A CASE STUDY ON CONFLICT MANAGEMENT STYLE OF UNIVERSITY EMPLOYEES

[1]Mr. Rajesh Kumar, [2]Mrs. Ani Smriti,

[1]*F.O.,* [2]*Ph.D. Research Scholar*
[1]*Registrar Office, Bihar Agricultural University, Sabour, Bhagalpur (Bihar), India*
[2]*Department of Commerce and Business Administration, Tilka Manjhi Bhagalpur University, Bhagalpur (Bihar), India*

Abstract: In the modern era, organizations are facing several challenges due to conflict Management at workplace. Conflict has been part of human civilization since the beginning. Conflict is the process in which one party perceives that its interests are being opposed or negatively affected by another party. The conflict process begins with the sources of conflict. These sources lead one or both sides to perceive a conflict and to experience conflict emotions. This produces manifest conflict, such as behaviours toward the other side.

When a conflict arises, an opportunity for growth dies. There are plenty of ways by which conflict can arise; two of the main reasons are miscommunication and incompatibility. Conflict management is thus essential, especially for businesses and diplomats who deal with international issues. Conflict management is different from conflict resolution since it an on-going process, unlike resolution, which only happens when the conflict has already taken place. As a conflict management trainer, you have to know all the activities used for training purposes.

The purpose of the study is to emphasize the impact of conflict management for university employees. The research method of this study used the second-hand data listed in different databases of books, research papers and related articles on conflict management on the Internet.

The research is mainly aimed to analyze the handling approach of various people within the organization. The study was a descriptive research design and used questionnaire to collect data from the selected organizations. Simple random sampling is used for collection of data from 102 employees. The implications of the results are discussed with respect to the learning objectives of conflict management resolution and recommendations for modification are made.

The major outcome of this research work that the most preferred style of handling conflict is Competing style for Management and Collaborating style for Employees. There is the need of commitment of all employees for resolving such conflict which will be helpful in efficient continuity of organization towards their goal.

Keywords: - Conflict management, conflict management style, employees, organization.

I. INTRODUCTION

Human being cannot avoid conflict in their life, at home, at play, and even at work. However, the outcome of the conflict is not predetermined. So, the conflict management is very important for the Organizations. It is the principle that all conflicts cannot resolved, but learning how to manage conflicts can decrease the odds of non-productive escalations. It involves acquiring skills related to conflict resolution, self-awareness of conflict patterns, conflict communication skills, and establishing conflict management structures for any organization, especially in the workplace, under current conditions. The conflict arises the interdependency of relationship between the employees.

Research shows that unresolved conflict can lead to aggression. Most people avoid conflict and see it as a huge negative. While conflict in the workplace is inevitable, it can be overcome. However, unresolved conflicts can lead to retreat, aggression, verbal abuse and resignation. But conflict, when handled appropriately, can lead to awareness that change is necessary and can be helpful and productive. Conflict in the workplace is overcoming when managers provide clear, transparent communication, set goals that are consistent with a simple, understandable mission statement, provide clarity in job responsibilities. Most of the people use conflict skills that also observed growing up, unless people have made a conscious effort to change their conflict management style. Some of the people observed good conflict management, while others observed faulty conflict management. Most of the people have several reassigns to improve their conflict management skills.

1.1 Definition and Concept of Conflict Management

Conflict can be defined as a struggle or contest between people with opposing needs, ideas, beliefs, values, or goals. Conflict on teams is inevitable; however, the results of conflict are not predetermining. Conflicts might escalate and lead to non-productive results, or conflict can be beneficially resolved and lead to quality final products. Hence, learning to manage conflict is integral to a high-performance team. Although very few people go looking for conflict, more often than not, conflict results from miscommunication between people with regard to their needs, ideas, beliefs, goals, or values. Conflict management is the principle that all conflicts cannot necessarily resolved, but learning how to manage conflicts can decrease the odds of non-productive escalation. Conflict management involves acquiring skills related to conflict resolution, self-awareness about conflict modes, conflict communication skills, and establishing a structure for management of conflict in your environment.

Employers should help employees develop their conflict management skills. Most employees do not resolve conflicts because they either have a faulty skill set and/or because they do not know the organization's policy on conflict management. All team members need to know their conflict management styles, conflict intervention methods, and strategies for conflict skill improvement.

1.2 Conflict Management Style

By using five conflict management styles, namely competition, adaptation, compromise, cooperation and avoidance, conflicts can be better understood.

➢ **Competing:** The competing conflict mode is high assertiveness and low cooperation. Times when the competing mode is appropriate are when quick action needs to take, when unpopular decisions need to be made, when vital issues must be handled, or when one is protecting self-interests.

➢ **Accommodating:** The accommodating mode is of low assertiveness and of high cooperation. The appropriate mode of accommodation is to behave reasonably, develop performance, create goodwill, or maintain peace. Some people use the accommodating mode when the issue or outcome is of low importance to them. The model is moderate self-confidence and moderate cooperation. Some people define compromise as "giving up more than the people want," while others see compromise as both parties winning. The accommodating mode can be problematic when one uses the mode to "keep a tally" or to be a martyr.

➢ **Compromising:** Times when the compromising mode is appropriate, especially when someone is dealing with issues of moderate importance and when the people have an equal power status or have a strong commitment for resolution. Compromising mode can also be used as a temporary solution when there are time constraints.

➢ **Collaborating:** The collaborating mode is high assertiveness and high cooperation. Collaboration has described as "putting an idea on top of an idea on top of an idea in order to achieve the best solution to a conflict." The best solution is defining as a creative solution to the conflict that would not hgenerated by a single person. With such a positive outcome for collaboration, some people will profess that the collaboration mode is always the best conflict mode to use. However, collaborating takes a great deal of time and energy. Therefore, the collaborating mode should used when the conflict warrants the time and energy. Times when the collaborative mode is appropriate are when the conflict is important to the people who are constructing an integrative solution, when the issues are too important to compromise or when merging perspectives or when gaining commitment, when improving relationships, or even learning. For example, if one team is establishing initial parameters for how to work effectively together, then using the collaborating mode could be quite useful. On the other hand, if another team is in conflict about where to go to lunch today, the time and energy necessary to collaboratively resolve the conflict is probably not beneficial.

➢ **Avoiding:** This has to do with not caring about yourself and others. It is a process where the individual tries to avoid the other person or pretend that the conflict does not exist even when the individual is hurt and angry. This approach does not solve the problem but postpones the evil day. Thus, it leaves the parties feeling more annoyed, resentful and frustrated.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Blake and Mouton (1964) observed that the first to present a conceptual scheme for classifying the modes (styles) for handling interpersonal conflicts into five types: forcing, withdrawing, smoothing, compromising, and problem solving.

Thomas (1976) and Pruitt (1983) put forth a model based on the concerns of the parties involved in the conflict. In the 1970's and 1980's, researchers began using the intentions of the parties involved to classify the styles of conflict management that they would include in their models. The combination of the parties concern for their own interests (i.e. assertiveness) and their concern for the interests of those across the table (i.e. cooperativeness) would yield a particular conflict management style. Pruitt called these styles yielding (low assertiveness/high cooperativeness), problem solving (high assertiveness/high cooperativeness), inaction (low assertiveness/low cooperativeness), and

contending (high assertiveness/low cooperativeness). Pruitt argues that problem-solving is the preferred method when seeking mutually beneficial options.

Borisoff & Victor (1989) viewed some special consideration should be paid to conflict management between two parties from distinct cultures. In addition to the everyday sources of conflict, "misunderstandings, and from this counterproductive, pseudo conflicts, arise when members of one culture are unable to understand culturally determined differences in communication practices, traditions, and thought processing".

Bakare (1992) echoed the same view when he posited that male labour leaders tend to exhibit more aggressive behaviour than female due to their lack of communication skills. In a similar study that investigated communication skill and conflict resolution strategy of workers, McDowell (1990) as cited in Akintayo (2005) observed that due to lack of interpersonal communication skill, male negotiator tend to express their opinions forcefully and prefer to assume control or dominate argument. Whereas their female counterparts tend to integrate argument and offer, trade offs to reach agreement.

Dreyfus (1999) asserted that emotional intelligence distinguishes an individual as 'Star Performer' and plays an important role in determining which organization will out-perform in the global competition.

Khun and Poole (2000) established a similar system of group conflict management. In their system, they split Kozan's confrontational model into two sub models: distributive and integrative.

- **Distributive** - Here conflict is approached as a distribution of a fixed amount of positive outcomes or resources, where one side will end up winning and the other losing, even if they do win some concessions.
- **Integrative** - Groups utilizing the integrative model see conflict as a chance to integrate the needs and concerns of both groups and make the best outcome possible. This model has a heavier emphasis on compromise than the distributive model. Khun and Poole found that the integrative model resulted in consistently better task related outcomes than those using the distributive model.

Ajala (2003) opined that good communication is one of the key skills to be acquired in peace education for successful conflict resolution.

Renner (2007) recounted several episodes where managers from developed countries moved to less developed countries to resolve conflicts within the company and met with little success due to their failure to adapt to the conflict management styles of the local culture.

III. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Keeping in view of the importance of the conflict management, the major objectives are as follow:
- To explore the level of awareness of conflict management in the organization.
- To find out involvement of middle & junior level employee's conflict in the organization.
- To know the Conflict management style or behaviour of employees when handling the conflict.

IV. NEED & SCOPE OF THE STUDY

Conflict has been a part of human civilization since the beginning. The functional view of organizational conflict sees conflict as a productive force, one that can stimulate members of the organizational innovation and productivity. The scope of the study is that by analyzing the conflict management of the employees, the organization further improve themselves with more benefits and facilities to overcome the drawback and improve the performance level of employees. Conflict is beneficial where intergroup conflict improves team dynamics in the organization. Terms increase their cohesiveness and task orientation when they face an external threat. Under conditions of moderate conflict, this fact motivates team members to work more efficiently towards these goals, thereby increasing the team's productivity. The study covers the employee's level of conflict management with respect to the concerned job. This study is helpful to that organization for conducting further research. This study is beneficial for the organization those who are facing conflict between employees and the management team. It is also study material for the employees as well as the students to learn how to handle the conflict at workplace.

V. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research is mainly to analyze the handling methods of various people in the organization. In this study both primary and secondary data were used. The study was Descriptive Research Design and used questionnaire to collect the data from the selected Organizations.

VI. DATA ANALYSIS

The researcher developed a report according to the respondent data**.** In this Article, the researcher has present a detailed report about Conflict Management. The researcher than explained the objectives of the study and also briefed them about the filling of the questionnaire. The researcher has distributed the questionnaires among Professors/ Scientists as well as Principal/ HODs and also sent mail to them. The valuable opinion of employees is displayed below through various statistical tables and graphs that show their responses on this study.

Table - 1
Questionnaire Distribution & Retrieval

Respondents	Sent out	%	Returned	%	Accepted	%	Un-accepted	%	Not returned	%
Senior Level	50	100	35	70	32	64	3	6	15	30
Middle & Junior Level	100	100	83	84	70	70	13	13	17	17
Total	**150**	**100**	**118**	**79**	**102**	**86**	**16**	**14**	**32**	**21**

Primary data for this study were collected from questionnaires distributed and returned. The use of tables and simple percentages are to summarize responses by respondents on the subject matter. Their responses were summed of senior level employees and middle and junior level employees and analysed from Table- 1, it shows that out of the 150 questionnaires sent out, 50 were sent to senior level employees, 100 were sent commendably to the middle and junior level employees of the seven organizations surveyed in three districts of Bihar state. The break-down from the table reveals that out of the 50 questionnaires sent out to the senior level employees, 35 representing 70% were returned, 32 representing 64% were accepted, 3 representing 6% was un-accepted while 15 representing 30% were not returned. The table also reveals that out of the 100 questionnaires sent out commendably to middle and junior level employees, 83 representing 83% were returned, 70 representing 70% were accepted and 13 representing 13% were un-accepted while 17 representing 17% were not returned.

Table – 2
Details Percentage of the Accepted Samples

	Total	Senior level employees	Middle & Junior level employees
Frequency	102	32	70
Percentage	100%	31%	69%

It was found from the table that accepted sample consists 31% senior level employees and 69% middle & junior level employees.

6.1 Personal details of respondents

Personal details of respondents covered are sex, age group, highest qualification and working experience. The data in Table- 3 revealed that males and females consist 84.38% and 15.62% for senior level employees and 60% and 40% for middle & junior level employees respectively. Also from Table -3, respondent with Ph. D. degree rank highest with 90.63% followed by Master's degree holders only with 9.37% for Senior level and Ph. D. degree with 47.14% followed by Master's degree holders with 45.71% as per Bachelor's degree 5.71% followed by only 1.43% Intermediate for Middle & Junior level. This showed that respondents are knowledgeable and well trained enough to understand the concept of conflict management. The respondents who have working experience of above 20 years are in the majority (71.88%) followed by those that have worked for 11-15 and 1-5 years (9.38%) jointly as per 16-20 years (6.25%) and 6-10 years (3.13%) only for Senior level. In other side for Middle & Junior level showed that who have worked for 1-5 years are in the majority (37.14%) followed by those that have worked for above 20 years (20%) as per 6-10 years (17.14%) and 11-15 years & 16-20 years (12.86%) jointly. It also showed that the involvement of the Middle and Junior level employees is facing conflict in the organization. On other side for senior level employees, the implication of this is that most of the respondents have worked enough to have experienced organizational conflict and how it was managed.

Table – 3
Personal Details of Respondents

Personal Details	No. of Senior level employees	%	No. of Middle & Junior level employees	%
Sex				
Male	27	84.38	42	60
Female	5	15.62	28	40
Age Group (Years)				
Below 30	-	-	4	5.71
30 – 40	4	12.5	33	47.14
41 – 50	4	12.5	20	28.57
51 – 60	20	62.5	8	11.42
Above 60	4	12.5	5	7.14
Highest Qualification				
Matriculation	-	-	-	-
Intermediate	-	-	1	1.43
Bachelor's Degree	-	-	4	5.71
Master's Degree	3	9.37	32	45.71
Ph.D. Degree	29	90.63	33	47.14
Working Experience (Years)				
1 - 5	3	9.38	26	37.14
6 – 10	1	3.13	12	17.14
11 – 15	3	9.38	9	12.86
16 – 20	2	6.25	9	12.86
Above 20	23	71.88	14	20

6.2 Statistical Data Analysis for Middle and Junior Level Employees

With the help of statistical analysis the expected outcome of the study can be done through correlation and regression analysis.

Correlation is merely a tool of ascertaining the degree of relationship between the dependents variables and the independents variables.

The correlation coefficient between the dependent variables and the independents variables (Table- 4) viz. sex, age, qualification and work experience showed that the accommodating behaviour has more associated positively with sex (0.1671) and other variables are less associated.

In case of avoiding behaviour the maximum contribution has 0.1076 with sex followed by 0.1027 with age as per 0.0617 with work experience and 0.0178 with qualification.

In case of compromising behaviour has the maximum contribution 0.0937 with age followed by work experience (0.0838) as per sex (0.0404) and qualification has in negative sign.

Now comes to competing behaviour the maximum contribution has 0.0732 with age followed by work experience (0.0595) and others are in negative sign.

In case of collaborating behaviour, it has no positive sign. It means that there is less relationship among independent variables.

Table – 4
Correlation Analysis for Middle & Junior Level Employees

	Correlation Coefficients among different dependent variables and independent variables								
	Independent variables				**Dependent variables**				
	Sex (X1)	**Age (X2)**	**Qualification (X3)**	**Work Ex. (X4)**	**Collaboration (Y1)**	**Accommodate (Y2)**	**Avoiding (Y3)**	**Compromise (Y4)**	**Competing (Y5)**
Sex (X1)	1.0000	0.1201	0.2735	-0.1484	-0.3574	0.1671	0.1076	0.0404	-0.0898
Age (X2)		1.0000	0.1643	0.9796	-0.2320	-0.0337	0.1027	0.0937	0.0732
Qualification (X3)			1.0000	0.1430	-0.1613	-0.2123	0.0178	-0.0817	-0.0285
Work Ex. (X4)				1.0000	-0.2047	-0.0841	0.0617	0.0838	0.0595

6.3 Multiple Regression Analysis of Five Conflict Management Styles for Middle and Junior Level Employees:

The objective of regression analysis is to study the 'Nature of Relationship' between the dependent and independent variables. The applying this analysis for middle and junior level employee's behaviour with sex, age, qualification and work experience.

The step wise regression analysis of table- 5, collaborating behaviour (dependent variable) with sex age, qualification and work experience (independent variables) inducted that 20.73% variability was explained by dependent variables. Out of these maximum contributions of collaborating behaviour was 12.76% with sex followed by 4.19% with work experience as par 1.99% with age and 1.78% with qualification.

In case of accommodating behaviour with all independent variables inducted that 16.16% variability was explained by dependent variables. Out of these, maximum contribution was 7.24% with age followed 4.12% with sex as per 4.09% with qualification and only 0.71% with work experience.

In case of avoiding behaviour with all independent variables inducted that 5.85% variability was explained by all dependent variables. Out of these, maximum contribution was 0.9% with qualification followed by 0.7% with work experience as per 0.6% with sex and only 0.9% with age.

In case of competing behaviour with all the independent variables inducted that 1.8% variability was explained by all dependent variables. Out of these, maximum contribution was 0.67% with sex followed by 0.63% with age as per 0.35% with work experience and only 0.14% with qualification.

Table- 5
Percent Contribution of Five Conflict Management Styles for Middle & Junior Level of Employees

Styles	Sex (X1)	Age (X2)	Qualification (X3)	Work Ex. (X4)	Total (R²)
Collaboration (Y1)	12.76	1.99	1.78	4.19	**20.73**
Accommodation (Y2)	4.12	7.24	4.09	0.71	**16.16**
Avoiding (Y3)	1.03	4.43	0.01	0.38	**5.85**
Compromise (Y4)	0.63	0.49	0.9	0.7	**2.72**
Competing (Y5)	0.67	0.63	0.14	0.35	**1.80**

Where, X1 = Sex, X2 = Age, X3 = Qualification, X4 = Work Experience, Y1 = Collaborating,

Y2 = Accommodating, Y3 = Avoiding,   Y4 = Compromising, Y5 = Competing

6.4 Statistical Data Analysis for Senior Level Employees

With the help of statistical analysis the expected outcome of the study can be done through correlation and regression analysis.

Correlation is merely a tool of ascertaining the degree of relationship between the dependents variables and independents variables.

The correlation coefficient between the dependent variables and independent variables (Table- 6) viz. sex, age, qualification and work experience showed that the accommodating behaviour has more associated with age (0.2858) followed by work experience (0.2587) as per sex (0.1762) and qualification has in negative sign.

In case of compromising behaviour has maximum contribution with qualification (0.2471) followed by age (0.0698) as per sex (0.0220) and work experience (0.0132).

In case of collaborating behaviour has more associated with qualification (0.1995) followed by age (0.1384) as per work experience (0.0628) and sex has in negative sign.

In case of competing behaviour has more associated with sex (0.0595) followed by qualification (0.0128) and others have less associated.

In case of avoiding behaviour has more associated with work experience (0.0364) and others has in negative sign.

Table- 6
Correlation Analysis for Senior Level Employees

	Correlation Coefficients among different dependent variables and independent variables								
	Independent variables				Dependent variables				
	Sex (X1)	Age (X2)	Qualific ation (X3)	Work Ex. (X4)	Competi ng (Y1)	Collabo ration (Y2)	Accom modate (Y3)	Avoidi ng (Y4)	Comprom ise (Y5)
Sex (X1)	1.0000	0.1659	0.1384	0.1705	0.0595	-0.2504	0.1762	-0.2205	0.0220
Age (X2)		1.0000	0.0307	0.9666	-0.2324	0.1384	0.2856	-0.0017	0.0698
Qualificati on (X3)			1.0000	-0.1031	0.0128	0.1995	-0.0451	-0.1941	0.2471
Work Ex. (X4)				1.0000	-0.3014	0.0628	0.2587	0.0364	0.0132

6.7 Multiple Regression Analysis of Five Conflict Management Styles for Senior Level Employee:

The step wise regression analysis of Table- 7, competing behaviour (dependent variable) with sex, age, qualification and work experience (independent variables) inducted that 18.93% variability was explained by dependent variables. Out of these, maximum contribution of competing behaviour is 9.08% with work experience followed by 7.77% with age as per 2.04% with sex and 0.03% with qualification.

In case of collaborating behaviour with all independent variables inducted that 17.91% explained dependent variables. Out of these, maximum contribution was 7.93% with sex followed by 5.27% with age as per 4.29% with qualification and only 0.39% with work experience.

In case of accommodating behaviour with all independent variables inducted that 12.12% variability was explained by all dependent variables. Out of these, maximum contribution is 6.69% with work experience followed by 2.98% with age as per 2.41% with sex and only 0.03% with qualification.

In case of avoiding behaviour with all the independent variables inducted that 8.41% variability was explained by all dependent variables. Out of these maximum contributions is 4.32% with sex followed by 3.66% with qualification as per 0.29% with age and only 0.13% with work experience.

In case of compromising behaviour with all the independent variables inducted that 7.48% variability was explained by all dependent variables. Out of these maximum contributions was 6.24% with qualification followed by 1.22% with age as per 0.02% with work experience and only 0.01% with sex.

Table- 7
Percentage Contribution of Five Conflict Management Styles for Senior Level of Employees

Styles	Sex (X1)	Age (X2)	Qualification (X3)	Work Ex. (X4)	Total (R^2)
Competing (Y1)	2.04	7.77	0.03	9.08	**18.93**
Collaboration (Y2)	7.96	5.27	4.29	0.39	**17.91**
Accommodation (Y3)	2.41	2.98	0.03	6.69	**12.12**
Avoiding (Y4)	4.32	0.29	3.66	0.13	**8.41**
Compromise (Y5)	0.01	1.22	6.24	0.02	**7.48**

Where, X1 = Sex, X2 = Age, X3 = Qualification, X4 = Work Experience, Y1 = Competing, Y2 = Collaborating, Y3 = Accommodating, Y4 = Avoiding, Y5 = Compromising

VII. RESULTS

A score of above 15 on any set is considered high; scores of 12 to 15 are moderately high (medium), and scores of below 12 are considered moderately low.

As per Table- 8, collaborating behaviours inducted that out of seventy respondents, 22 respondents were scored below 12 (moderately low), 26 respondents were scored 12 to 15 (moderately high) and 22 respondents were scored above 15 (high). In case of accommodating behaviour out these seventy respondent, 14 respondents were scored below 12 (moderately low), 36 respondents were scored 12 to 15 (moderately high) and 20 respondents were scored above 15 (high). In case of avoiding behaviour out these seventy respondent, 16 respondents were scored below 12 (moderately low), 26 respondents were scored 12 to 15 (moderately high) and 28 respondents were scored above 15 (high). In case of compromising behaviour out these seventy respondent, 24 respondents were scored below 12 (moderately low), 24 respondents were scored 12 to 15 (moderately high) and 22 respondents were scored above 15 (high). In case of competing behaviour out these seventy respondent, 14 respondents were scored below 12 (moderately low), 29 respondents were scored 12 to 15 (moderately high) and 27 respondents were scored above 15 (high).

This is the common view of all interviewees whose styles are important to middle and junior employees. They are handling conflict according to the situation using all the styles. However, the preferred style can not be judge after viewing Table-8. But the preferred style of the respondents for the said employees can be found out adjudged with the help of statistical analysis.

Table- 8
Preferred Styles for Handling Conflict for Middle & Junior level employees

Preferred style	Below 12	12 to 15	Above 15	Total
Collaborating	22	26	22	70
Accommodating	14	36	20	70
Avoiding	16	26	28	70
Compromising	24	24	22	70
Competing	14	29	27	70

According to Table- 9, one of the issues was highlighted after the study of thirty two senior level employee's handling approach of conflict i.e., to know the extent of the prediction of conflict management behaviour of senior level employees who are also responsible for managing conflict in the organization to provide good environment for work peacefully. The maximum respondents are 40.63%, which have collaborating behaviour and their nature for handle conflict is dominating the people and 37.50% respondents have back-up style followed by accommodating behaviour 37.50% (dominating style) and 21.88% (back-up style) as per avoiding behaviour 12.50% (dominating style) and 12.50% (back-up style). In compromising behaviour only 6.25% (dominating style) and 21.88% (back-up style) followed by 3.13% (dominating style) and 6.25% (back-up style).

Table – 9
Dominant Style & Back-up Style for Senior level employees

Style	Dominant Style	Back-up Style
Collaborating	13	12
Accommodating	12	7
Avoiding	4	4
Compromising	2	7
Competing	1	2
Total	32	32

On the basis of multiple regression analysis in Table- 5, it has been observed that the among the five styles the maximum contribution of collaboration style was 20.73% followed by 16.16% with accommodating style as a 5.85% with avoiding style, 2.72% with compromising style and 1.80% with competing style. Obviously, collaborative behaviour is the most preferred style, used by middle and junior employees.

While most of the people have the ability to vary their conflict response according to the situation, each of individual has a basic style for handling conflicts. The questionnaire for middle & junior level employee's approach helped the researcher to identify their preferred style for handling conflict. It has also been observed that the total variance of collaborating behaviour of middle and junior level employees is 20.73%, out of which two independent variables (sex and work experience) are most important factors to affect this behaviour. The characteristics of this conflict handling style are the ability to solve problems, maintain relationships, and better long-term solutions. which can create a win-

win situation. It is better for the organization to utilize this kind of strategy for their employees. This style is the most preferred style for middle and junior level employees to handle conflicts effectively in the organization.

On the basis of multiple regression analysis in Table- 7, it has been observed that the among the five styles the maximum contribution of competing style was 18.93% followed by 17.91% with collaborating style as a 12.12% with accommodating style, 8.41% with avoiding style and 7.48% with compromising style. Table- 7, also showed that the total variance of competing behaviour of senior employees is 18.93%, out of which two independent variables (work experience and age) are most important factors to affect the competing style. The characteristics of this style are highly goal-oriented, need to win at any cost, exercise own sense of power, etc. which can create a win–lose situation. It is good for the organization to use this type of strategy for their senior employees but there are some disadvantages i.e., feeling of alienation of others, relationship take on a lower priority, etc. The preferred style (competing style) is being mostly used by management for handling conflict.

The second foremost preferred style for management is collaboration style, which has total variance (17.91%), out of which independent variables (sex, age and qualification) are most important factors to affect this style. For organizational prospective, it can be said that the most preferred style is collaborating style. The difference of total variance of these two most preferred styles is only 1.02%, ultimately its observed that the most preferred style is collaborating style.

VIII.   DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

On the basis of findings of the study, it is observed that Collaborating is considered to the one of the best strategies, especially when the company interest are at the stake, this strategies is generally used when organization feel that the concern is important. This strategy is mainly used in all organizations, where we must resolve interpersonal conflicts. It promotes creative problem solving. It takes more time than other strategies. This statement was supported by the Ms. Surity, on her article "Handling Conflict in Organization".

Conflict can serve as a constructive mechanism of change for the organization. Conflict can be taken positively when it comes with any loophole, which gives the chance to Management for improvement to restrict such type of situation in the future. It allows an opportunity to work with someone, who ordinarily would not, understand that conflict will happen. But do not let it damage the organization; try to resolve them as quickly as possible. There is the need of commitment of all employees for resolving such conflict which will be helpful in efficient continuity of organization towards their goal.

REFERENCES:

[1]   Ajala, E. M. (2003) The influence of peace education on labour management relations in selected industries in Oyo state, Nigeria. Ph.D. Thesis. Dept. of Adult Education. University of Ibadan.

[2]   Akintayo, D.I. (2005). Interpersonal problem solving training skills utilization and conflict resolution effectiveness among industrial workers in south-western Nigeria. Nigeria Journal of Applied Psychology. Vol. 8/9, (2/1) 115-130.

[3]   Bakare, CG. M (1992). Interpersonal problem solving and communication structure of the adolescent children. Journal of Applied Psychology, 26 (2) 83-96.

[4]   Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). The managerial grid. Houston, TX: Gulf.

[5]   Borisoff, D., & Victor, D. A. (1989). Conflict management: A communication skills approach. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

[6]   Cornille, T., Pestle, R. & Vanwy, R. (1999). Teachers' conflict management styles with peers and students' parents. The International Journal of Conflict Management, vol. 10, no : 1, pp.69-79.

[7]   Dessler, G. (1998) Management : leading people and organizations in the 21st Century, New York, Prentice Hall.

[8]   Dreyfus, C. (1999). TV on-cognitive intelligence'. Paper presented at a meeting of the National Human Resources Association of Philadelphia, Nov. 3.

[9]   Drory, A. & Ritov, I. (1997). Effects of work experience and opponen's power on conflict management styles. The International Journal of Conflict Management. vol. 8, no : 2, pp.148-161.

[10] Johnson, D.W., Johnson, R.T., and Holubec, E.J. (1986) Circles of learning: cooperation in the classroom (rev. ed.), Edina, MN: Interaction Book Co. "Workplace Basics: The Skills Employers Want," Am. Soc. Training and Devel. and U.S. Dept. Labor, Employment and Training Admin., 1988.

[11] Khun, T., & Poole, M. S. (2000). Do conflict management styles affect group decision making? Human Communication Research, 26, 558-590.

[12]   McDowell, E. (1990). A study of the relationship between willingness to communicate and Preferred Conflict Strategy: Implications for Teaching Communication and Conflict. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the International Communication Association, (4th Dublin, Ireland, June 24-28, 1999).

[13]   McShane, S. L. & VonGlinow, M. A. (2005). Organizational Behavior 3e: Emerging Relations for the Workplace Relation, Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company Limited (2005), New Delhi pp.388-394.

[14]   Pruitt, D. G. (1983). Strategic choice in negotiation. American Behavioral Scientist, 27, 167-194.

[15]   Raudsepp, E. (2002) "Hone Listening Skills To Boost Your Career," available on the World Wide Web at http://www.careerjournal.com/myc/climbingladder/20021224 raudsepp.html, accessed on 28 January 2003.

[16]   Renner, J. (2007). Coaching abroad: Insights about assets. Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 59, 271–285.

[17]   Thomas, K. W. (1976). Conflict and conflict management. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook in industrial and organizational psychology (pp. 889-935). Chicago: Rand McNally.