An Exploratory Study on Conflict Management with the Perspective of Education as a Variable

Aayushi Dalal

Student, Pandit Deendayal Petroleum University

ABSTRACT

Conflict is a disagreement between two or more parties (people/group). Conflict Management has become a key criterion in understanding how an individual handles stressful situations and indeed comes out with a "win-win" solution for both of the conflicting parties. Emotional Intelligence is often linked with an individual's conflict managing style. One of the determinants/ variables in creating the conflict management corpus in an individual is considered to be education. The researches have shown a dependent relationship between the stream of education and the conflict management techniques promptly availed by an individual. Hence, the purpose of this research was to explore a relationship between the two. A sample of 200 Final year undergraduate students was selected to aggregate the results of this study while specific focus was on the field of Computer Engineering and Management. This will allow for more psychological consideration while grooming the potential human resource for their future endeavors. The Thomas Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument; a standardized instrument, was employed to collect the primary data necessary to complete the research. A rendezvous with each of the subjects was conducted in a quiet environment where they filled up the questionnaire and asked questions regarding the same (if any). It was made sure that the effect of environmental factors on the subjects was as minimal as possible; however, due to human factors it is not completely avoidable. This as such resulted into a Quantitative Research. The findings of this research would materialize a framework for training the students for organizational conflicts and subsequently its managing techniques while they are in the university itself. This would ameliorate the circumstances for both them as well as their prospective employer.

Keywords: Conflict Management, Education, Psychology, Human Resource, Computer Engineering, Management, Thomas Kilmann.

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1 Purpose

In conflicting situations, the behavior of one person is hampering, obstructing or in some other way making the other person's reactions less effective (Tjosvold, 1997, pg.24). It can also stem when the individual participants have contradictory goals or as a result of shortage of resources (Boulding, 1963; Deutsh, 1962, 1973; Hocker & Wilmot, 1991; Rubin, Pruit, Kim, 1994). Conflict subconsciously permeates in the lives of adolescents. "Conflicts in school centre around name calling and disrespect; gossip and rumours, stolen or damaged property; and dating or friendships issues (Burrell and Vogl, 1990; Ohio Commission on Dispute Resolution and Conflict Management, 1993)." Though it is quite confusing but conflict has the potential positive outcomes as well. Promoting self growth, causing mutual understanding, and refining individual personality and values are some of the examples. Many a times, however, these positive outcomes go unnoticed because young adults often engage in poor conflict management skills and subsequently they tend to manage their conflicts in deleterious ways (Johnson, Johnson, Dudley, Mitchell & Frederickson, 1997). The purpose of this research is to compare the Conflict Management Styles employed by individuals from different streams of education. Particularly, in this paper, the focus is on students from the two upcoming streams, Management stream and Technology (Engineering) stream. The reason why conflict management should be investigated further and developed for effective usage in the education sector is that these students are the prospective employees and the future human resource, hence training them for effective conflict management will not only be beneficial for the employer (organization) but it is also constructive for the psychological well being of the employee (student). Therefore, knowing how to tackle such conflicting situations and consequently reaching towards a common objective is one of the most essential skill adolescents can possess. Further, the study aims also find a correlation between the field of education and the conflict management style employed by the student. This will help in foreseeing and managing conflicts. Finally, this study

aims to contribute with further knowledge of how to effectively handle functional conflicts and to motivate others to do complementary research in this area.

Research Question

1. Which are the different conflict management approaches?
2. What are different conflict management techniques used by students from different educational background?
3. How do the techniques employed by individuals from different educational backgrounds differ?

2.2   Objectives

The objective of this study is to explore the area of conflict management further. This research is aimed to identify and compare the different conflict management approaches used by individuals from different educational backgrounds. Organizations face conflicting situations on a very frequent basis. As a result, a lot of valuable time which could be devoted to other significant activity gets wasted in resolving conflicts. Developing an approach which attacks the roots of conflicts is the most efficient way to truncate the time lost. This research is most beneficial for universities as then they would educate their students regarding the same thus making them a powerful future human resource.

2.3   Background

A project team is often defined as 'two or more people with some shared purpose who assume different responsibilities, depend on each other, coordinate their activities, and see themselves as part of the group' (Boddy, 2002, p.108). Usually, a team would have individuals from a variety of backgrounds so as to bring a wide range of knowledge to the table. As a result, difference in perspective and conflicts are bound to happen. An effective and efficient team would learn to work around these conflicts for their own good as well the organization's good. According to Tuckman and Jensen (1977), a team passes through five stages namely: Forming, Storming, Norming, Performing, Adjourning. Out of these five stages, Storming is the most critical stage. It is here where maximum amount of conflicts can occur as the team is brainstorming regarding the given project. Successful conflict management and resolution in this stage is crucial for the survival of the team and for delivering the objective efficiently.

There are different types of conflicts, apart from intra group conflict which was mentioned above, the other types of conflicts are: Inter Personal, Intra Personal and Inter Group. Knowing to deal with all these is equally important not just in the organizational setting but also in personal setting. Thus, learning conflict management techniques at university level is beneficial for students as prospective employees and for organizations as future employers as their training costs could be saved. Contradictorily, Ginnett and Curphy (2009) claims that from a conflict, positive outcomes could also arise and that could happen only after successful resolution of conflict. Positive effects such as, improved decision making, simulation of critical thinking, enhanced understanding of each other and healthy relationship among subordinates could be achieved (Kinnander, 2011).

3.   THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1   Approaches to Manage Conflict

"Conflict Situations" are situations in which the concern of two people appears to be   incompatible. In such situations we can describe a person's behavior along two basic dimensions:

- Assertiveness: The extent to which an individual attempts to satisfy his/her own concern.
- Cooperativeness: The extent to which an individual attempts to satisfy the other person's concern.

1. Accommodating
   It is low on assertiveness and high on cooperativeness. When accommodating, an individual neglects his/her own concerns to satisfy the concerns of the other person, there are elements of self-sacrifice in this mode: Accommodating might take the form of selfless generosity or charity, obeying another person's order when one would prefer not to, or yielding to another's point of view. The emphasis is on the common interests of the conflicting group and a de-emphasis on their differences. When the issue in conflict is more important to the other person than your own self, accommodating is a viable approach (Thomas & Kilmann, 1976). Also, cases in which an individual is trying to build up his/her social credits for future more important issues accommodating can be best used (Thomas & Kilmann, 1976). However, repetitive use of this approach may portray the individual as weak and thus he/she may not garner respect from his/her opponents (Jones T.S & Brinkert R., 2008).

2. Collaborating

    It is being both assertive and cooperative. It demands complete rethinking of the situation. Collaborating involves an attempt to work with the other person to find some solution, which fully satisfies the concern of both the persons. It means digging into an issue to identify the underlying concerns of the two individuals and to find an alternative which meets both sets of concerns. Collaborating between two persons might take the form of exploring a disagreement to learn from each other's insights, concluding to resolve some conditions which would otherwise have them competing for resources, or confronting and trying to find a creative solution to an interpersonal problem.

    Situations when the concern of both parties are too important to be compromised or when the objective of the conflict is to learn, collaborating is the best applicable approach (Thomas & Kilmann, 1976). Collaborating takes time to implement hence it may not be appropriate at all times (Jones T.S & Brinkert R., 2008). Also, the trust and good will needed for collaboration may not be always present (Jones T.S & Brinkert R., 2008).

3. Avoiding

    It is being unassertive and uncooperative. The individual does not immediately pursue his own concerns or those of the other person. He does not address the conflict. Avoiding might take the form of diplomatically side stepping the issue, postponing an issue for a better time or simply withdrawing from a threatening situation.

    Situations such as when the issue or the relationship is of low importance, the damage of confrontation outweighs the benefits of resolution, there is need for addressing more information or others can more effectively resolve the conflict, avoidance of the conflict makes sense (Thomas & Kilmann, 1976). It is also an appropriate approach when a relatively weak party has a very strong opponent (Thomas & Kilmann, 1976). On the other hand, when the motivation to avoid is not clear to the other party, it may intensify the existing conflict (Jones T.S & Brinkert R., 2008).

4. Competing

    It is being assertive and uncooperative- an individual pursues his own concern at the other person's expense. This is power oriented mode, in which one uses whatever power seems appropriate to win one's own position- one's ability to argue, one's rank, economic sanctions. Competing might mean "standing up for your right", defending a position that you believe is correct or simply trying to win. Such a style generally creates forces that aggravate the struggle and does little to discover innovative, constructive solutions acceptable to all.

    At times when quick decision is important or when the decision is very important to the company and the individual knows that he/she is right, competing is the best approach (Thomas & Kilmann, 1976). Competing takes less time than all other approaches. However, a leader who is relying on competing approach may find the people under his control unwilling to speak up (Jones T.S & Brinkert R., 2008).

5. Compromising

    It is an intermediate in both assertiveness and cooperativeness. The objective is to find some expedient, mutually acceptable solution, which partially satisfies both parties. It falls on a middle ground between competing and accommodating. Compromising gives up more than competing but less than accommodating. Likewise, it addresses an issue more directly than avoiding, but does not explore it in as much depth as collaborating. Compromising might mean splitting the difference, exchanging concessions, or seeking a quick middle-ground position.

    Situations when the two opposing parties are of equal stature and support mutually exclusive goals or when temporary decisions need to be made quickly, compromising can be a reasonable approach (Thomas & Kilmann, 1976). Though, it does not usually work for issues of principle that are not subject to trade off (Jones T.S & Brinkert R., 2008). Also, it may not show sufficient concern for the relationship to ensure effective solution implementation (Jones T.S & Brinkert R., 2008).

Hughes, Ginnett and Curphy (2009) suggests that instead of finding a best approach generally, focus should instead be on determining when a certain approach is appropriate. It is also highlighted that each approach comes with diverse advantages and disadvantages.

A cooperative conflict management approach in which individuals openly discuss their differences to combine their suggestions and interests has been proven to facilitate the decision-making process and also strengthening relationships among individuals. However, some researchers have pointed out that everybody does not have the ability and the yearning to make this approach work (Deutsch, 1973; Thomas et al., 1978). Alternative approaches to conflict management include:

(1) Compromise. Deutsch (1973) and Tjosvold (1977b) have shown that bargainers who are willing to compromise are able to reach mutually beneficial agreements and develop positive attitudes.

(2) Arguing strongly, Deutsch (1973) and Tjosvold (1977a) found that assertive presentation of one's own view conveys credibility and may induce the other person to listen and respond. However, attempts to force one's views on the other person can escalate conflict (Lawrence and Lorsch, 1969; Tjosvold and Deemer, 1980).

(3) Avoidance. Tjosvold and Deemer (1980) found that conflict avoidance can lead to improved attitudes and feelings.

(4) Third party mediation. Glasl (1980) contends that third parties aid exchange of information, concession-making, and finding solutions.

In addition to identifying the viable conflict management approaches, a contingency model has to specify situational variables which affect the effectiveness of each approach. Glasl (1980), for example, has proposed that as the level of conflict intensifies, the appropriate third party intervention moves from helping the participants communicate and decide to provide a solution for the participants. Extending that idea one might speculate that the appropriateness of the five conflict management approaches listed above varies as a function of conflict level intensity. This possibility was examined in an exploratory way in the present study.

3.2 Literature Review

There is fascinating evidence that teaching conflict management skills helps students in developing interpersonal relationships and enhancing their understanding of core curriculum subjects (Tschannen-Moran, 2001). High school English students in one study received conflict training in combination with the study of a novel for a two-week period (Tschannen-Moran, 2001). A control group spent the same two-week period studying just the novel (Tschannen-Moran, 2001). At the end of the two-week period, the students who had received conflict training scored considerably more on a test over the novel than the students who had spent the whole time studying the novel (Tschannen-Moran, 2001). The trained students not only learnt the factual information better but also were better able to interpret the information in intuitive ways (Stevahn, Johnson, Johnson, Green & Laginski, 1997).

Conflict management education is important not only from the organizational perspective. It helps in combating situations of youth violence and outburst in schools and colleges and also makes students better citizens (Tschannen-Moran, 2001). A study in which 50 schools in Ohio received grants by The Ohio Commission of Dispute Resolution and Conflict Management and The Ohio Department of Education to include conflict management training in their curriculum observed that, "Of the 50 participating schools, 48 of them still had the program three years later. In some schools the program had grown and flourished. Others were limping along, struggling to cope with obstacles and challenges that made application difficult. Some schools noticed only modest improvements as a result of these programs, while others experienced dramatic reductions in the number of fights and suppressions"(Tschannen-Moran, 2001).

From the organizational perspective, effective resolution of intra group conflicts helps in team building and increasing team effectiveness. In modern organizations, teams are the means for responding quickly to changing technological and market needs and as a result for organization's survival (Illgen, Hollenbeck, Johnson & Jundt, 2006; Richter, West, van Dick & Dawson, 2006). Time and again research has proven that it not just the mere presence of conflict that affects teams; rather, how the team members respond to and manage the conflict has a lot of say in whether the conflict is constructive or destructive (Ayoko, Hartel & Cullen, 2002; De dreu & van de Vliert, 1997). Theoretical justification for studying conflict management in teams is justified by three types of literature (Somech, Desivilya and Lidogoster, 2009). The first type includes studies on situation specific factors which tend to influence the way individuals manage conflicts (Eisenberg & Fames, 1988; George & Jones, 1997). The assumption under this approach is that, the conflict management styles employed by each individual is situation specific and is influenced by the organizational structure, organizational behaviour and work design (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1988). The second set of studies focuses on group arena like group norms and workplace atmosphere (Somech, Desivilya and Lidogoster, 2009). These studies suggest that teams, at times can serve as prevailing sources of norms regarding how their members should handle disagreements if any were to come their way (Ehrhart & Naumann, 2004). According to Jehn (1997), groups in which there is flexibility or openness about norms, members willingly discussed issues and openly showed feelings of conflict. The third group of studies examines the social learning theory which means that individuals learn by observing the behaviour of others (Bandura, 1986). When a team member models a particular conflict management style significant number of times, the more likely it is for others to behave consistently with that model, precisely when that behaviour is associated with positive social consequences (Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997).

3.3 Conflict Coaching

According to Jones and Brinkert (2008, p.4,5), Conflict coaching is a process in which a coach and a client communicate one-on-one for the purpose of developing the client's conflict-related understanding, interaction strategies, and interaction skills. The definition is broad in that it encompasses different forms of communication between the coach and the client.

The research-based peer mediation programs began in the 1960s with the "Teaching Students to be Peacemakers Program" (D. W. Johnson, 1970, 1991, 1997; D. W. Johnson & F. Johnson, 1997; D. W. Johnson & R. Johnson, 1979, 1995b, 1995c; D. W. Johnson, R. Johnson, & F. Johnson, 1976). It was derived from the social interdependence theory (Deutsch, 1949; D. W. Johnson & R. Johnson, 1989; Lewin, 1951) and it focused on teaching all students in a school the nature of conflict, how to use an integrative negotiation procedure, and how to mediate peer conflicts. All students then took turns at being a class and school mediator. A similar program was initiated by Morton Deutsch (1992) in the 1990's. Peer conflict mediation is one type of conflict resolution education. It is a type of service learning as it includes not only training the students but also the establishment of active roles for the students.

4. METHODOLOGY

This chapter will describe in detail how the research for this study has been performed, the chosen methods and the reason why they have been used. Further, it will also address the way the data has been collected, the reliability of the data, correlation between the sub variables and the way the data has been analyzed. Research limitations will also be underlined and the ethical and moral considerations would also be specifically stated.

4.1 Type of Research

This research will be based on literature review as well as experimentation. Literature review includes relevant journal articles, published research papers and books within the area of conflict management and teaching conflict management to students. The data is gathered by a one on one rendezvous with each of the subjects while they filled up the Thomas Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument (TKI). Their individual responses were analyzed as per the TKI scoring guidelines and appropriate responses were returned to the subjects within a week of the study.

The sample for the study included 201 students out of which 101 students were from management background and 100 students were from engineering background.

4.2 Limitations

This research will focus on how students from different educational background respond to conflicting situations. Data collected through that would form the basis of the next level of the study as to which stream needs what kind of training in order to effectively manage conflicts.

Organizational functional and dysfunctional conflicts will not be a part of this research. The research would be done from a general perspective and exceptional cases regarding virtual teams would also not be taken into considerations.

Cultural factors such as race, religion, caste and different beliefs and values would not be specifically addressed as probable causes of a particular conflict management style employed by individuals in the research. Geographical proximity is an influencing factor in choosing the sample population. Instead of focusing on the sources of conflicts, the research investigates the different approaches to conflict management and how to use all those styles effectively under different situations.

5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS.

Primary Observation at a Glance

Table 1 shows level of the answers of the students from both engineering and management field for the competing parameter. These findings indicated that more number of management students than engineering students assessed their use of competing style of conflict management as low. It can thus be implied that a significantly larger proportion of management students are unaware of the power that they possess or an unwilling to use their power. Whereas, a considerable percentage engineering students have assessed themselves as average users of competitive conflict management style than management students. This means that engineering students are aware about their competencies and where they can use their power and where it is better to give up their stand.

Similarly, Table 2 shows the answers of the students from both engineering and management field for the collaborating parameter. Approximately the same percentage of students and a trivial percentage have assessed their use of collaborating

conflict management style as high. This is a major concern because scoring high in this parameter could mean that the student is concerned with not only promoting his/her own ideas but also their respective opponent's opinion as well. Another observation could be made regarding the management students is that nearly half of their population have assessed their ability for collaboration as low. This means that the students are unable to handle conflicting situations in a way that benefits both the parties.

Similarly, Table 3 shows the answers of the students from both engineering and management field for the compromising parameter. Approximately the same percentages of engineering and management students have assessed their compromising conflict management style as low. A reason for this is that these students are unable to find a graceful way out of a destructive argument. Majority of engineering students have assessed their capability for compromising conflict management style as average. These students have near to perfect compromising nature- intermediate between more and less compromising. They avoid the unimportant arguments and show their competencies in the important ones.

Similarly, Table 4 shows the answers of the students from both engineering and management field for the Avoiding parameter. A higher percentage of engineering students have measured their avoiding conflict management style as low. This means that these students avoid the tasks much rather they devote their time to them and would thus prioritize their work. A higher percentage of management students have measured their avoiding conflict management style as high. This means that these students lack the confidence and are thus unable to express themselves in conflicting situations. A result of this could be flight from the situation.

Similarly, Table 5 shows the answers of the students from both engineering and management field for the Accommodating parameter. In comparison to all other styles, maximum percentage of both engineering and management students has gauged their accommodating conflict management style as high. These students are more concerned with the ideas of others than their own and thus think it is better to go with the other person's opinion rather than getting into an argument.

Question 6B says, "I try to win my position." More than half of the engineering students have shown assertion that they would do that and there is a significant proportion of difference between the percentage of engineering students choosing that

Table 1: Profile score on competing on Thomas-kilmann conflict mode instrument		Engineering	Management
High (25%)	8-12	15%	19.80%
Middle (50%)	4-7	71%	44.55%
Low (25%)	0-3	14%	35.64%

Table 2: Profile score on collaborating on Thomas-kilmann conflict mode instrument		Engineering	Management
High (25%)	10-12	2%	1.98%
Middle (50%)	6-9	67%	51.49%
Low (25%)	0-5	31%	46.53%

Table 3: Profile score on compromising on Thomas-kilmann conflict mode instrument		Engineering	Management
High (25%)	9-12	5%	15.84%
Middle (50%)	5-8	72%	60.40%
Low (25%)	0-4	23%	23.76%

Table 4: Profile score on avoiding on Thomas-kilmann conflict mode instrument		Engineering	Management
High (25%)	8-12	22%	29.70%
Middle (50%)	5-7	62%	59.41%
Low (25%)	0-4	16%	10.89%

managing style and the percentage of management students choosing that style. Management students' choice reflects that they tend to avoid creating situations of unpleasantness for themselves (Corresponding choice 6A).

Engineering students' choice in 6B is complementary to their choice in 13B which states that, "I press to get my points made." Similarly, percentage of Management students who choose that managing approach is almost the same as percentage of Management students in 6B.

The answers chosen by students in question 16B, has a very interesting take on it. The percentage of management students is approximately half of that of engineering students. The question states that, "I try to convince the other person the merits of my position". Engineering students have shown strong assertion over management students for this question. The answer choices for this parameter have thus determined that engineering students are more willing to maintain their opinion than management students.

Question 5A states that, "I consistently seek other's help in working out a solution". Nearly three times more engineering students have displayed collaborating conflict management style in this question. Contradictorily, a majority of management students have chosen collaborating as their conflict management approach in question 14A which states that, "I tell him my ideas and ask for his." This means that these students do not blindly defend their position; rather they try to understand the reasoning behind other's position as well.

Whereas, question 23A has a very interesting turn. There is only a slight variation in the percentage of engineering students and management students choosing this style. The question states that, "I am very often concerned with satisfying all our wishes". This means that the students are finding a mutually acceptable solution and trying to know the other party's opinions. However, it is interesting to note that question 26B which is the same as 23A has a totally different response. This change is because in 23A, the option choice was that of Avoiding, whereas in 26B, the option choice is of compromising. Hence, it can be noted that collaborating conflict management style is more likeable when put against avoiding rather than compromising.

Question 13A states that, "I propose middle ground". A majority of Management students have opted for compromising conflict management style for this question. This means that all of these students are willing to let go of some of their points if their opponent agrees to do the same. Question18B indirectly means what 13A states. It states that, "I will let him have some of his positions if he lets me have some of mine." However approximately 12% more management students chose compromising conflict management style in Question 13A. The reason for this discrepancy is that the other option in question 18 is Accommodating so out of the two, these students are more likely to be Compromising.

Table 5: Profile score on accommodating on Thomas-kilmann conflict mode instrument		Engineering	Management
High (25%)	7-12	46%	43.56%
Middle (50%)	4-6	49%	45.54%
Low (25%)	0-3	5%	10.89%

Table 6: Secondary observation at a glance			
Parameter	Question number	Engineering (100 students)	Management (101 students)
Competing	3A	43.00%	49.50%
	6B	57.00%	36.63%
	8A	41.00%	49.50%
	9B	52.00%	60.40%
	10A	41.00%	54.46%
	13B	53.00%	37.62%
	14B	44.00%	28.71%
	16B	59.00%	27.72%
	17A	44.00%	44.55%
	22B	45.00%	26.73%
	25A	37.00%	44.55%
	28A	35.00%	49.50%

There is a similarity between the responses for question 13A and 26A. This is because both the questions state the exact same statement. However, a slightly higher response in 26A from management students is because the other option for question 26A is Collaborating. This means that out of Collaborating and Compromising conflict management style, Compromising is a more viable option for Management students.

Question 5B makes a revealing observation. It states that, "I try to do what is necessary to avoid useless tensions." Nearly 80% of Management students are willing to do whatever is necessary to avoid tensions whereas about half of those engineering students are willing to do so. Such a large response from management students means that these students react in diplomatic ways in difficult situations.

On the other hand question 7A which states that, "I try to postpone the issue until I have had some time to think it over", has an almost equal response from both students. This is however an effective way to deal with conflicts if an immediate decision is not required or the issue in tension is of marginal importance. Question 29B reflects a similar ideology. Hence, even though there is a significant difference in the response for the two questions but there is minute difference between the responses of students from both fields. This similarity suggests that for issues of low importance, these students have similar conflict managing styles.

Question 3B and question 15A states that, "I might try to soothe the other's feelings and preserve our relationship". However, nearly 15% more students chose Accommodating in 3B than 15A. This is because in question 3 the other option is Competing and in question 15 the other option is Avoiding. Hence, it could be noted that management students have more preference towards Accommodating style if put together with Competing than Avoiding.

Question 16A states that, "I try not to hurt other's feelings". Majority of the managing students assessed their conflict managing approach as Accommodating here. This is of key importance because these students have a high tendency to put other's wishes over their own.

Question 30A and question 16A states the same situations although, there is a major inconsistency between the responses of management students. Nearly half the population has showcased this inconsistency. This is because in question 16 the other option is that of Competing whereas in question 30 the other option is that of collaborating. This proves that management students have more feasibility towards accommodating when put with competing rather than with collaborating.

6. CONCLUSION

The research concludes that management students are less likely to use competing conflict management style in conflicting situations than engineering students. This implies that management students are either reluctant to or unaware of the power they possess whereas engineering students have assessed themselves as average users of conflict management approach which means that they are willing to use their power in areas of their expertise. Majority of engineering students have scored average for collaborating approach. This indicates that although they may try to discuss the situation with their opponent but they do not go in much depth. Contradictorily, management students are scored low and average which is in unfortunate because

Table 7:			
Parameter	Question number	Engineering (100 students)	Management (101 students)
Collaborating	2B	56.00%	43.56%
	5A	59.00%	20.79%
	8B	59.00%	50.50%
	11A	39.00%	46.53%
	14A	56.00%	71.29%
	19A	52.00%	59.41%
	20A	39.00%	48.51%
	21B	47.00%	43.56%
	23A	44.00%	46.53%
	26B	57.00%	30.69%
	28B	65.00%	50.50%
	30B	53.00%	56.44%

this deprives them of the mutual gains and satisfaction. Typically engineering and management students have scored average in compromising as well though a higher percentage of engineering students have scored average than management. This denotes that they are focused above a certain level only after that they avoid the conflicts which come below that level. For avoiding, the responses of engineering and management students are similar although if individual question wise scoring is taken into consideration than management students have scored much higher in a few questions. Similarly, the overall percentages indicate that for accommodating the engineering and management students have similar scoring but question wise scoring is contradictory.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

The sample and operations limit the results of this study. This research tries to establish a relationship between education and conflict management styles. However, it is observed in the results that education is not the only parameter. The psychological thought process of the student needs to be examined as well in order to accurately establish a relationship. This is because every institution has its own set of values and cultures, thus, students from different institutes are accustomed with different work settings. Hence, further research is needed related to the psychological quotient in order to justify the influence of education. Spector and Brannick (1995) have argued that the most effective way to overcome recall and other methodological weaknesses is to test ideas with different methods. It would be desirable to provide direct experimental verification of the role of psychological growth on conflict management approaches.

Table 8:			
Parameter	Question number	Engineering (100 students)	Management (101 students)
Compromising	2A	44.00%	56.44%
	4A	33.00%	45.54%
	7B	41.00%	38.61%
	10B	59.00%	45.54%
	12B	40.00%	33.66%
	13A	47.00%	62.38%
	18B	51.00%	50.50%
	20B	61.00%	51.49%
	22A	55.00%	73.27%
	24B	41.00%	51.49%
	26A	43.00%	69.31%
	29A	52.00%	54.46%

Table 9:			
Parameter	Question number	Engineering (100 studsents)	Management (101 students)
Avoiding	1A	45.00%	38.61%
	5B	41.00%	79.21%
	6A	43.00%	63.37%
	7A	59.00%	61.39%
	9A	48.00%	39.60%
	12A	60.00%	66.34%
	15B	54.00%	64.36%
	17B	56.00%	55.45%
	19B	48.00%	40.59%
	23B	56.00%	53.47%
	27A	53.00%	56.44%
	29B	48.00%	45.54%

Table 10:			
Parameter	Question number	Engineering (100 students)	Management (101 students)
Accommodating	1B	55.00%	61.39%
	3B	57.00%	50.50%
	4B	67.00%	54.46%
	11B	61.00%	53.47%
	15A	46.00%	35.64%
	16A	41.00%	72.28%
	18A	49.00%	49.50%
	21A	53.00%	56.44%
	24A	59.00%	48.51%
	25B	63.00%	55.45%
	27B	47.00%	43.56%
	30A	47.00%	43.56%

8. QUESTIONNAIRE

Consider situations in which you find your wishes differing from those of another person. How do you usually respond to such situations?

On the following pages are several pairs of statements describing possible behavioral responses. For each pair, please circle the "A" or "B" statement which is most characteristic of your own behavior.

In many cases, neither the "A" nor the "B" statement may be very typical of your behavior, but please select the response which you would be more likely to use.

1. A. There are times when I let others take responsibility for solving the problem.
   B. Rather than negotiate the things on which we disagree, I try to stress those things upon which we both agree.
2. A. I try to find a compromise solution.
   B. I attempt to deal with all of another's and my concerns.
3. A. I am usually firm in pursuing my goals.
   B. I might try to soothe the other's feelings and preserve our relationship.
4. A. I try to find a compromise solution.
   B. I sometimes sacrifice my own wishes for the wishes of the other person.
5. A. I consistently seek the other's help in working out a solution.
   B. I try to do what is necessary to avoid useless tensions.
6. A. I try to avoid creating unpleasantness for myself.
   B. I try to win my position.
7. A. I try to postpone the issue until I have had some time to think about it.
   B. I give up some points in exchange for others.
8. A. I am usually firm in pursuing my goals.
   B. I attempt to get all concerns and issues immediately out in the open.
9. A. I feel that differences are not always worrying about.
   B. I make some effort to get my way.
10. A. I am firm in pursuing my goals.
    B. I try to find a compromise solution.
11. A. I attempt to get all concerns and issues immediately out in the open.
    B. I might try to soothe the other's feelings and preserve our relationship.
12. A. I sometimes avoid taking positions which would create controversy.
    B. I will let another have some of their positions if they let me have some of mine.
13. A. I propose middle ground.
    B. I press to get my points made.
14. A. I tell another my ideas and ask them for theirs.

B. I try to show him the logic and benefits of my position.

15. A. I might try to soothe the other's feelings and preserve our relationship.
    B. I try to do what is necessary to avoid tension.
16. A. I try not to hurt the other's feelings.
    B. I try to convince the other person of the merits of my position.
17. A. I am usually firm in pursuing my goals.
    B. I try to do what is necessary to avoid useless tensions.
18. A. If it makes the other person happy, I might let them maintain their views.
    B. I will let the other person have some of their positions if they let me have some of   mine.
19. A. I try to get all concerns and issues immediately out in the open.
    B. I try to postpone the issue until I have had some time to think it over.
20. A. I attempt to immediately work through our differences.
    B. I try to find a fair combination of gains and losses for both of us.
21. A. In approaching negotiations, I try to be considerate of the other person's feelings.
    B. I always lean toward a direct discussion of the problem.
22. A. I try to find a position that is intermediate between mine and another person's.
    B. I assert my wishes.
23. A. I am often concerned with satisfying all my wishes.
    B. There are times when I let others take responsibility for solving problems.
24. A. If the other's position seems important to them, I would try to meet their wishes.
    B. I try to get the other person to settle for a compromise.
25. A. I try to show the other person the logic and benefits of my position.
    B. In approaching negotiations, I try to be considerate of the other person's wishes.
26. A. I propose a middle ground.
    B. I am nearly always concerned with satisfying all my wishes.
27. A. I sometimes avoid taking positions that would create controversy.
    B. If it makes the other person happy, I might let them maintain their views.
28. A. I am usually firm in pursuing my goals.
    B. I feel that differences are not always worth worrying about.
29. A. I propose middle ground.
    B. I feel that differences are not always worth worrying about.
30. A. I try not to hurt the other person's feelings.
    B. I always share the problem with the other person so that we can work it out.

9. REFERENCES

1. Andrews, I. R., & Tjosvold, D. (1983). Conflict management under different levels of conflict intensity. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, 4(3), 223-228.
2. Ayoko, O. B., Härtel, C. E. J., & Cullen, V. J. (2002). Resolving the puzzle of productive and destructive conflict in culturally heterogeneous work groups: A communication accommodation theory approach. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 13, 165-187.
3. Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundation of thought and action: Social theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
4. Bickmore, K. (2001). Student conflict resolution, power "sharing" in schools, and citizenship education. *Curriculum inquiry*, 31(2), 137-162.
5. Boddy, D. (2002) *Managing Projects*. Edinburgh Gate: Pearson Education.
6. Boulding, (1963). *Conflict and defense*. New York: Harper and Row.
7. Burrell, N. & Vogl, S. (1990). Turf-side conflict mediation for students. *Mediation Quarterly* 7, 237- 250.
8. De Dreu, C., & van de Vliert, E. (1997). *Using conflict in organizations*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
9. Deutsch, M. (1949). A theory of cooperation and competition. *Human Relations*, 2, 129- 152.
10. Deutsch, M. (1962). Cooperation and trust: Some theoretical notes. In Jones, M. R. (Ed.). *Nebraska symposium on motivation*, (pp. 275-319). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
11. Deutsch, M. (1973). *The Resolution of Conflict*, Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn.
12. Deutsch, M. (1973). *The resolution of conflict*. New Haven, CT: Yale University
13. Deutsch, M. (1992). *The effects of training in conflict resolution and cooperative learning in an alternative high school*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, International Center for Cooperation and Conflict Resolution.
14. Ehrhart, M. G., & Naumann, S. E. (2004). Organizational citizenship behavior in work groups: A group norms approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 960-974.
15. Eisenberg, N., & Fabes, R. A. (1988). The development of prosocial behavior from a life-span perspective. In P.B. Baltes, D. L. Featherman,

& R. M. Learner (Eds.), *Life-span development and behavior* (pp. 173-202) Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

16. George, J. M., & Jones, G. R. (1997). Organizational spontaneity in context. *Human Performance*, 10, 153-170.

17. Glasl, F. (1980). 'The process of escalation of conflicts and role of third parties'. Paper presented at the, *Congress on Conflict Management*, Nijenrode.

18. Hocker, J. L. & Wilmot, W. W. (1991). *Interpersonal conflict* (3rd edition). Dubuque, IA: William Brown.

19. Hughes, R. Ginnett, R. and Curphy, G. (2009) *Leadership: Enhancing the Lessons of Experience*. 6th edn. New York: McGraw Hill.

20. Illgen, D. R., Hollenbeck, J. R., Johnson, M., & Jundt, D. (2006). Teams in organizations: IMOI models. *Annual Review*, 56, 517-543.

21. Jehn, K. A. (1997). A qualitative analysis of conflict types and dimensions in organizational groups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42, 530-557.

22. Johnson, D. W. (1970). *Social psychology of education*. Edina, MN: Interaction Book.

23. Johnson, D. W. (1991). *Human relations and your career* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

24. Johnson, D. W. (1997). *Reaching out: Interpersonal effectiveness and self-actualization* (6th ed.). Englewood Cliff, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

25. Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, F. (1997). *Joining together: Group theory and group skills* (6th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

26. Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (1979). Conflict in the classroom: Controversy and learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 49, 51-61.

27. Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (1989). *Cooperation and competition: Theory and research*. Edina, MN: Interaction Book.

28. Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (1995b). *My mediation notebook* (3rd ed.). Edina: Interaction Book.

29. Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (1995c). *Teaching students to be peacemakers* (3rd ed.). Edina, MN: Interaction Book.

30. Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1996). Conflict resolution and peer mediation programs in elementary and secondary schools: A review of the research. *Review of Educational research*, 66(4), 459-506.

31. Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R., & Johnson, F. (1976). Promoting constructive conflict in the classroom. *Notre Dame Journal of Education*, 7, 163-168.

32. Johnson, D.W. & Johnson, R., Dudley, B., Mitchell, J. & Frederickson, J. (1997). The impact conflict resolution training on middle school students. *The journal of Social Psychology*, 137 (1), 11-21.

33. Jones, T. S., & Brinkert, R. (2007). *Conflict coaching: Conflict management strategies and skills for the individual*. Sage Publications.

34. Kinnander, M. (2011). Conflict Management How to manage functional conflicts within project teams.

35. Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science*. New York: Harper.

36. Ohio Commission on Dispute Resolution and Conflict Management (1993). *Dealing with conflict in Ohio's schools*. Columbus, OH.

37. Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestions for future research. *Human Performance*, 1, 133-151.

38. Richter, A. W., West, M. A., van Dick, R., & Dawson, J. F. (2006). Boundary spanners identification, contact, and effective intergroup relations. *The Academy of Management Journal,* 49, 1252-1269.

39. Rubin, J. Z. Pruit, D. G. & Kim, T. (1 994). *Social conflict: Escalation, stalemate, and settlement*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

40. Schaubhut, N. A. (2007). TM Technical Brief for the THOMAS-KILMANN CONFLICT MODE INSTRUMENT Description of the Updated Normative Sample and Implications for Use.

41. Somech, A., Desivilya, H. S., & Lidogoster, H. (2009). Team conflict management and team effectiveness: The effects of task interdependence and team identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30(3), 359-378.

42. Stevahn, L, Johnson, D.W., Johnson, R., Green, K. & Laginski, A. (1997). Effects of integrating conflict resolution training into English literature on high school students. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 737,302-315.

43. Thomas, K. W. (1974). *Thomas-Kilmann conflict mode instrument*. Tuxedo, NY: Xicom.

44. Thomas, K. W., Jamieson, D. W. and Moore, R. K. (1978). 'Conflict and collaboration: Some concluding observations', *California Management Review*, 21, 91-96.

45. Tjosvold, D. (1977a). 'The constituent's affirmation and the opposing negotiator's self-presentation in conflict between unequal status groups', *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 18, 146-157.

46. Tjosvold, D. (1977b). 'Low power person's strategies in bargaining: Negotiatibility of demand, maintaining face, and race', *International Journal of Group Tensions*, 7, 29-41.

47. Tjosvold, D. (1997). Conflict within interdependence: Its value for productivity and individuality. In K.W. C. De Dreu & E. Van de Vliert, *Using Conflict in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

48. Tjosvold, D. and Deemer, D. K. (1980). 'Effects of controversy within a cooperative or competitive context on organizational decision-making', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 5, 590-595.

49. Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). The effects of a state-wide conflict management initiative in schools. *American Secondary Education,* 2-32.

50. Tuckman, B. W., & Jensen, M. A. C. (1977). Stages of small-group development revisited. *Group & Organization Management*, 2(4), 419-427.

51. Spector, P. E., & Brannick, M. T. (1995). The nature and effects of method variance in organizational research. In C. L. Cooper, & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 249-274). Chichester: Wiley.