

Traditional, Interactionist, and Managed-Conflict Views of Conflict

Murtadhi Hussain AlFayez

Abstract

Conflict has been characterized as a procedure that starts when one party sees that another party has contrarily influenced, or is going to adversely influence, something that the main party thinks about. There are three general schools of thought identifying with conflict. The traditional view (which is the most seasoned perspective) of contention expect that all difference is hurtful and ought to be stayed away from. The managed (human relations view) contends that contention is a characteristic event in all gatherings and, all things considered, it ought to be overseen and not killed. The interactionist view recommends that contention can be a positive power in a gathering and unequivocally contends that some contention is important for a gathering to perform successfully. By interactionist view, conflict can be practical or useless. Practical conflict bolsters the objectives of the gathering and enhances its execution while useless conflict thwarts bunch execution.

ensured through planning and control. Consequently, conflict is perceived in the context of management failure, destruction, irrationality, dysfunction, “breakdown” and violence. As such, conflict should be controlled, avoided or alleviated. The negative perceptions of conflicts have significantly

The traditional view dominated from the late 19th century through 40ies in the 20th century. Traditional view assumes conflict as something bad for the organization, the factor that adversely influences organizational performance. Organizations are seen as linear and rational systems that are

determine if conflicts bear a negative or positive effect on the organizational performance. Conflict management theory (also known as CMS – conflict management system) claims conflict as a constructive means that serves to increase company's performance if managed properly. It is crucial, however, to distinguish between the extent when the conflict serves to boost the organizational performance and the point when it becomes destructive if it remains unresolved. CMS offers a broad array of management instruments to manage conflicts, such as template for external and internal system components, preferred path, evaluations and checkpoints, among others. For example, CMS theory emphasises the role of management support, cultural considerations, training and learning. Norm, values, routines and are seen as strong levers that can regulate organizational structures (Bhat, Rangnekar, & Barua,

contributed to the establishment of trade unions as mechanisms to resolve conflicts (Bhat, Rangnekar, & Barua, 2013). Companies tend to design conflict management policies and procedures that are in compliance with the overall company's strategy, such as recruitment of talent, encouragement of innovation and creativity (Lipsky & Avgar, 2010). For example, rules are prescribed for versatile aspects of the workplace, such as the salary rate or working hours beginning and end, criterion for promotions or demotions among others (Andrade, Plowman, & Duchon, 2008). On a similar note, managers can examine conflict management system in order to identify weak linkages in terms of inter-department cooperation (Aula & Siira, 2010).

In contrast, the latest theories view conflicts as unavoidable and place emphasis on the approaches to conflict management as means to

the career ladder. However, a group of engineers were seeking autonomy in their work environment and had no desire to manage their subordinates. Once the conflicting issue was identified, a different leadership plan was consequently designed for the engineering department. Ultimately, this approach to conflict management not only served to reduce the conflict but also helped to design separate strategies, including for training, for various departments. Company operates on the global scale, with employees working together, and conflict helped in developing a mechanism that fosters a much-needed integrity (Bhat, Rangnekar, & Barua, 2013).

2013). Petty conflicts (e.g., greeting in the hallway as seen by people of different generations or cultural backgrounds) might escalate to serious threat to both cultural environment affecting other employees or even threaten company's reputation at large (Aula&Siira, 2010).

The latest, interactionist view gives credit to conflict as a positive element that increases the company's performance. The view propagates that harmonious, calm and peaceful organizations are not potent to respond to challenges in their environments, such as innovation and need to change. Thus, advocates of the theory prompt managers to maintain a certain level of conflict as means to increase production efficiency (Katz& Flynn2013). For example, one organization had a uniform leadership strategy across various departments, and one of its mandatory points was to "manage others" in order to move up

Lipsky, D. B., & Avgar, A. C. (2010).

The conflict over conflict
management. *Dispute
Resolution Journal*, May/
October, 11 and 38-43.

References

- Andrade, L., Plowman, D. A., &
Duchon, D. (2008). Getting
past conflict resolution: A
complexity view of conflict.
E:CO, 10(1), 23-38.
- Aula, P., & Siira, K. (2010).
Organizational communication
and conflict management
systems. A social complexity
approach. *Nordicom Review*,
31(1), 125-141.
- Bhat, A. B., Rangnekar, S., & Barua,
M. K. (2013). Organizational
conflict scale: Reexamining the
instrument. *The IUP Journal of
Organizational Behavior*,
XII(1), 7-23.
- Katz, N. H., & Flynn, L. T. (2013).
Understanding conflict
management systems and
strategies in the workplace: A
pilot study. *Conflict Resolution
Quarterly*, 30(4), 393-409.