel that they may be neglected. The conclusion of these findings is that group size moderates the occurrence conflicts positively.

Weinberg (1981) conducted research on the objective of group cohesiveness and found that lack of cohesion ("problems resulting in maintenance of the group" p.84) was the greatest cause of conflict in 70% of 125 naturally occurring groups encountering some interaction problems. But they accept that "lack of cohesion" is such a broad category that it subsumes a number Potential conflicts. He reiterated that cohesion is an umbrella problem containing several other categories within it. However, there are disadvantages to cohesion. Evans & Jarvis (1980) suggest that "too cohesive a group may cause members to be more concerned with the group itself than with the purpose for which the group exists". Although there may be less conflict, the group may be less productive. The conclusion of these findings is that
an optimum level of group cohesiveness encourages group effectiveness reducing unproductive conflicts.

The studies of Baker (1981) conducted studies with the objective of work on the division of labour in small groups. he distinguished two key concepts of differentiation and specialisation, both of which provide measures of interdependence of the group members. Task differentiation describes the extent to which the work is divided into a large number of subtasks relative to the size of the group. Task specialisation is the degree to which tasks are able to be performed by a small subset of the group. The latter is a better measure of interdependence, because as task specialization increases, the group becomes dependant on fewer individuals for the completion of each task. Baker comments that an increase in task specialisation leads to more cohesion, but that this simultaneously leads to more actor specialisation, which reduces cohesion and tends to isolate individuals. Actor specialisation, in this context, is defined as the extent to which group members spend all their time on particular tasks. He suggests that plenty of face-to-face communication and the development of a collective identity is needed to counteract these processes. In the nutshell this finding has the implication that differentiation and specialization of tasks should be managed with the strategy of unity of command and feeling of oneness.

Weinberg (1981) conducted studies with the objective of identifying the sources of conflicts in groups found that in 22% of the groups encountering interaction problems, there were problems with communication patterns. This category included difficulties caused by inadequate networks, unclear speech patterns, or inattentive listening. There is no one-to-one relationship between communication and organizational conflict. Simple formulae such as "more communication will reduce conflict" or "ambiguities in communication lead to conflict" have been refuted in various empirical studies.

Putnam & Poole, (1983). concentrated on communication, as it is so fundamental to conflict. the very "activity of having or managing a conflict occurs through communication" They point out ion their studies that the mechanistic view of communication, with its emphasis on channels and transmission of messages, is
central to many studies of conflict. They argued that this leads to research in which the medium or mode of communication is manipulated, and different types of networks investigated. The significance of their study is that they selected the variables of channels and transmission of messages for their study. These variables are the core of the communication process.

Robins (1980) opined through his studies that people are aware of the factors that generate conflicts such as scarcity, obstruction and incompatible interests or goals. Resource scarcity in the form of monetary benefits, job, prestige or power, encourage the obstruction of behavior and conflict arises. Conflict can also be broken out when one party avoids the goal achievement of the other one. Reiterating these ideas, Jung (2003) also revealed that conflict is clearly associated with power and can emerge when goal achievement of an organization is avoided. However, according to Pondy (1966), in situations of routine behavior where procedures are well defined and environment is stable, it is probable that causes for conflicts are not highly correlated with goal and objective achievement. In these circumstances, conflict variables are probably more related to personality, autonomy reasons, functional interdependence and status. The conclusion of these findings is that personal variable come to the forefront to create conflicts when all other organizational norms are met.

Crott (1980), Milgram,(1965) Curtis. (1988) argued that the opportunity for conflict increases with the communication bandwidth, as there is more opportunity to perceive both conflict of values and motivation, and affective conflict. High bandwidth media such as Face to-face, permit group members to exercise 'regulatory functions' in the interaction. It works out by achieving a better success rate in conflict resolution, by suppressing the use of high-risk conflict strategies such as bluffing and decreasing the readiness to harm one's opponent. One further problem with low bandwidth communication is that the relative anonymity may lead to de-individuation (neutralisation of individuals distinguishing characteristics). This may make group members more critical, more probing and hence generate more conflict. The conclusion is that low bandwidth communication causes more conflicts.
Baxter (1982) found that if conflicts are avoided when they are noticed, the end result may be a 'super-conflict' of stockpiled issues. By saving up unresolved conflicts, it becomes harder to reconcile the parties involved. Baxter noted a pattern of conflict avoidance, or 'fight-flight' in the groups she studied. She used this to explain her observation of a marked increase of information-giving during conflict resolutions. The implication of this finding is that no conflict should be kept unresolved when it is found destructive.

McGrath (1984) found that the bandwidth of communication available seems to have a greater influence points out that the amount of communication and amount of influence in the group is much lower in restricted bandwidth communications than in face-to-face groups. Different modes of communication, such as face-to-face, electronically mediated audio-visual, or text only, provide different bandwidths, with face-to-face communication providing the richest interactions. One finding is that the narrower the bandwidth the more task-focussed the interaction becomes, since interpersonal and social aspects are not conveyed, due to the absence of non-verbal cues. In some circumstances, the interpersonally rich conditions may produce 'noise' that distracts from the task. Under such conditions, the relatively lean modalities may deliver more efficient task performance – provided the leaness does not eliminate necessary cues. However, there will be no pattern of interpersonal relations and members will not be very interpersonally satisfied. McGrath concludes that group members prefer relatively rich communication modes.

McGrath, (1984) conducted his studies with centralised communication nets where all communication has to travel via a central person at the wheel hub. It was found to be very efficient for transmission of information. But if the task is complex, and not reliant simply on information, then the wheel loses its relative task efficiency advantage, and the menus on solving the problem falls to the person at the hub of the wheel. In the 'circle', each member is connected to two other members, but no one member is more central than the others. Although information cannot be routed to one node as efficiently, each group member feels equally central. It is the level of satisfaction with the structure that is more likely to affect conflict than the efficiency of the arrangement. For example, McGrath points out that in a circle group, all members have a relatively high satisfaction, as does the person at the hub.
in a wheel group. On the other hand, peripheral members of a wheel report much dissatisfaction. The conclusion of this study is that centralized communication channels procure more efficiency and less conflicts.

Walker (1986) studied that conflict arises due to a variety of factors such as individual differences in goals, expectations, values, proposed courses of action, and suggestions about how to best handle a situation are unavoidable. When we add to these differences, the unease or conflict arising out of a business' future, often increases.

Kiesler (1986) conducted studies regarding the role of individual and group affiliation in creating conflicts. In particular, the weakening of social norms through de-individuation is questioned. An alternative view of de-individuation is put forward which emphasizes the role of the social context. He found that de-individuation associated with immersion in a group enhances the salience of the group, and hence strengthens norms. He reiterates that if the group identity is not already salient, then de-individuation only serves to strengthen one's sense of individuality, and so weaken group norms. This was investigated empirically by situating each subject in a separate room to create de-individuation, and in the same room for individuation, while varying group immersion by altering the wording of the initial instructions and the headers of the messages. As predicted, the results showed that subjects in de-individuating conditions, where the group identity was strong, were significantly more polarized in the direction of the group norm. The significance of this study is that group affiliation makes more commitment towards tasks. This tends to lessen the affective conflicts.

Norman & Draper, in 1986 conducted a study with the objective whether the use of technology to support group interactions seems to affect the behaviour of the group. It was found that introduction of a new technology in a group induces conflicts in the group. This may be arising out of the imbalance of the awareness to the new technology the conclusion is that introduction of a technology cause social impact within the group beyond the individual impact it creates among the participants. The implication is that sufficient methodology is lacking in these studies to expose the true facts of the phenomenon.
Sproull & Kiesler (1986) showed that e-mail reduces social context cues, and hence people behave irresponsibly more often and focus on themselves rather than others in salutations and closings. However, they did not compare this behavior specifically with other modes of communication such as memos, telephone, and face-to-face.

Sainfort. (1986) conducted a study of group decision making, comparing the use of videotape, the use of a computerized decision support system (DSS) and a control group with neither technology. In subsequent questioning, groups with access to the two technologies perceived greater progress in reaching a resolution and rated that resolution significantly higher than did the control group. Also, the group using the DSS generated more alternative solutions to the problem than those using the videotape. The conclusion is that introduction of a new technology in a group makes the group more advanced than others. This imbalance can also create conflicts. In fact this finding can be annexed to the previous finding in this regard related to the introduction of a new technology. Clegg(1988) clarified this observation saying that many problems with the introduction of new technology can be attributed to the inappropriateness of the technology chosen.

Gordon (1987) after his studies cited some reasons that justify conflict escalation in organizations. His findings include the following. (1) As departments grow, people lose contact with other departments, and member of a department start to think differently from other areas. (2) The increase of emphasis in the financial measures as a tool for motivation for managers and the establishment of different profit centers inside an integrated business system end up creating many conflicts. (3) The increasing rise of emphasis in functional specialization, politics of promotion and recruiting reinforce the isolation of departments generating conflicts. (4) Today there is more room for workers to show criticism among each other. If this freedom exceeds a limit in the organizational context it can be transformed into conflicts. (5) Consumers demand lower prices, better quality in products and services, creating pressures so that departments work more effectively which can result in conflicts among departments. The whole findingds of Gordon can be concluded emphasising on the behavioural issues in each of the above.
According to the studies of the communication scholar Roloff (1987), intrapersonal conflicts occurs when there is incompatibility or inconsistency among an individual’s cognitive elements which implies that a new cognitive element is at variance with a prior explanation or expectation. Thus intrapersonal conflict reflects a challenge to a person’s basis for prediction and control resulting in greater uncertainty. Roloff reiterates that an individual is in an intrapersonal conflict if he or she has difficulty in making a decision because of uncertainty or if he or she is pushed or pulled in opposite directions; that is, the alternatives are both attractive or unattractive. Each organizational member is required to face the challenge of coping with this type of conflict almost every day. Kurt Lewin’s field theory falls in this category. He conceptualized intrapersonal conflict as a situation where oppositely directed, simultaneous forces of about equal strength occur in a person. This implies the instability occurs intrapersonal conflicts.

Putnam & Poole (1987) reported that both personalised (or 'affective') and depersonalised (or 'substantive') conflicts can be observed to occur in group interactions and some studies have compared the occurrence of the two. The finding showed that there was little affective conflict within a cohesive task-focused group. The indication is that whenever a group is focused on its task, there is little chance for generating unwanted emotions ending in bitter or bad conflicts.

Davies (1988), explained the cause of conflict based on the following psychological model The Basic Human Needs Theory, or Human Need Hierarchy of Abraham Maslow. The fundamental idea is, that the most basic physical needs such as food, water, sleep etc. are non-negotiable. If someone lacks fulfilling one of them, he or she will get aggressive. In spite of its popularity, Maslow's theory was never proved empirically.. Scholars now a days distinguish only between primary and secondary needs or between substantive and instrumental needs. In conclusion, there is still no agreement among those scientists that what needs are when and after how long time it may get manifested. In fact this explanation also supports the behaviourists.

Moreno and Wood (1989) studied on the problems of task groups when the roles are imposed undemocratically. They found that formal groupings which are
superimposed upon informal, spontaneous groupings by some authority are a chronic source of conflict. Also, groups may perceive a difference between formal and informal roles. They describe a case study of a group which believed that adherence to formal group structures would inhibit creativity. The group agreed to work as equals rather than in any hierarchical arrangement, refused to designate a chairperson, and were determined to reach decisions through consensus. The group failed to achieve their task after fifteen months. The lack of clearly defined roles meant that no one person had the responsibility for focusing the group's attention. Furthermore, the group tended to avoid conflict and critical discussion, preferring to suppress their anxieties about progress in the name of politeness. They conclude that failure to use task-holding mechanisms increases the likelihood of conflicts in a task group. The implication of this study is that clearly defined roles with the least of ambiguity regarding the norms and responsibilities will reduce unwanted conflicts.

Robbins (1989) grouped the conditions under which conflicts arise as communicational, including insufficient exchange of information, noise, and the semantic differences that arise from selective perception and difference of background, structural, which includes the goal compatibility of members of the group, jurisdictional clarity, and leadership style, and personal factors, including individual value systems and personality characteristics. This finding is relevant since it mainly focuses on the individual variables.

Wood (1989) a specific example. The unsuccessful group described in her case study were more committed to the group as a group than to the task, and she suggests that when a norm of cohesiveness exists, members are well advised to ensure that they are not preserving the group at the expense of the work at hand. Hence cohesiveness can be taken too far. Group-think is a term that describes how individuals in certain types of cohesive group engage in self-censorship of deviations from the majority decision, to preserve the group's cohesiveness and confidence in the decision (Janis, 1972). Gero (1985) provides experimental evidence of group-think, and states in conclusion I would again emphasize the importance of disagreement to the outcome of group decisions. If disagreement is suppressed, the conditions of group-think may develop and threaten the quality of the group's decision.
Pace's (1990) findings indicate that high consensus groups (i.e., effective decision making groups) differed from other groups not so much in the amount of conflict, but in the group's ability to differentiate personalised and depersonalised conflict. In particular, such groups are better able to identify and understand positive (cooperative) conflicts, and can use them to clarify the issues prior to forming a common perspective. This finding absolutely supports the above mentioned finding of Putnam & Poole (1987) regarding task oriented groups.

Dougherty & Pfaltzgraf, (1990) conducted studies to get at the roots of all conflicts in general. A huge number of theories exist to the question what the underlying processes of the motivation for conflicts probably are. Psychologists, sociologists, and political scientists have all their very own opinions. Some call it Aggression Instinct (K. Lorenz) and others call it as Death Instinct (Freud’s destroying antagonist to the creating Sexual Instinct) : Aggression is a kind of rudimentary left-over of evolution that strives to come in action from time to time, triggered by specific motives. It is important to acknowledge that this personal trait is not learned but an inborn mechanism for ensuring the survival of human kind. The indication of this finding is that neurochemical and genetical factors are also influencing the induction of conflicts which are innate and inborn.

Jessup (1990) and Lea & Spears (1991) conducted a laboratory experiment and found that the anonymity afforded by electronic communication leads to, among other things, a reduction of normal restraints on behaviour. This effect is believed to be a result of de-individuation. Use of computer mediated communication (CMC), such as electronic mail, does more than just speed up the flow of information. It may change the pattern of communication, the distribution of information, and it may change the nature of interactions between people. The finding was that in particular, CMC provides the possibility for anonymous engagement in group activities, and it is this anonymity that has been the focus of many studies, and much speculation. CMC does not have to be anonymous. By varying the amount of communication available, there is an increased tendency for more aggressive and less cooperative behaviour when communication channels are restricted. When there is no voice component the effect is higher. Their study compared the behaviour of pairs of students in a bargaining game in which one participant has much greater payoff.
possibilities than the other. The participants could only discover this possibility through communication. The observation was that audio communication reduced the use of bluffs and other high risk and aggressive behaviour modes, hence the conclusion is that anonymity coupled with want of audio channels enhances the possibility of conflicts.

David M. Buss (1992), a psychologist at the University of Michigan conducted empirical studies interpersonal studies on precisely what men and women do that leads to conflict, Dr. Buss conducted four different studies with nearly 600 men and women., he simply asked men and women in dating relationships about the things their partners did that made them upset, hurt or angry. The survey yielded 147 distinct sources of conflict, ranging from being insulting to flirting with others or forcing sex on a partner. Dr. Buss asked men and women who were dating or who were newlyweds how often they had been irked by their partner's doing any of those things. From these results, Dr. Buss determined that the complaints fell into 15 specific groups. He then had another group of men and women rate just how bothersome those traits were. Men said they were most troubled by women who were unfaithful, abusive, self-centered, condescending, sexually withholding, neglectful or moody. Many men were bothered, if their partner was self-absorbed with her appearance, spending too much money on clothes, and being overly concerned with how her face and hair looked. Women complained most about men who were sexually aggressive, unfaithful, abusive, condescending, emotionally constricted, and those who insulted the woman's appearance, neglected them, or openly admired other women. Many women were also bothered by inconsiderate men. For instance, they complained about a man who teases his partner about how long it takes to get dressed, or who does not help clean up the home or who leaves the toilet seat up. The conclusion is that in interpersonal conflicts the traits and habits of the individuals cause conflicts. In fact the these traits are the variables of their personality which becomes instrumental for interpersonal conflicts.

John Gottman (1993) conducted another research which produced supporting findings. The objective of his research involved observations of married couples while they fight. Many of these complaints seemed to be due to basic differences in outlook between the sexes. These studies are relevant in that case in which the
importance of basic human nature such as attitudes and perception is exposed as the principal source of conflicts.

Another reason pointed out in the studies by Kumar, Scheer, and Steenkamp (1995) for the occurrence of conflicts is the asymmetric degree of interdependence, that affects the level of trust and commitment of the groups. Asymmetric interdependence occurs when parties have different levels of dependence among each other. That is, in one same group some individuals can depend on people that, in turn, show independence in relation to them. In total interdependence, on the other hand, individuals are totally dependent on one another. Kumar, Scheer and Steenkamp (1995) state that relationships with total interdependence have less conflict than the ones with asymmetric interdependence. For Jung also conflict is smaller in highly dependent relationships because, the dependent party conforms itself that it can not alter the situation and accept the leader’s power.

Gross and Guerrero, (2000) in their studies observed that individuals that manage conflicts effectively in organizations are perceived as competent communicators and leaders. Those individuals incapable of managing conflicts effectively may have problems not only in reaching organizational goals, but also in keeping positive and consistent relationships and solving problems. Individuals that have difficulty in dealing with conflicts also have greater probability to be dissatisfied with work. The conclusion is that competencies of conflict management and general skills are interrelated.

Fisher R,(2000), distinguished different sources of conflicts that might occur in the organization. The list includes competition for scarce resources, inherent conflict, line-staff relationship, organizational ambiguities and difference in goal and values. All of the sources mentioned here are organizational factors.

Behfar and Peterson (2003) in their studies pointed that the reason of conflicts can also lay in relationship conflict, that is the perception of animosities and personal incompatibility. According to Peterson the negative impact of relationship conflict in the group performance occurs in three ways. First, it limits the ability to process information, because the group members spend their time and energy focusing on one another, rather than in group problems. Second, because it
limits the cognitive functioning of the group members by increasing the level of stress and anxiety. Third, because it encourages accusations and antagonisms regarding the behaviour of the other group which can create a predisposition to hostility and conflict escalation. In these findings the emphasis is on the dynamics of conflicts creating change in conflict behaviour.

In the research conducted by Marcos Cortez (2005) on organizational conflicts perceived by marketing executives, when asked about conflicts that occur above, below and in the same hierarchical level that they work, executives state that in general they occur more in higher hierarchical level and less between subordinates. It is in accordance with Pondy’s (1966) observation that it should be expected that high status peers to perceive more conflict with each other than low status peers with each other because: (i) high status persons, more than low status persons, are engaged in more non-routine, policy-making type activities where the guides to action are less clear and the chance for disagreement is higher and (ii) high status persons, more than low status persons, are probably less flexible in their views.

Elmagri, & Eaton, (2010) examined that interpersonal conflicts arise from personal factors which can be divided into the following.

• Individual differences: everyone thinks, feels, looks, or acts alike, and some people simply rub us the wrong way, and we cannot necessarily explain why, personality differences can also cause conflict as well as different values and beliefs;

• Threats to status: the social rank of a person in a group is very important to many people in any organization. Therefore, when they feel that they will lose their status, they become a powerful driving force and struggle to maintain a desired image;

• lack of trust: every continuing relationship requires some degree of trust that opens up boundaries, provides opportunities in which to act, and enriches the entire social fabric of an organization;
• Incivility: workplace incivility occurs when employees fail to exhibit concern and regard for others or disrespect each other on the job. Lack of consideration can appear in many forms, including brusque greetings, sarcasm, failure to return borrowed supplies, selfishness, showing up late for appointments, untidiness, noise (such as playing a radio loudly).

The implication is that individual factors arise from within the individuals concerned.

Elmagri, & Eaton, (2010) extracted the organizational factors that contribute to interpersonal conflicts. These are the factors that stem from the nature of the organization and the way in which work is organized. They can be divided into the following.

• Limitation of resources: all organizations have limited resources and attempt to find themost efficient way to divide the resources and accomplish tasks. One study found that competition for limited resources often leads to negative conflict;

• Unfair treatment: Some organizations have a strong status difference between managers and non-managers (employees). For example, managers have flexible s chedules, personal telephone calls allowed at work, and longer lunch hours which are not available to other employees. This may lead to resentment and conflict;

• Role ambiguity: when an individual does not have adequate information on the nature of the work required of him in the organization or when he has a lack of determined competences or lack of defined responsibilities. This may lead him into conflict with others;

• Role incompatibility: in this situation conflict occur when an individual finds himself do more one role which include incompatible goals;

• Organizational change: with the pace of technological, political and social change increasing and the marketplace hurtling toward a global economy. Organizational changes will be over-present and then conflict will exist;

• Contradiction of goals: out of necessity, organization members frequently pursue goals that are somewhat different from one another and they are sometimes incompatible or contradiction, thus setting the stage for potential conflicts;
• Information deficiency: This source of conflict results from communication breakdown in the organization. It may be that the two employees in conflict are using different information or that one or both have misinformation. This source of conflict is not emotionally charged and after corrected, there is little resentment;

• Environmental stress: it is more likely that conflicts will occur in environments that are characterized by a lack of resources, by downsizing, competitive pressures, or by high degrees of uncertainty

The conclusion is that organizational factors vary from simple to complex in nature.

Hart and Moore (2008) conducted exploratory studies regarding the topic of resistance to change in organizations. He found that threat of resisting change may arise from a behavioural sense of entitlement, induced by expectations created by initial contracts. These expectations may be the matter perceived threats to security, status and power. It may be driven by beliefs or psychological utility. This leads to non-cooperative behaviour or shading, which resembles passive or active resistance. This resistance is manifested in the form of conflicts. They argued that such shading undermines cooperation within organizations. The conclusion is that resistance to change creates conflicts in organizations perceiving threats to security and power equations.

Hart and Holmstrom (2009) conducted studies on the matter of resistance to change in organizations. They found that employees resist change due to five reasons. (1) Employees were not aware of the underlying business need for change. (2) Lay-offs were announced or feared as part of the change. (3) Employees were unsure if they had the needed skills for success in the future state. (4) Individuals were comfortable with the current state. They wanted to maintain the personal rewards and sense of accomplishment and fulfillment provided by the status quo. (5) Employees felt that they were being required to do more with less, or do more for the same pay. The conclusion of this findings is that attitude changes occur consequent on the environmental changes in the organization. This change in attitude cause conflicts through behavioural changes.

Regarding the attitude related studies William J. McGuire (1961) suggested that an attitude contains cognitive, affective, and behavioural components. These are
related to the interactive process between thoughts, emotions, and behavioural intentions associated with a particular attitude. He also suggested that attitudes also have other characteristics such as importance, certainty, flexibility and accessibility. A criticism of this tripartite view of attitudes is that it requires cognitive, affective, and behavioural associations of an attitude to be consistent. The conclusion of this suggestion is that the cognitive and behavioural components are the derivatives of affect. It can be that affect and behaviour are the derivatives of underlying beliefs or cognitive components. The implication is that the components of attitude are mutually reacting to each other, hence the pattern of attitude can be manipulated by managing the components of affect (or emotion) and belief (or cognition).

Icek Ajen (1980) conducted researches on the effects of attitudes on behaviours. A theoretical approach has been put forward in this research namely the theory of reasoned action and the theory of planned behaviour. Both of these theories describe the link between attitude and behaviour as a deliberative process, with an individual actively choosing to engage in an attitude-related behaviour. An alternative model, called MODE for "Motivation and Opportunity as determinants" was proposed by Russell H. Fazio, which focuses on motivations and opportunities for deliberative attitude-related behaviour to occur. The implication is that behaviour is the outcome of attitude. Hence conflict behaviour can also be regarded as the outcome of attitude.

2.4.1 Role of Emotional Intelligence and Conflict Management Styles

Studies on intelligence by Gardner (1983, 1999) and Sternberg (1985, 2002) have suggested encompassing approaches to conceptualizing intelligence. Sternberg suggests that there are other dimensions of intelligence such as social intelligence, emotional intelligence, or practical intelligence or what scholars refer to as "street smarts which indicates that an individual is not limited simply because he or she has a below average academic intelligence or IQ. Although Gardner did not use the term emotional intelligence (EQ), his concepts of intrapersonal and interpersonal intelligences provided the basis for the conceptualization of EQ. Whereas intrapersonal intelligence is the ability to understand one's own emotions, interpersonal intelligence is one's ability to understand the emotions of others. The
implication is that the basis of emotional intelligence is the intrapersonal and interpersonal intelligence itself.

Goleman (1995) after his studies on emotional intelligence stated that intelligence or EQ is twice as important than technical skills and IQ for jobs at all levels. He also reported that emotional intelligence plays an increasingly important role at the highest levels of a company. When he compared star performers with average ones in senior leadership positions, nearly 90% of the difference in their profiles was attributable to emotional intelligence factors rather than cognitive abilities. The implication is that emotional intelligence plays a very important role in the performance of the concerned person.

Salovey and Mayer (1990) after conducting studies defined emotional intelligence as “the subset of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one’s own and others’ feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one’s thinking and actions”. Later on, they refined and defined emotional intelligence as “the ability to perceive emotions, to access and generate emotions so as to assist thoughts, to understand emotions and emotional knowledge, and to reflectively regulate emotions so as to promote emotional and intellectual growth” (Mayer and Salovey, 1997, ). According to Van Maanen and Kunda (1989, ), emotions are “ineffable feelings of the self-referential sort”, and are comprehensively defined as “self-referential feelings an actor (employee) experiences or, at least, claims to experience in regard to the performances he or she brings off in the social world”. States of feeling refer to basic emotions (e.g. joy, love, anger) and social emotions (e.g. shame, guilt, jealousy, envy), as well as to related constructs as affect, sentiments and moods (Ashforth and Humphrey, 1995). Salovey and Mayer (1990) argued that there is a set of three conceptually related mental processes – appraising and expressing emotions in the self and others, regulating emotion in the self and others, and using emotions in adaptive ways involving emotional information.

Salovy & Mayer, (1990) defined emotional intelligence as one's ability to be aware of one's own feelings, be aware of others' feelings, to differentiate among them, and to use the information to guide one's thinking and behavior This definition
consists of three categories of abilities: evaluation and expression of emotion, regulation of emotion, and using emotions in decision making. A similar definition was provided by Goleman (1998). According to him it is "the capacity for organizing our own feelings and those of others, for motivating ourselves, and for managing emotions well in ourselves and in our relationships" It can be concluded that EQ relates to a number of non-cognitive skills, abilities, or competencies that influence an individual's capacity to deal with environmental demands and pressures.

Afzalur Rahim (2002) conducted a study on the objective of establishing the relationship between the variables of emotional intelligence and conflict management strategies. He found that that supervisors' self-awareness is positively associated with their self-regulation, empathy, and social skills. Self-regulation is positively associated with empathy and social skills. Empathy and social skills are positively associated with motivation. Finally, motivation, in turn, is positively associated with subordinates' use of problem solving strategy and negatively associated with bargaining strategy. The study contributed to the understanding of the linkage among various dimensions of EQ. It also contributed to our understanding of the process through which the various components of EQ influence subordinates’ conflict-management strategies in the organizational context. The implication of this finding is that emotional intelligent should be managed in order to manage conflicts efficiently.

Yu Fai Leung (2010) conducted a study with the objective of establishing the relationship between emotional intelligence and conflict management among the staff of marketing organizations in six different countries. From the findings on conflict formation, both high emotional quotient of service staff and high concern for others can prevent the outbreak of conflict. This implies that if the customer service staff have a high emotional quotient, conflicts are less likely to happen. Emotional quotient and stress management has a direct relationship with conflict formation. That is, low emotional quotient in the stress management tends to induce conflict. Therefore, the stress management emotional quotient has a significant relationship with the frequency of conflicts. When customer service staff have a low emotional quotient, the customer service office must endeavour to prevent the
outbreak of conflict by changing the duty staff and the content and timing of the service provisions. The implication is that low emotional intelligence quotient induces conflict through low capacity to manage stress.

Alireza & Hamid (2010) conducted a study on the topic of the relationship between the emotional intelligence and various styles of conflict management. The findings reveal that emotional intelligence is associated negatively to bargaining style which means managers with higher emotional intelligence have lower intention to put bargaining style to use. Satisfactory social relations, empathy and acceptance of advice and criticism are features of high emotional intelligent individuals. These characteristics prevent managers to utilize bargaining style for conflict management. In addition to this the result provides support for negative association between emotional intelligence and problem solving style in contrast with previous findings. Furthermore, findings of this research express that there isn’t any significant relationship between emotional intelligence and control style contrary to previous research results. It is compatible with the findings that managers who select control style in conflict management while they have high concern for themselves. They behave against other party’s desire regardless of whether it may cause opposition. In this style managers pressure subordinates and impose his or her desire on them. The implication is that at times there is not significant relationship between emotional intelligence and most of the styles of conflict management.

Abbas (2010) in his studies about the role of emotional intelligence selecting the conflict management styles of employees in different organizations found that the integrating style of the subordinate is positively correlated with the emotional intelligence of the supervisor. The obliging, dominating, compromising and avoiding styles of the subordinates have no significant correlation with the emotional intelligence of the supervisor. The implication of these findings is that the cooperativeness can be sought from the subordinates effectively with the high level of emotional intelligence of the supervisor.

Abraham Carmeli (2010) studied about emotional intelligence and work family conflicts employees of selected firms in different countries. This study
indicates that compared to emotionally intelligent senior managers, low-emotionally intelligent senior managers are not less able to be sensitive enough to acknowledge how work is affected by family matters, and, thus, feel no need to reduce their career commitment. Senior managers who are high on emotional intelligence recognize having important responsibilities at work, and at the same time realize that they may neglect their family and their needs. In other words, they are equally sensitive to what they feel when they are consumed with their work all the time. This recognition help them balance their career commitment to a healthy mid point which is not very high but not very low either.

Mary P. Follett (1940) found three main ways of dealing with conflict: domination, compromise, and integration. She also found other ways of handling conflict in organizations, such as avoidance and suppression. In fact these are the styles of handling conflict situations. The implication of this finding is that individuals manages conflicts in accordance with the fixed behaviour patterns. Hence These patterns can be changed and modified with professional management skills.

Blake and Mouton (1964) first presented a conceptual scheme for classifying the modes (styles) for handling interpersonal conflicts into five types: forcing, withdrawing, smoothing, compromising, and problem solving. They described the five modes of handling conflict on the basis of the attitudes of the manager such as concern for production and for people. This also implies the behaviour patterns of the individuals involved.

Thomas (1976) reinterpreted their scheme. He considered the intentions of a party (cooperativeness, i.e., attempting to satisfy the other party's concerns; and assertiveness, i.e., attempting to satisfy one's own concerns) in classifying the modes of handling conflict into five types. Pruitt's (1983) presented the dual-concern model (concern for self and concern for others) which suggests that there are four styles of handling conflict: yielding, problem solving, inaction, and contending. He did not recognize compromising as a distinct style. In fact this classification is almost same as the previously designed concepts.
Thomas (1976) examined that further insights into the five styles of handling interpersonal conflict may be obtained by organizing them according to the integrative and distributive dimensions of labor–management bargaining suggested by Walton and McKersie (1965). The integrative dimension (integrating–avoiding) represents the extent (high or low) of satisfaction of the concerns received by self and others. The distributive dimension (dominating–obliging) represents the ratio of the satisfaction of concerns received by self and others. In the integrative dimension, the integrating style attempts to increase the satisfaction of the concerns of both parties by

Rahim and Bonoma (1979) differentiated the styles of handling conflict on two basic dimensions: concern for self and concern for others. The first dimension explains the degree (high or low) to which a person attempts to satisfy his or her own concern. The second dimension explains the degree (high or low) to which a person attempts to satisfy the concern of others. It should be pointed out that these dimensions portray the motivational orientations of a given individual during conflict. Studies by Ruble and Thomas (1976) and Van de Vliert and Kabanoff (1990) yielded general support for these dimensions. Combination of the two dimensions results in five specific styles of handling interpersonal conflict. They state that though integrating or problem solving style is more appropriate to handle conflicts in general, there is no right selection of any one of these styles. In fact, the situation of the conflict determines the adequate style. The implication of these findings is that all the five styles are grouped into two classes which signifies the individualization of conflict handling. All the styles are generating the individual behaviour and perceptions.

Rahim (2002) suggested that the integrative dimension represents the amount of satisfaction of concerns received by both parties (i.e., self and others), the distributive dimension represents the amount of satisfaction of the concerns received by one of the parties (i.e., self or others). The compromising style represents the point of intersection of the two dimensions, that is, a middle-ground position where both parties receive an intermediate level of satisfaction of their concerns from the resolution of their conflicts. Walton and McKersie (1965) described these integrative and distributive dimensions as the dimensions of labor–management bargaining.
They pointed that bargaining is one of a number of strategies that can be used to manage intraorganizational conflict effectively. They concluded that in order to manage various conflicts effectively, both the bargaining and problem-solving dimensions are needed. The implication is that application of each of the style is solely depending on the strength and purpose of the conflict negotiation processes.

Martin c. (1990) conducted studies on the theory of conglomerated conflict behaviour among nursing staff. The impact of seven conflict behaviours on substantive and relational conflict outcomes is examined through multiple independent observations of 103 nurse managers handling a standardized conflict. Results show that process controlling is most important for achieving substantive outcomes, whereas problem solving, confronting, and forcing are most important for relational outcomes. In addition, substantive and relational outcomes are positively related. The implication of these findings is that the conflict management style determines whether the outcome of the conflict should be at the desired level and suitable for maintaining good relations even after the resolution of conflicts.

2.5 Role of Liberalisation, Privatisation and Globalisation

(Macdonald, 1997) enlisted the effects and challenges of globalization. He states that the effects of globalisation are particularly difficult to categorise as they are often interrelated in rather complex ways. The most important effects of economic globalisation According to him include the following:

- increasing integration of global economic activities;
- rising competitiveness;
- relocation of economic activities;
- structural changes in the economy;
- rapid technological advancements and innovation

He reiterates that increased competition in global markets has created the demand for more specialised and better quality items. This has led to a higher volatility in product markets and shorter product life cycles which, in turn, requires companies to respond quicker to changes in market demand. In terms of production organization, new technologies increase the scope for greater flexibility in the production process
and resolve any information and coordination difficulties which previously limited the production capacity of enterprises in different locations around the world.

Due to the growth in competitiveness, companies increasingly focus on the demands of international and domestic niche markets in a way that contributes to a growing individualisation and decollectivism of work. In cases where enterprises are servicing more specialised markets, smaller and more limited production processes are involved. Moreover, new technology has made it possible to produce the same level of production output with fewer workers. In both situations, an increased emphasis is placed on workers having higher value capacities and skills to perform a variety of jobs. This development has blurred the functional and hierarchical distinctions between different types of jobs and between labour and management in general. In addition, efforts to improve products through innovation, quality, availability and pricing have led companies to set up cross-functional development teams, thus transcending the traditional boundaries between engineering, manufacturing and marketing. These developments have been accompanied by the erosion of the standardised, segmented, stable production process which had facilitated collective industrial relations. These changes are also associated with a continuing shift in employment conditions from manufacturing to service-oriented industries. In other words, jobs shift from traditional manual occupations to various forms of white-collar employment. The implication of these changes in the marketisation and competitiveness is that the industrial relations in the country are getting pressurized to adopt the new environment in terms of employment and market conditions.

Frenkel and Peetz, (1998) evaluated globalization through his studies. He listed the various dimensions of globalisation affect the world in the following ways.

- Economic globalisation is the convergence of prices, products, wages, interest rates and profits towards the standards of developed countries. The extent to which an economy will globalise depends on the importance of certain processes at play, such as labour migration, international trade, movement of capital and integration of financial markets.
Political globalisation relates to the increasing number and power of international organizations which influence or govern the relationships among nations and which safeguard the rights of countries arising from social and economic globalisation.

Informational globalisation refers to the rapid development of ICT worldwide, such as a global telecommunications infrastructure allowing for greater cross-border data flow.

Cultural globalisation means greater international cultural exchange and growth of cross-cultural contacts between nations and people. It also involves the expansion of multiculturalism and improved individual access to cultural diversity, as well as the growth of international travel and tourism, while at the same time developing and establishing a set of universal values.

In terms of the labour market, the most influential effects of globalisation include the following:

- flexibilisation of labour markets;
- increasing labour migration;
- rising atypical and non-standard forms of employment;
- changes in work content and working conditions;
- skills mismatch, multi-skilling and the need for lifelong learning.

The conclusion of this study is that labour flexibility and migration, cultural globalization and restructuring of labour standards can have far reaching implications in the concerned sectors.

Alan Tidwell & Charles Lerche (2004) observed that globalization is a source of, or contributing factor to, conflict and there are numerous case studies of the destabilizing impact of economic and cultural forces. He observed that globalization is often disruptive and inequitable in its effects and that it has posed new challenges for the existing public institutions. He suggested that it has also, paradoxically, opened avenues for the excluded and marginalized to organize and protest against. He argued that the relationship between globalization and conflict is complex in ways which has not fully been discussed in the literature. He opined
that though Globalization is an accelerator of social change, and as such, may act as a catalyst for conflict, aggravating the tensions in any given society and even creating new ones. Thus the intensifying interconnectedness which characterizes globalization has unintended consequences for both conflict and peace processes. The conclusion of his observation is that economic reforms create tension and conflicts among the concerned sectors in spite of the proclamations made on behalf of it.

Friedman, (1999) observed that economic perspectives on globalization view it to be rooted in changes in technology and production processes. He argued that the emergence of a global division of labor and a more open and less regulated world economy are viewed as its products. The ‘globalization as economics’ thesis actually has two versions, the relatively benign and the malevolent. The relatively benign thesis of globalization as economics posits that with the growing complexity of and interdependence of the world economy there are emerging centers of consumption and production that are no longer bounded by nation states. Nation-states have little or no control over this movement of capital, thereby losing the ability to regulate their economies. This view to a large degree assumes globalization to be a natural and inevitable process having unintended, but generally positive, consequences. The malevolent version of globalization as technological change and capital mobility produce a number of undesirable effects. Hence, companies can take advantage of local conditions and move production facilities in response to changing local conditions – regardless of the impact of these changes on local populations. The conclusion is that free movement of goods and technology creates imbalance and uncertainty among the population. This imbalance accounts for the generation of conflicts.

Robert Cox (2000), opined that ideology of globalization presents it as inevitable and beneficial. For them this ideology underplays the unevenness of the process and the inequality between states and actors who are caught up in it. In reality, some peoples, localities, or institutions are more affected by globalizing forces than others. Some areas will benefit economically, others will not; certain groups will feel invaded by alien cultural forms, whereas others will be untouched. The great divide between those benefiting from globalization and those hurting from
it accentuates the possibilities for conflict. More generally, globalization creates new spatial organizations and social relations defined in terms of four key factors: (1) Extensity is the stretching of social, political, and economic activities across frontiers and borders. (2) Velocity is the speed of interactions and (3) Impact which is the deepening of extensity, intensity and velocity. The implication is that the widespread activities of globalization find itself instrumental for conflicts in the concerned locations and organizations.

Alan Tidwell (2004) illustrated that Globalization may influence the expression of conflict in a number of ways, including disturbing local events, providing new resources over which to compete, and threatening deeply held values or symbols, to name a few. We have selected two cases to illustrate these connections. This implies the possibility for a variety of conflicting situations.

(Ali, 2005) critically evaluated the characteristics of globalization in an impartial way. He illustrates that globalisation can be defined as a process of increasing global connectivity, integration and interdependence in the economic, social, technological, cultural, political and institutional spheres. Globalisation refers, for instance, to the processes that reduce barriers between countries and involve greater integration in world markets, thus increasing the pressure for assimilation towards international standards. The economic aspects of globalisation are the most visible and important ones. These include intensifying economic competition among nations, rapidly expanding international trade and financial flows and foreign direct investment (FDI) by multinational corporations (MNCs), disseminating advanced management practices and newer forms of work organization and in some cases sharing of internationally recognised labour standards.

According to him globalization enhances competitiveness, both at company level and national level, which leads company management and governments to adopt strategies designed to increase labour effectiveness in terms of productivity, quality and innovation. In general, globalization involves economies that are opening up to international competition and that do not discriminate against international capital. Therefore, globalisation is often accompanied by a
liberalisation of the markets and the privatisation of productive assets. At the same time, globalization has obviously contributed to raising unemployment, increasing casual employment and weakening labour movements (Ali, 2005). The implication of this observations is that the competitiveness, transfer and turnover of labour, and contribution towards unemployment create conflicts in the corresponding sectors and organizations.

Pillay, (2006) studied about the impact of economic reform on the industrial relations across countries. He states that employment issues are critical to every country. However, countries have approached these issues in different ways and employment standards thus vary widely across countries. Nevertheless, employment standards continue to play a key role in determining a country’s competitive advantage in terms of labour market development. Due to growing competitiveness, many countries are obliged to relax their employment protection mechanisms in order to increase their labour market flexibility. Therefore, a new balance between labour market flexibility and social protection will have to be established. Several countries propose labour market reforms as a way of coping with the challenges of flexibilisation while providing an adequate level of job and employment security. As a result of intensified competition, companies are now being required to innovate to deliver ‘the right product at the right price and time’ Hence, company management should also focus on promoting enterprise efficiency, both in terms of labour market flexibility and labour productivity. Overall, employment rates are increasing, but non-standard forms of work such as part-time, fixed term and self employment are also rising. Broad social developments in many countries have also led to an increasing participation rate of women in the labour market which, in turn, has augmented the demand for atypical forms of employment. As a result of these developments, working conditions do not improve for a lot of workers while their job security may decline. Moreover, the study argues that building employment Challenges of globalisation and industrial relations growth on sub-optimal solution, such as involuntary part-time and other non-standard employment relationships, will only undermine outsourcing and subcontracting are backdoor attempts to introduce labour market flexibility in the country. In other words, it lowers the employment standards.
The conclusion is that the impact of these reforms have serious implications in a country like India where the living standards of the working class are comparatively poor. Obviously, the public and private sector enterprises in Kerala are also having the above mentioned consequences.

Joseph E. Stiglitz (2002, ‘Globalization and its Discontents’) analysed globalization and its policies in the past decades. He says that pro-globalization policies have the potential of doing a lot of good, if undertaken properly and if they incorporate the characteristics of each individual country. Countries should embrace globalization on their own terms, taking into account their own history, culture, and traditions. However, if poorly designed or if a cookie-cutter approach is followed, pro-globalization policies are likely to be costly. They will increase instability, make countries more vulnerable to external shocks, reduce growth, and increase poverty.

The problem, according to Stiglitz, is that globalization has not been pushed carefully, or fairly. On the contrary, liberalization policies have been implemented too fast, in the wrong order, and often using inadequate or plainly wrong economic analysis. As a consequence, he argues, we now face terrible results, including increases in destitution and social conflict, and generalized frustration. The culprits are the IMF and its ‘market fundamentalists.’ Three interrelated policy issues are at the centre of Stiglitz’s criticism of globalization. (1) In designing reform packages during the 1990s, crucial aspects of the sequencing and pace of reform were ignored. As a result, in many countries, reform was implemented too fast and in the wrong order. (2) Advocating (and imposing) capital account liberalization was a huge mistake. And (3), the IMF response to crises was a disaster that made things worse rather than better. Stiglitz claims that if things had been done differently, that is, if they had been done his way, the outcome in terms of social conditions would have been significantly better. The implication of this observation is that conflicts are generated due to economic reforms which is a social and economic issue in the concerned economies including India.

Barbara Stallings (2001) evaluated the distinction between liberalization and globalization. She states that developing countries themselves had to take some important steps before the full impact of globalization could be felt. Specifically,
they had to open their economies, to lower the barriers to trade and capital flows that had been an essential component of the import-substitution industrialization model that almost all followed for some period. Without these policy shifts, globalization would be much less relevant than it is today, especially in the developing world. Liberalization, then, is the other side of globalization. At the same time, liberalization is also a creature of globalization. Several linkages stand out as helping to promote liberalization in developing countries. One was the need to open economies as a prerequisite of membership in the GATT/WTO or as part of the conditionally accompanying loans from the IMF or World Bank. Also important was the increased cultural homogeneity of the world that stimulated demands for imports and travel on the part of local populations in developing countries. Finally, a key mechanism was the fact that many political leaders in developing counties came to agree with the types of policies that were advocated by the international financial institutions and private sector investors. The significance of these evaluations is that it exposes the reasons for the generation of conflicts by the economic reforms through LPG.

Charles O. Lerche (2008) thoroughly examined the role of economic reform in creating conflicts. He states that social change, in and of itself, has historically been associated with increasing levels of conflict. This has been explored in great depth by P. A. Sorokin in one of his classic works. (Sorokin, ‘Social and Cultural Dynamics’, 1937: 409-475). His study of twelve European countries and empires over the period 500 B.C. to 1925 A.D. showed that the magnitude of what he called "social strife" or social conflict was at its highest during periods when a given society was undergoing a great change of world view such as from a religious, other-worldly, outlook to a more secular and materialist perspective. Such periods of change are, by definition, transitional, and are characterized by conflicts of values and interests, which have become widespread and violent. One of the few points of agreement among globalization commentators such as Richard Barnet (Barnet and Cavanagh, 1994) and Ruud Lubbers (Lubbers, 1997) is that the spreading and acceleration of globalization is generating change on an unprecedented scale.

Therefore, generalizing Sorokin’s findings to the world as a whole, there may be grounds to conclude that the process of globalization, liberalization and
privatization is inherently disruptive and that an increasing incidence of conflict is an inevitable bi-product of it. Following Arnold Toynbee (Toynbee, 1956) it could be further argued that the conflicts generated by globalization represent a significant early challenge to what he himself saw as an emerging world civilization (Toynbee, 1960: 107) whose immediate future will be greatly influenced by how these divisive issues are approached and dealt with in the years ahead. This evaluation of economic reforms and LPG has significant implications in India also since the public and private sector enterprises are being undergone a period of change due to economic reforms in the form of LPG.

Charles O. Lerche (2008) in his study about LPG induced conflicts state that globalization and its subsidiaries induce conflicts through three intervening variables such as change, reflexivity and identity crisis. According to him these three factors are created by economic reforms paving the way to social and organisational conflicts. He states that the spreading and acceleration of globalization is generating change on an unprecedented scale. Similarly reflexivity, is stimulated by globalized media and information technology. Globalization seems to be pulling virtually all identity groups on the planet out of their various degrees of isolation, pushing them into the currents of the global trend and, thereby, obliging them to re-define, or as Robertson and others put it, relativize themselves in regard to global trends. All of these processes create the background of cognitive dissonance. This cognitive dissonance generates conflicts in the respective sectors or organisations. The conclusions of this observation is that irrespective of country, organisation or any other context economic reforms create conflicts through the LPG policies. Hence the implication is that the concerned economies should have to go through a conflict episode together with the changing scenario.

G. K. Nair (‘Kerala’s economic set backs’, 2005) examines Kerala’s economic setbacks down the history. He says that not only Liberalisation, Globalisation and Privatisation, there are many other reasons for the economical backwardness of Kerala compared with other states in India. He points out that in Kerala, the crises in the primary, secondary and tertiary sectors are also to be attributed to the outcome of poor, short-sighted and politically expedient policies going back from the time of the State's creation. He reminds that the state is highly
literate and the social infrastructure is one of the best in the country. But in pursuit of this, the activities required to develop the facilities essentially needed to attract investments in all the three sectors have been relegated to the backseat. He categorically expresses that the absence of such attempts, coupled with the politicisation of everything, including the workplace and educational institutions, has given birth to generation which knows only of demands and not responsibilities, and has hampered the state's development.

He suggests that the aspects that need to be given weightage are the pressure on land because of the high population density, which has not only made agriculture less attractive but also resulted in large-scale encroachment of forests, leading to denudation of the state's green cover. He reiterates that the emphasis on the social service sectors to the subordination of commodity-producing sectors has inherently weakened the economy. As the labour absorption in the private sector has been either stagnant or falling, government and public sector employment has become an end in itself, resulting in overstaffing and inefficiency. On the other hand, because of inadequate production and the need to import most of the essential and other items of consumption, the pressure on the general price level has been high. This has created the vicious circle of higher wages and higher prices. The flow of remittances from abroad also contributed to the pressure on prices. Such factors have made the State a high-cost non-competitive economy, which has come in the way of attracting investors from within the State and from the rest of the country. These observations have serious implications on the policy makers of the state regarding the decision making on the development of the state. The remarks about the role of several other factors other than LPG point towards the general attitude of the various sections of the society and the concerned authorities.

2.6 Impact of Conflicts on Organisational Effectiveness and Efficiency

Etzioni, (1964); Georgopoulos & Tannenbaum, (1957); Price, (1968) stated that goal attainment is the most widely used model by management practitioners and researchers. They emphasized that the effectiveness of an organization is assessed by ends or outcomes as opposed to means. The advocates of this model define organizational effectiveness as the ability of a social system to achieve its
goals or objectives. In other words, an organization is said to be operating effectively if it attains some predetermined goals (i.e., missions, purpose, objective). They added that the measures of goal attainment often take the form of productivity or efficiency. Other common measures of goal attainment are return on equity, return on assets, and earning per share.

Yuchtman and Seashore (1967) proposed the model. They states that unlike the goal attainment model, the focus of this approach is on inputs rather than outputs. It is concerned with an organization’s ability to obtain an advantageous bargaining position in its environment to obtain needed resources. By “bargaining position” the writers meant “the exclusion of any specific goal (or function) as the ultimate criterion of organizational effectiveness. Instead it points to the more general capacity of the organization as a resource-getting system. It is concluded that an organization is effective if it is able to acquire necessary resources.

Likert, (1967) formulated internal process model which focuses on the internal organizational processes such as interpersonal relationships, trust, commitment and work involvement among the employees, and flow of information in all directions. Likert explains that the greater the extent to which an organization possesses these characteristics, the greater is the effectiveness of this organization. This approach to effectiveness also provides a limited view of organizations because it ignores the relationships of internal processes to output and external environment. It can be argued that an organization may be effective even if its internal processes are less than satisfactory. For example, the existence of conflict and organizational slack may indicate inefficiency in internal processes, but conflict may be essential for innovation and change, and slack may help an organization in its long-term survival and adaptability. It can be concluded that the organization is effective when all the organizational processes are satisfactory.

Keeley (1978) formulated Strategic Constituency approach. This is sometimes referred to as the participant satisfaction or ecological model (Miles, 1980). Keeley suggests that the model is concerned with the extent to which an organization is able to satisfy the needs and expectations of the strategic constituencies (stakeholders) as well as attain a satisfactory balance among them.
A strategic constituency is a group of individuals, such as owners, employees, customers, suppliers, and government officials who have some interests in the organization. This model is based on the assumption that an organization will be effective if it can at least minimally satisfy the needs of different constituencies. Although this model takes a broader view of effectiveness than the previous three (Tsui, 1990), it also provides a partial view of organizational effectiveness. An organization can be effective even if it fails to satisfy the needs of all the constituencies. The implication is that customer satisfaction plays an important role in the effectiveness of the organization.

(Rahim, 1981) evaluated the studies on organizational effectiveness (OE). He states that content analysis of syllabi on organizational behavior courses for MBA students indicated that organizational effectiveness was the 31st among the 65 frequently mentioned topics. He reiterates the importance of conflict management saying that conflict management should be designed to encourage the enhancement of organizational effectiveness. He reiterates that the enhancement of organizational effectiveness needs a moderate amount of substantive or functional conflict, though affective or emotional conflict should be minimized. The organizational participants should learn to use the five styles of handling conflict to deal with different conflict situations. In other words, if the variables, other than conflict, that affect organizational learning and effectiveness are controlled, effectiveness can be maximized if effective conflict management strategies are implemented. This indicates that the management of organizational conflict requires proper understanding of the effect of conflict on organizational effectiveness. The literature on organizational behavior implicitly or explicitly suggests that organizational processes or conditions, such as leadership, conflict, communication, structure, technology, and so on, influence the effectiveness of an organization. This implies that organizational effectiveness can be conceptualized and measured. The conclusion of these observations and findings is that conflicts are critically affecting organizational effectiveness.

Cameron,(1986),Quinn & Rohrbaugh,(1983) states that the literature shows there are disagreements regarding the conceptualization and measurement of organizational effectiveness. They suggested that the literature on organizational
effectiveness is in disarray. Several approaches to the definition of organizational effectiveness have emerged from different conceptualizations of the meaning of an organization (Cameron, 1981). Four models or approaches to organizational effectiveness are goal attainment, system resource, internal process, and strategic constituencies. Goal attainment and system resource approaches are two basic models of organizational effectiveness. Whereas the goal attainment model attempts to assess organizational effectiveness in terms of the ends. The systems model focuses on the means for the achievement. The other two models are concerned with improving an organization’s processes, such as communication, motivation, and so on (internal process), and satisfying the needs of an organization’s stakeholders (strategic constituencies). The implication is that effectiveness is the most important and relevant as far as the performance of the organization is concerned.

The two types of intra group conflict such as task conflicts and affective or relationship conflicts have different personal and organizational consequences. Several studies have investigated the relationships between these types of conflict and several outcomes such as satisfaction, tension or group commitment. Relationship conflict is negatively associated with employees’ affective reactions such as satisfaction (De Dreu and Van Viannen, 2001) climate, and team effectiveness (Jehn, 1997). In contrast, task conflict appears to be positively related to the quality of ideas and innovation (West and Anderson, 1996), and the increase of constructive debate (Jehn et al., 1999). Affective conflicts negatively affect the acceptance of group decisions (Amason, 1996) and group think (Turner and Pratkanis, 1994).

These conclusions about the positive function of task conflict and the negative function of relationship conflict are based on research that only examined how one type of conflict affects team performance regardless of the other type (e.g. Amason, 1996; Jehn, 1994, 1995). Consistent with this perspective, scholars tend to recommend management teams to stimulate task conflict and mitigate relationship conflict during team decision-making. These recommendations are, however, problematic because both types of conflicts are related. Almost all studies – with the exception of Jehn (1995) that measured task and relationship
conflict in groups, have shown positive correlations between the two types of conflict (Amason, 1996; De Dreu, 1997; Friedman et al., 2000; Janssen et al., 1999; Jehn, 1995; Jehn and Mannix, 2001; Jehn and Chatman). It can be concluded that the interrelationship between task and emotional conflicts makes two constructive and destructive depending on the extent to which the two are correlated.

Many authors have attempted to measure organizational efficiency empirically. Seashore & Yutchman (1967), Campbell (1977) 30 criteria; Mahoney (1977) 114 variables; 76 different indicators, and Miles (1980), for instance, used 29 measurements. Some authors (Dalton and Kesner, 1983) even claim that the number of possible measurements is nearly infinite, while all of them experience the difficulty involved in standardizing measures for comparison. Generally speaking, positions range from those (such as Goodman, Atkin and Schoormann, 1985) who propose a moratorium in the analysis of organizational efficiency. There are, naturally, authors (such as Morgan, 1985) who believe that such an agreement is not impossible or who argue that the decisive importance of the concept precludes abandonment if the aim pursued is to understand and improve business organizations (such as Peters & Waterman, 1982; Handy 1993). In short, from the earliest attempts quoted above to the most recent papers such as Puig-Junoy (2000), Surrucu (2003) or Vergés (2004), there is incremental advances in this regard. The general conclusion of these studies is that several factors constitute organizational efficiency depending on the environmental demands which is essential for the existence of the organization. This exactly what Charles Darwin observed that only those who understand and adapt to change can exist in the changing world.

Francisco Parra Luna (2005) examines organizational efficiency in terms of business efficiency (BE). The study states that efficiency can be measured through six criteria related to the various performance of the organization. Hence:

A company is efficient if and only if it is ecological (attains a desirable input/output ratio).
A company is efficient if and only if it is efficacious (obtains what it plans to obtain).

A company is efficient if and only if it is effective (its results are accepted by its stakeholders).

A company is efficient if and only if it is incremental (its results are an improvement over the preceding period, i.e., the positive factors grow and the negative factors decline).

A company is efficient if and only if it is profitable (earns suitable financial profits).

A company is efficient if and only if it is adapted (it is at least as ecological in its basic ratio between “outputs” and “inputs” as its relevant competitors, on average).

It can be concluded that these six factors are the independent variables of organizational efficiency. The implication is that business efficiency is synonymously representing organizational efficiency as far as the mission and objectives of the organization are concerned.

Meng-Ling Wu (2006) in his meta-analyses of 121 empirical studies investigated the effect of firm size on organisational efficiency. Although previous studies had shown conflicting results, he found no significant effect of firm size on financial performance. The result may be attributed to the methodological handicaps and contextual interpretation. Still it is relevant as far as the long term objectives of the firm are concerned.

Chris Harris (2010) defines that Organizational Efficiency essentially denotes how well a company uses money. He explains that Non profit assessment organization Charity Navigator measures efficiency based on the relationship between the effectiveness of fund raisers and organizational expenditure. In publicly traded corporations, organizational efficiency lies in a company’s ability to maximize profits based on capital acquired through equity and debt. The return on investment (ROI) constitutes a good measure of organizational efficiency. He
concludes that regular monitoring of organizational efficiency can help small businesses prevent money loss.

The review of literature regarding the source, dynamics, complementing factors, efficiency and effectiveness and related processes have been examined in this chapter with the intention of acquiring insight into the main objectives of this research. The analyses of these factors are made in the coming chapters.