
REVIEW ON CONFLICT MANAGEMENT

Satyendra Arya*

*Associate Professor,

Department of General Management / Production and Operation,
Teerthanker Mahaveer Institute of Management and Technology,

Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, INDIA

Email id: satyendra.management@tmu.ac.in

DOI: 10.5958/2249-7307.2021.00048.7

ABSTRACT

This article examines the conflict literature by first looking at the causes, core process, and effects of conflict. We then look at international conflict (and de-escalation), situations, and conflict resolution. When looking at this last point, we should keep in mind that dispute can be handled by the disputing parties themselves, managers, or other third parties. Finally, we make recommendations for future 'research directions for practicing managers. These tasks-for-conflict will be tackled in this article. An overview of the communication process will be presented first, followed by a description or elaboration of the construct. In the following sections, we'll look at the causes of conflict, the core process, and the consequences. We'll then look at international conflict and the context of situation. With these concepts under our belts, we'll move on to conflict resolution, finishing with some recommendations for managers and researchers.

KEYWORDS: *Conflict Management, Causes, Communication, Effects, Issues.*

1. INTRODUCTION

The war literature is vast; so vast, in fact, that even if single-spaced, the references for it would outnumber the pages allotted to this article. Why? Because war has been here for a long time, and people have already been write about it since the dawn of literature. Conflict has been addressed on five levels by authors in the past. One is a private matter. The struggle here is internal to the individual. When significant demands from one's coworkers run contrary to one's principles or views, it may manifest as person-role conflict[1].

It may also be of the cross type, which occurs when several demands in a job cannot be fulfilled at the same time. Finally, inter-role conflict may arise as a result of personal dispute. Conflict occurs in this scenario when the person plays several roles (for example, professor and mother) and discovers that certain expectations from each position cannot be fulfilled at the same time. Individuals get into confrontation with others on a personal level. Intergroup conflict, as the name implies, is conflict between even amongst groups. Inter organizational conflict occurs when there is a dispute between even amongst organizations[2].

We will focus on interpersonal, intergroup, and inter organizational conflicts in this review, pulling from the other two planes where results in these three arenas may be generalized. Scholars seem to believe that disputes at many levels have a common pattern. There are causes, as with every social process, as well as a core process with outcomes or impacts. These consequences have a cascading impact on the causes. A conflict cycle like this occurs inside a context (environment), and it will go through many iterations. The model shown here is a generic one that shows how the main conflict puzzle parts go together. It was chosen since we agree with Blalock that when specific disputes are presented and evaluated in a fairly common framework, information accumulates systematically. He believes that using this approach is preferable to

believing that every dispute has so many unique characteristics that it should be examined separately or grouped with someone of its kind[3].

A variety of academic evaluations of the war literature have been produced throughout the years, and we recommend that readers wanting additional information study these. Pondy (1967), Thomas (1976), Thomas (1992), Putnam and Poole (1987), Lewicki, Weiss, and Lewin (1992), Morrill (1989), and van de Vliert (in press) papers should all be read in the order listed. The Pondy (1967) paper is well-written and offers two important contributions: first, it describes the phases of conflict episodes, and second, it proposes a comprehensive view of organizational conflict. Thomas' previous work (1976) concentrates on dyadic conflict, proposing two conflict models: (1) a management model that describes conflict dynamics; and (2) a structural model that examines underlying and contextual effects on conflict. Thomas (1992) concentrates more on long-term gains in conflict management in his later paper. Putnam and Poole (1988) offer comprehensive treatment of three conflict levels: interpersonal, intergroup, and interorganizational, while emphasizing the role of communication in conflict. Forms of conflict, mediation, and third-party processes are identified and classified by Lewicki, Weiss, and Lewin (1992). According to Morrill (1989), research has moved by how conflict should be managed to how conflict is handled in recent years, while van de Vliert (in press) concentrates on conflict escalation and de-escalation[4].

2. DISCUSSION

Each of the previous reviews adds to the main procedure. Conflict, according to the definition, is a procedure in which some party believes that another party's interest are being resisted or adversely impacted. Most interpretations agree that dispute is a process that involves two or more participants, according to a thorough review of the literature. Similarly, there is consensus that for conflict to exist, one side must perceive the resistance of the other. There is, however, considerable disagreement about what the "other" opposes. According to Thomas (1976), the party's "concerns" or "anything cared about" are opposed. Other' involvement with the party's products, goals, and ideals, according to Putnam and Poole (1987)[5].

Pruitt and Rubin (1986) mention goals, while Donahue and Kolt (1992) consider requirements or interests. Deutsch (1980) refers to "activities." We are satisfied with a definition stating that another, in a dispute, is obstructing the party's interest(s) or objective since worries, things cared about, goals, purposes, values, interests, and ambitions are all fairly similar (s). Let's move on to the sources of violence now that we've reached a preliminary consensus on this concept.[6]

1. Causes of Conflict:

Researchers have not focused on identifying reasons in the last twenty-five years. However, sufficient empirical research, theoretic components, and insightful observation have allowed us to count them. When you consider the concept of dispute, it seems to imply many things. The interpersonal connection between such disputants, on the other hand, is the source of the greatest number of reasons. First, there are perceptual variables like mutual mistrust. Second, there are communication factors, as Robbins (1978) and Putnam and Poole (1987) point out. Behavioral, structural, and "prior interaction" factors are also found. There's also the effect of problems. We'll break down several of these reasons utilizing, which sets out the aforementioned typology. We'll leave some to the readers' particular reconnoitering for brevity's sake. Causes are grouped in logical ways. Since a party and others are both engaged in the dispute, some of the reasons may be attributed to their own qualities[7].

1.1 Individual Characteristics:

That there some evidence suggesting personality traits may create friction; for particular, Baron (1989) discovered that Type-A personalities had a greater incidence of dispute with subordinates

than Type-B personalities. Thompson (1990) and Wall and Blum (1991) both conducted evaluations of the negotiating literature and found that personality and other individual characteristics, such as attitudes, had only a small effect on negotiations. Extrapolating from these results, we conclude that they will have a modest effect on conflict. This result is supported by Wrightman's (1966) discovery that just one of his 12 personality and attitude measures had any impact on competitive game conduct. When we look at personal values, we see that they have a greater impact. Individuals in diverse cultures value conflict in very different ways, as, and the others point out. Some people, particularly those from western cultures, see it as a necessary, even desirable, part of life. Others, especially those from the Korean or Japanese cultures, believe that confrontation is inherently undesirable and therefore should be avoided. As a result, these later parties are less likely to start a fight[8].

When it comes to objectives, we can see that many of them will cause conflict. To begin with, if a person's aim is to engage in conflict or rivalry with another person, such goal is likely to result in conflicts. Also, when one's objectives (aspirations) are high (due to one's previous successes, perceived power, social standards, peers' accomplishments, etc.), one is more likely to clash with another. Even modest objectives (e.g., the goal of avoiding embarrassment) may cause conflict if they are inflexible.

1.2 Interpersonal Factors:

The example above shows how the connection between two parties may sometimes be the source of conflict. The connection has many different aspects, including the visual interface, as well as communicative, behavioral, structural, and prior connections. Let's start with the perceptual interface[9].

• Interaction with the senses:

The belief that the other has lofty ambitions is a driving factor in this group. This view often leads to conflict since the party believes that someone else's success in achieving her objectives will be at the expense of the party's own. This latter impression is often true, although it is sometimes wrong. The perception of the other party's intentions adds to this reason. When the other's motivations appear to be at odds with the party's payoffs, when they appear to breach the party's social rules of fairness, equity, and when the other's behavior appears to be deliberately designed to harm the party in the some way, are the most likely to cause conflict.

• Communications:

Communications has both positive and negative consequences. Low communication, on only one hand, leads to a lack of understanding of others and may be the source of coordination issues. As a result, there is strife. Extensive contact between parties, on the other hand, is often seen as a fertile ground for misunderstandings. Too frequently, one's thoughts, facial expressions, body posture, and voice are misinterpreted, resulting in conflict. These phenomena may occur in any culture, and it is especially prevalent in pass communication. When one person is angry, hates, or distrusts the other, communication-based misunderstandings become more often. A background of interpersonal issues, on the other hand, may set the scene for misunderstanding all too easily. When it communicates criticism, particularly the thoughtless, destructive kind, high personal ambitions, threats, planned distributive conduct, insults, and so on, accurate, clear communication may just as easily create conflict[10].

• Behavior:

When it comes to behavioral causes of conflict, we found that another person's decrease of a person's outcomes is an unmistakable source of conflict. Blocking a person's objectives, results, or ambitions, on the other hand, is likely to cause conflict. Such acts obviously promote conflict

unless they are hidden or misinterpreted in some manner. Such actions may be unintentional, such as when a Chinese lady embarrasses her parents by sending home a lover from a rival clan. They may also be deliberate, such as the Cuban blockade or a labor strike. Take into account the impact of the prospective disputants' interaction level. The majority of research backs up the idea that moderate levels of contact are better than infrequent interaction.

• **Structure:**

It seems that the latter leads to unfavorable views of others, misunderstanding of others' motivations, and the overall stereotype of others as adversaries. We discover that laws, conventions, practices, technical or production needs, agreements, and other factors create the structure of relationships among families, informal groupings, formal organizations, businesses, governments, and international arenas. Marriage, for example, establishes a mutually beneficial connection between such a husband and wife. The technological constraints of an amniocentesis operation create a symbiotic relationship between the clinician who draws the embryonic fluid as well as the geneticist who analyzes it. Similarly, the structural criteria demand that the clinician extracts the fluid first, with a short period between both the fluid withdraw and the genetic test.

What effect does such structure have on conflict? The impact of proximity has an ironic twist. The closer and more secure individuals feel with one another, the more likely they are to bring up bothersome problems. Power imbalance has a more intuitively obvious impact. Conflict is likely to occur if structure generates power imbalances and the weaker party rejects the stronger party's influence or views conflict as a means of gaining power[7].

1.3 Issues:

When people get into a fight, it's generally about a problem, large or little, emotional or substantive, simple or complicated. Which of the problem features causes disagreement? "Complexity" is one of them. Simple problems are more likely to cause conflict than complex ones. Conflict is also more likely to arise when there are many (rather than a few) problems. In all instances, the reason is quite obvious: complicated and diverse problems are more likely to cause misunderstanding, to elicit different interests, or to uncover disparate objectives. However, one aspect that may not be immediately apparent is that although these qualities cause conflict, they also make the problem manageable. We often believe that the causes of disputes will exacerbate their intractable nature. That's not the case for these two reasons. Consider a variety of problems first. Although the plurality increases the likelihood of objectives causing conflict, if there is disagreement, the many problems allow the parties to arrange bargains and head exits from the dispute[9].

In a similar way, complex problems work. Tension and misunderstanding are used to create conflict. Complex problems, on the other hand, may often be split into a series of tiny sizes, which can then be exchanged. A similar argument may be made for ambiguous problems. While problems with the aforementioned qualities may result in both a settlement and a dispute, some do not; instead, they create and prolong conflict. This group is dominated by issues of principle or non-negotiable requirements.

Parties get emotionally attached to their views on such topics (such as abortion or security), and once in dispute over these, the disputants discover that trading, mutual give and take, is impossible. Large, non-divisible problems often go the same path. Because such issues (e.g., does a proposed expressway cut through the slums?) have stakes involved (e.g., an area is broken, or an expressway is canceled or rerouted), the opposing parties are adamant about their positions and engage in conflict. Once in the fight, the issue's all-or-nothing nature makes acceptable, face-saving, piece-meal bargains impossible to come by.

2. *Effects of Conflict:*

We've looked at the causes of conflict and the core process of conflict, and now we'll look at the consequences. As a result, we discover that impacts can be classed in similar ways to the causes. Individuals, connections or communications, behavior patterns, structure, and issues are all affected in some way. The conflict's leftovers are another category.

2.1 *Effects on Individuals:*

One of the most common outcomes of conflict is dissatisfied individuals. Anger, emotions of animosity, social-emotional isolation, tension, anxiety, and stress are examples, although disputants may also find conflict invigorating or thrilling at low levels of intensity. Negative emotions may contribute to personal disappointments, low work satisfaction, low motivation, and poor performance.

2.2 *Issues:*

It seems that problems do not alter as a consequence of disagreement when viewed objectively. Nonetheless, we are all aware that they fluctuate, both subjectively and objectively. Simple problems become complicated when individuals, organizations, or businesses get into disagreements; a few issues may lead to a slew of others. Misconceptions obscure the problems, and clarity suffers as a result. As exchangeable problems become questions of principle, conflicts become increasingly difficult to settle. Individual perceptions play a role in this transformation of issues: a problem that would ordinarily seem straightforward gets obscured when seen by opponents. On the other hand, part of it is attributable to subjective shifts: simple problems, for example, may become more complicated when new concerns and connections emerge during a dispute. In a disagreement between a transportation and manufacturing company, for example, the question of which facility will receive pieces of heavy equipment rapidly extends to encompass who will load the gear and when it will be examined for damage[11].

3. CONCLUSION

We've tried to provide a comprehensive study of violence and its handling in this post. We started by looking at the causes, fundamental process, and consequences of conflict. Following that, it was discovered that conflict occurs in a cycle: causes start the fundamental conflict and its consequences, which may then give feedback to start a new the process, which can then increase or not. Conflict and cycling may occur in a number of settings. The disputing parties or third parties may likely to attempt their hand at controlling the dispute if it continues, intensifies, or comes to a close too slowly.

The conflict get off to a good start before they are noticed, giving them an edge in momentum. Both have self-sustaining cycles as well. A cold virus infects (our) bodily cells and replicates itself via cell proteins. Conflict is also self-generating; when it occurs in a partnership, it causes social processes to bend to its will. If a person gains advantages from conflict, for example, he is more likely to continue the process. If it results in losses, the dispute is perpetuated as the losing side tries to catch up and square the score. We could go on with the parallels, but the most remarkable and important one is that both the cold and war are shifting targets, although very smart moving targets. The common cold binds to bodily cell, insert its RNA or DNA into them, arranges the molecules in the cells into multiple replications of itself, bursts the cell, and goes on to other cells. When the virus is recognized by the body's cells and antibodies are summoned to combat it, the virus employs a devious strategy: it changes shape (basic details its protein shell) to avoid being recognized by the body.

REFERENCES:

1. R. Vashisht, K. Singh, and S. Sharma, "Emotional Intelligence and its Relationship with Conflict Management and Occupational Stress: A Meta-Analysis," *Pacific Bus. Rev. Int.*, 2018.
2. C. G. Kakouris, "Postmerger conflict management issues in the banking sector after the 2012 financial crisis.," 2017.
3. A. B. García, E. Pender, and P. Elgoibar, "The State of Art: Trust and Conflict Management in Organizational Industrial Relations," 2016.
4. Y. Meng, H. Yu, Z. Ma, and Z. Yang, "The impact of young Chinese employees' notions of work on conflict management styles: An explorative study," *Int. J. Confl. Manag.*, 2018, doi: 10.1108/IJCMA-09-2017-0084.
5. M. H. Bazerman, *Negotiation, decision making, and conflict management*. 2005.
6. L. J. Summers Jr., "A social style analysis of conflict management behavior in military leadership," 2017.
7. V. Pathak and P. Gautam, "Conflict Management - A Rare Art of Modern Management In India," *Int. J. Trend Sci. Res. Dev.*, 2017, doi: 10.31142/ijtsrd2524.
8. P. Aula and K. Siira, "Organizational Communication and Conflict Management Systems," *Nord. Rev.*, 2010, doi: 10.1515/nor-2017-0125.
9. D. J. Pickering, "The relationship between religious commitment and conflict management in a private Christian university.," *Diss. Abstr. Int. Sect. A Humanit. Soc. Sci.*, 2017.
10. S. O. Odobo, A. M. Andekin, and K. Udegbunam, "Analysis of ECOWAS Institutional Framework for Conflict Management," *Mediterr. J. Soc. Sci.*, 2017, doi: 10.1515/mjss-2017-0051.
11. M. Lazzaro-Salazar and L. J. Pujol-Cols, "Psychosocial risks and professional integration of foreign physicians: A study on conflict management in Chile," *Rev. Med. Chil.*, 2017, doi: 10.4067/S0034-98872017001001300.