

Analysis of Conflict Management Styles and Organisational Performance

Marwa Al Kabbani, Serene Dalati

Faculty of Business Administration, Arab International University, Syria

s-dalati@aiu.edu.sy

Received date: Jul. 29, 2024, revision date: Dec. 22, 2024, Accepted: Jan.13, 2025

ABSTRACT

This research presents a theoretical review of conflict management styles based on the Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Management Model and their impact on organizational performance. It examines how each of the five styles—competing, accommodating, avoiding, collaborating, and compromising—affects key performance indicators such as productivity, employee morale, and interpersonal relationships within organizations. By reviewing existing literature, this paper highlights the importance of adapting conflict management strategies to fit different organizations' specific cultural and situational needs. Notably, the discussion focuses on the collaborating and accommodating styles, highlighting how the collaborating style supports effective communication and shared problem-solving while the accommodating style builds relationships through compromise and support. The review indicates that prioritizing these two styles can improve conflict resolution and foster a supportive organizational environment. Additionally, it highlights the need for specific training programs to equip employees with essential skills for managing conflicts effectively, which can eventually enhance overall organizational performance.

Keywords: conflict, conflict management, conflict management styles, Thomas-Kilmann instrument, organizational performance, key performance indicators.

1. Introduction

In organizations, dealing with complex and unpredictable environments is an ongoing challenge, where conflicts among stakeholders are a natural part of human interactions. These conflicts often arise from various factors, including differing goals, interests, and personal differences, which can significantly influence employee performance and, ultimately, organizational success.

Disputes can arise when people fail to meet their role expectations or have conflicting interests. This makes conflict management essential for maintaining good performance in organizations. Rather than perceiving conflicts merely as disruptive forces, effective conflict management can turn these tensions into opportunities. This helps create a culture that boosts productivity, employee morale, and long-term efficiency. The results of conflicts—whether they stimulate creativity and enhance job performance or lower motivation and efficiency—depend significantly on how these conflicts are managed.

The Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Management Model provides a comprehensive framework with five distinct styles for addressing conflicts: competing, collaborating, compromising, avoiding, and accommodating. These styles are distinguished by their levels of assertiveness—prioritizing one's own needs—and cooperativeness, emphasizing the needs of others. For instance, the collaborating style combines high levels of assertiveness and cooperativeness, encouraging joint problem-solving and engagement, while the accommodating style, which prioritizes the needs of others, can create temporary harmony but may lead to dissatisfaction if one's own needs are consistently ignored.

The model also includes competing, characterized by assertiveness with low cooperation; avoiding, which involves low engagement on both fronts; and compromising, which seeks a middle ground.

Among these styles, collaboration and accommodation emerge as two influential approaches. Collaborating, which fosters win-win scenarios, is often linked to positive outcomes like increased engagement and effective relationships, contributing to organizational performance. Meanwhile, accommodating while promoting harmony can occasionally impact individual satisfaction if relied upon too heavily.

This review examines how various conflict management styles affect organizational performance indicators, such as effectiveness, efficiency, and productivity, by examining these styles in different organizational contexts. Aligning conflict management strategies with specific situations within an organization can lead to positive outcomes, ultimately contributing to a productive and cohesive workplace that aligns with organizational objectives and supports sustainable growth.

2. Concept of Conflict

Since the dawn of humanity, conflict has been acknowledged as a fundamental aspect of our existence. It is intricately interwoven into the essence of life and the progression of humanity, as each person possesses distinct traits that contribute to the continuously evolving narrative of humankind. (Jumawan et al., 2024). "Conflict is generally defined as a disagreement between two or more individuals or groups, each trying to assert its own perspective." (Thakore, 2013, p. 7). People express varying perspectives on how to fulfill their desires and interests, often facing challenges in achieving their objectives. The vast array of potential differences among people leads to conflicts in various types of human relationships and across all social settings. (Kilag et al., 2024). Scholars demonstrate a wide range of theoretical perspectives on conflict, influenced by varying contextual factors, disciplinary boundaries, and diverse conceptual frameworks. Robbins (2005) defines conflict as a process that begins when one party perceives that another party has been negatively affected or is about to affect something the first party cares about negatively. This definition emphasizes that conflict often arises from perceptions rather than objective facts, highlighting its emotional and subjective nature.

According to Folger, Poole, and Stutman (2009), conflict is defined as the interaction of mutually dependent individuals who recognize a lack of compatibility, and the potential for disruption by others stemming from this perceived incompatibility is a significant aspect of conflict dynamics. This viewpoint emphasizes that conflict is not solely a product of tangible incompatibilities but is often rooted in perceived differences. In this context, communication is pivotal in influencing these perceptions. While issues in communication can exacerbate conflicts, it is essential to note that the most profound conflicts typically arise from genuine conflicts of interest.

While some view conflict as a divisive force that disrupts social harmony. For instance, Durkheim regarded conflict as an aberrant occurrence, characterizing it as anomie or a form of pathology. (Sipova, 1989, as cited in Thakore, 2013) similarly, Wilson and Kolb (1949, as cited in Thakore, 2013) stated that conflict has a disjunctive impact.

In contrast, other scholars argue that conflict can contribute to social cohesion and unity. For example, Park and Burgess (1921) and Simmel (1955, as cited in Thakore, 2013) viewed conflict as a means of preventing total disintegration and maintaining some form of unity. Additionally, Bohannan (1967) and Thakore (2013) identified conflict as essential to both culture and social structure.

Conflict is also a fundamental aspect of work teams and human interactions, often manifesting as disagreement, hostility, or rivalry. Larfela (1988) supports this view by defining conflict as "part of the competition process that is basic to the survival and successful evolution of Homo sapiens and to the search for new and better ways to cope with limited resources and stress from environmental change." This perspective underscores that conflict is a constant element in interactions among people, groups, and organizations. By integrating these perspectives, it becomes evident that conflict can be viewed both as a disruptive force as well as a catalyst for social cohesion and adaptation.

2.1. Organizational Conflict

As we navigate the scholarly discourse on conflict, we narrow our scope to examine organizational conflict in more detail. According to Thakore (2013), organizational conflict, also known as workplace conflict, arises when incompatible activities, different perspectives, and competing demands collide within an organization. Organizational conflict is defined as the behavior intended to obstruct the achievement of some other person's goals. Conflict is, therefore, a product of the incompatibility of goals and arises from opposing behaviors.

According to Neupane (2022), organizational conflict is a state of disagreement or misunderstanding between individuals or groups working within the same organization. This conflict directly results from competing demands, perceptions, beliefs, values, or goals. Conflict is an unavoidable aspect of organizational dynamics, as Lewis, French, and Stein (1997) noted. The inherent structure of organizations fosters the formation of distinct groups that vie for limited resources, thereby resulting in conflict. Rivers (2005) suggests that categorization into "us" and "them" groups is sufficient to cause conflict, a principle referred to as social identity theory; such categorization takes place when groups are established to fulfill distinct roles within an organization (Neupane, 2022).

Applebaum, Abdullah, and Shapiro (1999) expand upon this concept, arguing that conflict is a social interaction process involving struggles over resources, power, status, beliefs, preferences, and desires. Roloff (1987, as cited in Rahim, 2002) adds that organizational conflict arises when individuals participate in actions that are at odds with the endeavors of their colleagues, other teams, or external parties utilizing the organization's services or products; such conflict is an unavoidable aspect of contemporary life, influenced by current trends (Neupane, 2022).

Kieliszek (2019) points out that constant change, increased employee diversity, the rise of virtual and self-managed teams, and decreased face-to-face communication due to technology and the global economy are all factors that contribute to the inevitability of organizational conflict (Kilag et al., 2024).

In organizational environments, conflicts frequently emerge due to a variety of factors, including divergent interpretations of rules or policies, competition among individuals or departments, differing needs, or disputes regarding the methods to attain shared objectives (Nurjanah, 2022).

Conflict within the workplace can result in swift and detrimental effects on individual and collective relationships. If not appropriately addressed, it may cause considerable losses in time and resources, thereby impacting productivity and efficiency across individual, group, and organizational dimensions (Neupane, 2022).

While conflict is an inherent aspect of social interactions, it can still be effectively managed within organizational settings. Implementing effective conflict management strategies is essential for preserving

harmony and collaboration in the workplace. In short, it can be inferred that within the workplace, employees are susceptible to a range of conflicts that stem from factors such as personality traits, cultural values, beliefs, perceptions, worldviews, and role ambiguities. Therefore, it is essential to engage in discussions regarding the constructive and/or destructive nature of these conflicts, as this understanding will facilitate effective management strategies aimed at improving employee productivity and efficiency.

2.2. Constructive versus Destructive Conflict Perspective

According to Vokic and Sontor (2009), three primary theoretical frameworks exist regarding the nature of conflict: traditional, behavioral, and interactionist (Folger, Poole, & Stutman, 2009).

From the 1930s to the 1950s, the traditional perspective dominated, characterizing conflict as undesirable. However, during the 1960s, behavioral organizational scholars began to assert that conflict is an unavoidable aspect of organizational dynamics that must be acknowledged and addressed (Jones & White, 1985). In contrast, contemporary interactionists view conflict as a potentially advantageous phenomenon within organizations (Banner, 1995, as cited in Folger, Poole, & Stutman, 2009).

Numerous studies have highlighted the detrimental aspects of workplace conflict, indicating that it often leads to negative emotions, increased employee turnover, and expensive legal disputes (Hirschman, 2001, as cited in Folger, Poole, & Stutman, 2009). This phenomenon poses significant challenges for employees (Phillips & Cheston, 1979) and is frequently regarded as one of the most frustrating and distressing experiences for management (Earnest & McCaslin, 1994). Furthermore, conflict can potentially halt the functioning of groups, departments, and even entire organizations (Fritchie & Leary, 1998).

Deutsch (1973) introduced a widely discussed theory (Kochan, 1974) that distinguishes between constructive and destructive conflicts, elucidating the factors that render a conflict either productive and beneficial or harmful and detrimental. Kochan (1974) summarized vital points: (1) conflict can be either cooperative or competitive; (2) cooperation generally fosters constructive outcomes while competition tends to yield destructive results; (3) both cooperation and competition can act as self-fulfilling prophecies, where perceptions shape reality; and (4) while cooperation can easily shift into competition, the reverse is not as readily achievable (Coltri, 2004, as cited in Folger, Poole, & Stutman, 2009).

The foundational concepts of Deutsch's theory encompass (1) "cooperative conflict," characterized by a situation where the involved parties perceive that aiding one party simultaneously benefits the other; (2) "competitive conflict," where one party believes that their self-advancement diminishes the power of the opposing party; (3) "autistic hostility," which refers to a state where hostile emotions hinder communication, resulting in negative interpretations of the other party's actions, attitudes, and intentions; (4) "reactive devaluation," a phenomenon observed in escalating conflicts where proposals from one party are met with skepticism by the opposing party, and (5) "meta-conflict," which involves disputes regarding the management of another interpersonal conflict (Coltri, 2004; Hafeez, 2005, as cited in Folger, Poole, & Stutman, 2009). Building on the research of Deutsch (1973) and Coltri (2004), Hafeez (2005) introduced two distinct cycles: the competition cycle of conflict and the cooperation cycle of conflict. The "competition cycle" elucidates the internal mechanisms of competitive conflict, providing insights to facilitate the transition from competitive to cooperative conflict. Conversely, the "cooperation cycle" illustrates the dynamics of cooperative conflict, which can yield constructive outcomes. To facilitate the transformation from competitive to cooperative conflict, Hafeez (2005) recommended several strategies, including (i) the judicious use of verbal communication, (ii) the assignment of joint tasks, (iii) the enhancement of

communication channels, (iv) the establishment of fundamental rules for respectful communication; (v) the identification of a common adversary; (vi) shifting blame from the opposing party to the process itself; (vii) highlighting shared interests and agreements; (viii) implementing trust-building exercises; and (ix) creating an open information-sharing system (Folger, Poole, & Stutman, 2009).

Drawing on the work of Deutsch (1973), Tjosvold (1986a) introduced a model of interdependence that elucidates the influence of values, tasks, and rewards on organizational interactions. This model posits that elements such as a shared vision, a supportive culture, collaborative tasks, and mutual rewards foster cooperative interdependence and enhance member interaction. Conversely, distrust, individual tasks, and competitive rewards tend to promote a competitive atmosphere (Tjosvold & Tsao, 1989). Empirical research, including field experiments, indicates that employees who adopt a cooperative approach are more likely to share resources, aid one another, and engage in constructive conflict resolution, thereby achieving win-win outcomes (Tjosvold, 1986b; Johnson, Johnson & Maruyama, 1983). Such cooperative interactions are associated with increased morale, organizational commitment, and productivity (Tjosvold et al., 1983).

The findings from the (Tjosvold & Tsao 1989) study support Tjosvold's (1986a) model of cooperative dynamics within organizations. A shared vision and mission, a focus on valuing individuals and productivity, established group procedures for coordination, and cooperative interactions among employees are all significantly correlated with effective collaboration and a strong commitment to the organization. While conflict presents significant potential for growth and improvement, its full realization remains elusive. Conflict resolution through cooperative means necessitates a range of intellectual, logical, emotional, and interpersonal skills; many executives, professionals, and employees have indicated their willingness to engage in open and constructive discussions regarding their differences (Tjosvold, 2008). (Tjosvold et al. 2006) highlight the long-term psychological benefits and health implications of managing conflict cooperatively. According to Tjosvold et al. (2006), individuals are not only frequently faced with conflict but must also effectively resolve and manage it to ensure smooth operations across various functional areas, including accounting, marketing, human resources, and information systems (Folger, Poole, & Stutman, 2009).

2.3. Classification of Conflict

Pembi et al. (2023) proposed four distinct types of conflicts, including behavioral conflict, which occurs when one individual or group engages in actions that are deemed unacceptable by others; goal conflict, which arises when individuals or groups pursue differing outcomes, resulting in a clash over the preferred objectives to be achieved; affective conflict, which emerges when interpersonal relations are strained between two individuals or groups due to incompatible feelings and emotional responses; and finally cognitive conflict, which is characterized by the divergence of beliefs or attitudes between individuals or groups. Such ideological differences create opposing views that lead to discord.

2.3.1. Interpersonal Conflict

According to Hussein and Al-Mamary (2019), interpersonal conflict is defined as conflict that occurs when an individual's motives or desires are obstructed or when they are faced with two distinct choices, leading to difficulty in deciding due to conflicting objectives and roles. This internal conflict is often linked to personal values, especially when there is a mismatch between one's role and personal beliefs. For instance, secretaries may sometimes mislead callers by saying their managers are unavailable to avoid interruptions, which can cause internal turmoil for those who value honesty (Chand, 2010).

Additionally, this type of conflict can involve cognitive or goal-related struggles. Goal conflicts arise when a person's attitudes and behaviors contain both compatible and incompatible elements, leading to mutually exclusive positive and negative outcomes. Factors contributing to interpersonal conflict include incompatibility, unacceptability, uncertainty, frustration, goal conflict, and role conflict (Evans, 2013, as cited in Hussein & Al-Mamary, 2019).

Awan and Ibrahim (2015) argue that poor interpersonal or communication skills can exacerbate disagreements, negatively affecting the individuals involved and their colleagues' job satisfaction and overall performance (Hussein & Al-Mamary, 2019). Approach-approach conflict occurs when a person must choose between two or more favorable options, such as deciding between two equally attractive job offers. Avoidance conflict arises when an individual is forced to choose between two unfavorable options, like facing demotion unless they take on an undesirable task, such as longer commutes for work. Approach-avoidance conflict is when a decision involves both positive and negative consequences, such as accepting a good job offer in a less desirable location (Evans, 2013, as cited in Hussein & Al-Mamary, 2019).

2.3.2. Intra-Personal Conflict

According to Green & Charles (2012), intrapersonal conflict is defined as conflict that involves an individual's internal struggle, often caused by uncertainty regarding organizational expectations or when professional responsibilities clash with personal obligations. It is one of the most common forms of conflict within organizations, typically envisioned as disagreements between individuals. Such conflicts can emerge between managers competing for limited resources, striving for the same promotion, or differing on marketing strategies for a critical client.

Additionally, intra-personal conflicts can arise between managers and superiors, supervisors and employees, or among colleagues. These conflicts are often driven by differing objectives and goals within the organization (Kinicki & Kreitner, 2008).

According to Whetten & Cameron (2012), the primary causes of intra-personal conflict include differences in personality, varying perceptions shaped by experience and education, conflicting values and interests, disparities in power and status, insufficient information, role incompatibility, stress, and limited resources. Key factors that contribute to these internal struggles include incompatibility, ambiguity, dissatisfaction, conflicts of purpose, and role-related tensions (Evans, 2013, as cited in Hussein & Al-Mamary, 2019).

2.3.3. Inter-Group Conflict

This type of conflict occurs between different groups within the same organization. Intergroup conflict typically arises from disagreements between opposing objectives or the competition for shared resources (Thakore, 2013). An illustrative example would be the conflict that may arise between various functional departments, such as marketing and production or finance and production, as each department seeks to secure additional resources to achieve its specific goals (Pembi et al., 2023).

2.3.4. Intra-Group Conflict

In contrast to intra- and interpersonal conflicts, intra-group conflict pertains to disagreements within a group. This type of conflict often arises when individuals within the group struggle to align with the

established norms, values, and culture. A member may feel social pressure to remain part of the group while simultaneously opposing its goals and the strategies employed to achieve them. Conflicts can emerge between leaders and their subordinates, as well as between managers and employee groups. Disciplinary actions taken by managers or leaders against group members can lead to tensions within the group, ultimately resulting in decreased productivity for the organization (Hussein & Al-Mamary, 2019).

2.3.5. Inter-Organizational

Jones and George (2008) state that this conflict occurs between two or more organizations. Economic factors such as innovation, competitive pricing, market share, or regulatory policies often drive it. Conflicts that manifest at the individual or group level often have corresponding issues at the organizational level; for instance, disputes may arise between a purchasing organization and a supplier regarding delivery timelines, product quality, or order quantities. Conflicts can occur between regulatory agencies and the organizations they oversee or between labor unions and the entities they represent (Pembi et al., 2023).

2.3.6. Intra-Organizational Conflict

Hussein and Al-Mamary (2019) delineated four distinct categories of intra-organizational conflict: vertical conflict, horizontal conflict, line-staff conflict, and role conflict. Vertical conflict arises between different levels within the organization, exemplified by disputes between superiors and subordinates, while horizontal conflict occurs among departments or employees occupying similar hierarchical positions (Jones & George, 2008).

Typically, line departments receive support from staff departments, which can lead to friction between these two groups. Conflicts may emerge in the interactions between line and staff departments, as line and staff managers often possess differing personality traits. In contrast to line workers, staff members tend to be younger and generally hold higher educational qualifications. They also come from diverse backgrounds. These varying personal characteristics are frequently rooted in differing beliefs, ethics, and values, which can contribute to conflict (Kinicki & Kreitner, 2008).

2.4. Effects of Conflict in Organizations

Steers (1999) posits that there is a common misconception that all conflict is detrimental and should be eradicated. In contrast, he suggests that a moderate level of conflict can be advantageous in certain contexts. Steers further elaborates on the functional impacts of conflict on organizational productivity (Pembi et al., 2023).

In the pursuit of conflict resolution, the participants often experience personal growth and the evolution of their identities, which significantly contribute to establishing harmonious relationships and strengthening unity among the group members. This newfound harmony catalyzes enhanced vigor, improved group cohesion, and, ultimately, a rise in productivity (Robbins, 1998; Ramachander, 2005, as cited in Pembi et al., 2023).

Due to the presence of conflict, organizations must implement the most effective strategies for resolution, prompting the exploration of innovative mechanisms to address organizational challenges. This approach contributes to enhanced productivity.

Conflict emerges because ambiguity can enhance effective communication, clearly articulating roles and responsibilities. Effective communication, in turn, contributes to increased productivity within organizations.

When groups experience conflict due to the absence of shared performance standards, it motivates them to exert greater effort to achieve their performance goals. Consequently, this leads to enhanced productivity as the groups strive for excellence.

2.5 Conflict management in organizations

Conflict management is constructively identifying and addressing disputes and disagreements. It encompasses various strategies and approaches to resolve conflicts effectively, foster communication, and promote collaboration among involved parties. Effective conflict management helps resolve immediate issues, strengthens relationships, and enhances organizational performance (Usendok et al., 2022).

For example, effective conflict management involves understanding the sources of conflict, employing negotiation techniques, and utilizing problem-solving skills to facilitate a resolution that is acceptable to all parties involved. The goal is to address the underlying issues while maintaining a positive working environment and minimizing negative outcomes associated with conflicts (Safi & Khairkhwa, 2024).

The strategies for managing organizational conflict are as diverse as the underlying causes and contexts that contribute to its emergence. Conflict management, whether carried out by the conflicting parties themselves or with the aid of an external mediator, seeks to shift the dynamics of the conflict to mitigate its harmful effects—such as hostility and aggression—while guiding the involved parties toward a resolution despite their differing goals.

According to Thakore (2013), successful conflict management achieves two primary outcomes: (1) it reduces the disruptions caused by the presence of conflict, and (2) it facilitates a resolution that is satisfactory and agreeable to all parties involved. One of the most effective methods for managing conflict involves negotiation and bargaining processes, where open discussions allow both parties to explore potential solutions, often leading to mutually beneficial exchanges. Given that conflict is an inevitable aspect of organizational life, its proper management is crucial in turning it into a constructive and positive force within the organization. Strategic conflict management is further enhanced using effective bargaining and negotiation techniques.

Conflict is an inevitable part of organizational life, making its effective management crucial to ensure positive and functional outcomes. One key method for strategically managing conflict is through bargaining and negotiation. Negotiation involves being open. According to Thakore (2013), there are discussions aimed at resolving issues where both parties seek mutually beneficial solutions.

According to Thakore (2013), there are five primary bargaining styles: conflict avoider, accommodator, compromiser, problem solver, and competitor. The bargaining styles adopted by the parties significantly shape the nature of interactive communication. The Harvard Negotiation Project outlines three distinct bargaining strategies, emphasizing the importance of these approaches in conflict resolution. Bargaining styles greatly shape interactive communication during negotiations. For instance, the Harvard Negotiation Project identifies three key bargaining strategies: soft, hard, and principled bargaining. Soft bargaining focuses on maintaining friendly relations between the parties, while hard bargaining takes a competitive

approach. In contrast, principled bargaining encourages both parties to serve as problem solvers, aiming to build trust and achieve a shared advantage.

Bargaining is typically divided into two major types: distributive and integrative. Distributive bargaining occurs when the objectives of one party are in direct opposition to those of the other, characterizing it as a win-lose scenario. In contrast, integrative bargaining focuses on collaboration, where both parties work towards achieving their individual goals. This method stresses the substantive value of the issues in question and seeks a win-win solution. In integrative negotiations, participants adopt a positive attitude, understand each other's needs, and strive for long-term relationship building (Thakore, 2013).

The role of third parties in resolving conflict. Third-party intervention becomes essential when conflicting parties are unable or unwilling to resolve disputes independently. According to Thakore (2013), there are four main categories of third-party negotiators, which can be identified: Mediator: Mediation is the most common form of third-party intervention. A neutral facilitator, the mediator, helps disputing parties reach a mutually acceptable solution without imposing any decisions; the effectiveness of mediation relies heavily on the trust both parties place in the mediator, who has no formal authority.

Arbitrator: While arbitrators may employ similar methods to those of mediators, they differ in that they have the authority to impose binding decisions on the conflicting parties.

Conciliation and Consultation: These are fewer formal alternatives to mediation or arbitration, characterized by their voluntary nature. Research by Fisher (1990), suggests that both conciliation and consultation are effective due to their non-assertive nature, making them valuable tools in conflict management.

2.6. The Five Styles of Conflict Resolution

The Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument (TKI), developed by Kenneth W. Thomas and Ralph H. Kilmann in the early 1970s, emerged from their roles as professors of management at the University of Pittsburgh. Influenced by earlier frameworks, particularly the managerial grid by Blake and Mouton, which focused on "concern for production" and "concern for people," Thomas and Kilmann restructured these ideas into a new model. They introduced two key dimensions, assertiveness, and cooperativeness, which form the foundation for the five conflict resolution modes they identified: competing, collaborating, compromising, avoiding, and accommodating.

The TKI's development began around 1971, with the formal release of the instrument in 1974. Since then, it has become one of the most widely used tools for assessing conflict management styles, particularly within organizational settings. Thomas and Kilmann aimed to create a simple, accessible model that could be applied across various organizational levels, helping individuals handle conflict more effectively. The Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument (TKI) evaluates how individuals behave in conflict scenarios characterized by the perceived incompatibility of concerns between two parties. In such situations, an individual's behavior can be analyzed along two fundamental dimensions: (1) assertiveness, which refers to the degree to which a person seeks to fulfill their own needs, and (2) cooperativeness, which indicates the extent to which an individual aims to address the needs of the other party. Assertiveness is an interpersonal behavior that promotes equality in human relationships by assisting an individual to give expression to their rights, thoughts, and feelings in a manner that neither denies nor demeans but recognizes and respects those of others (Benedict, 2012, as cited in Folger, Poole, & Stutman 2009). Meanwhile, cooperativeness involves tolerance, empathy, and altruism. Individuals high in cooperativeness are seen as helpful and

agreeable, contributing positively to team dynamics and organizational environments (Cloninger, 2004, as cited in Folger, Poole, & Stutman, 2009).

According to Thomas and Kilmann (2008), the dimensions of their model provide a comprehensive framework for identifying five distinct strategies for managing conflict, as detailed below.

Competing. This is characterized by assertiveness and a lack of cooperation, representing a power-driven approach. In this mode, an individual prioritizes their own interests, often at the expense of others, employing any means necessary to secure their position. Competing may involve advocating for one's rights, defending a strongly held belief, or simply striving to achieve victory. This approach is characterized by a predominant focus on addressing the interests of the party itself, often at the expense of acknowledging the concerns of others. It is a relatively insular style, exhibiting low to moderate levels of openness; while parties clearly articulate their demands, they frequently conceal their genuine intentions and any information that could undermine their stance. Individuals who adopt a competing style are notably proactive and deeply engaged in conflict. They tenaciously strive to fulfill their personal objectives, employing any necessary measures to attain them. Overall, adaptability tends to be limited within this competitive framework. Generally, individuals are more inclined to adopt competing styles when the stakes of the conflicts are significant to them and when the prospect of reaching a resolution through alternative methods appears improbable (Phillips & Cheston, 1979; Keck & Samp, 2007, as cited in Folger, Poole, & Stutman 2009).

Collaborating. In contrast, it embodies both assertiveness and cooperation. This approach entails working alongside the other party to develop a solution that comprehensively addresses the concerns of both individuals. It requires a thorough examination of the issue to uncover the fundamental interests of each party, ultimately leading to a resolution that accommodates both sets of needs. Collaborative efforts may manifest as a dialogue to understand differing perspectives, resolve conflicts over shared resources, or creatively address interpersonal challenges (Folger, Poole, & Stutman, 2009).

According to Folger, Poole, and Stutman (2009), collaboration is usually the preferred conflict resolution approach among many scholars and practitioners, as it aims to create a solution that satisfies the significant needs of both parties involved. When collaboration is successful, individuals typically feel satisfied and often excited about the resolution achieved. The process of jointly discovering a creative solution can be invigorating, allowing participants to gain insights about themselves and explore new opportunities for the future. These positive reactions not only energize individuals but also facilitate effective follow-up and implementation of the agreed-upon solution. Effective collaboration necessitates the fulfillment of several essential conditions: All involved parties must possess a genuine interest in the results. Each party should have confidence in their ability to address the conflict in a manner that accommodates the primary interests of all stakeholders. Furthermore, it is imperative that the parties are prepared to relinquish any animosity or lingering resentments towards one another. Substantial evidence supports the notion that collaboration produces favorable results. Research conducted by Wall, Galanes, and Love (1987) alongside Sambamurthy and Poole (1992) demonstrated that recognizing and openly discussing conflicts enhances groups' capacity to reach consensus and improves the quality of their outcomes (Folger, Poole, & Stutman, 2009). In an investigation of new product development teams, Lovelace, Shapiro, and Weingart (2001) discovered that collaborative communication—characteristic of compromise and problem-solving—was linked to increased innovativeness within teams. Furthermore, various studies on negotiation indicate that collaborative strategies tend to yield more advantageous outcomes for all parties involved (Brett, Shapiro, & Lyle, 1998; Dreu, Weingar, & Kwon, 2000; Weingart, Hyder, & Prietula, 1996, as cited in Folger, Poole, & Stutman, 2009).

Compromising. It occupies a middle ground in terms of assertiveness and cooperativeness. The goal of compromising is to reach a practical, mutually acceptable resolution that partially fulfills the interests of both parties. This approach involves concessions that are greater than those made in competing but less than those in accommodating. Compromising addresses the issue more directly than avoidance, yet it does not delve as deeply into the matter as collaboration.

Compromise entails efforts to establish a middle ground or a mutually beneficial arrangement whereby parties can attain certain significant objectives while relinquishing others. This process necessitates a balanced degree of assertiveness and cooperativeness, as it compels both parties to sacrifice some of their desires to satisfy alternative needs. Individuals who engage in compromising typically exhibit moderate to high levels of activity; in certain situations, considerable energy and engagement are essential to reach a satisfactory compromise, whereas, in other instances, parties may opt for compromise when the prospect of achieving an optimal solution appears improbable. Compromising is characterized by moderate flexibility, as those who compromise are willing to concede on specific demands. Nevertheless, they maintain sufficient rigidity to avoid altering their positions to facilitate problem-solving or accommodating others. A distinct approach is firm compromising, characterized by trade-offs while demonstrating restricted positional flexibility and a low to moderate level of disclosure. In this scenario, compromisers exert some pressure on the opposing parties, adopting a relatively assertive strategy to encourage collaboration (Folger, Poole, & Stutman, 2009).

Avoiding. A lack of assertiveness and cooperation marks this. In this mode, an individual refrains from pursuing their interests or those of the other party, effectively neglecting the conflict. Avoidance can manifest as tactfully evading a topic, delaying discussions until a more opportune moment, or withdrawing from individuals who evade conflict and exhibit minimal concern for both their interests and those of others (Folger, Poole, & Stutman, 2009).

One variation of avoidance is the protective style, which is characterized by a strong commitment to sidestepping conflict entirely. These individuals are so apprehensive about the potential emergence of conflict that they create a defensive barrier around themselves, often refusing to acknowledge the existence of any disagreement. In certain instances, those who adopt a protective stance may react to efforts to address an issue with a vigorous counterattack, intending to dissuade others from pursuing the matter further. A protective approach is characterized by minimal activity and flexibility. Individuals adopting this style are reluctant to engage in conflict and resist any efforts to bring it to the forefront. Additionally, this protective stance is marked by low levels of disclosure, as the underlying motivations for avoidance typically remain concealed.

A gentler approach to avoidance is the act of withdrawing. In this context, parties strive to keep contentious issues from being addressed, exhibiting greater flexibility than a more defensive style. One strategy employed by those who withdraw is known as fogging, where the individual responds to criticism or an attack by acknowledging only a portion of the concern raised. Another form of avoidance is smoothing, where the individual minimizes differences and highlights areas of agreement. In this approach, potentially sensitive topics that could lead to hurt feelings or provoke anger are sidestepped whenever feasible, with the aim of alleviating negative emotions. Those who engage in smoothing focus on the positive aspects and prioritize the preservation of harmonious relationships in potentially confrontational situations (Folger, Poole, & Stutman, 2009).

Accommodating. It is characterized by a lack of assertiveness and a cooperative spirit, starkly contrasting to competitive behavior. In this mode, an individual prioritizes the needs and concerns of others over their

own, often involving a degree of self-denial. This approach can manifest as acts of selfless generosity, compliance with another's directives despite personal reservations, or an inclination to accept another's perspective.

According to Folger, Poole, and Stutman (2009), those who use this style tend to yield to others' preferences, which can help mend or maintain relationships, especially when the issue is less significant than the interpersonal connection. Accommodators are flexible, conforming to others' demands and altering their viewpoints with a low level of engagement focused more on relational dynamics than specific issues. They typically reveal little about their own perspectives while gaining insight into others'. Accommodating behavior can be divided into two forms: yielding and conceding. Yielding involves a passive approach where individuals show indifference to their own needs and fully accommodate others, often detaching from the situation. In contrast, conceding is more assertive, where individuals address others' concerns while staying connected to the underlying issues.

This strategy is beneficial when prioritizing future relationships over conflict issues. When done effectively, accommodation can enhance relational dynamics and may be particularly advantageous for a less powerful party in a competitive situation, allowing them to minimize concessions.

2.7. Business Dynamics and Conflict Management

In contrast, a separate yet significant study conducted by Trippe and Baumol (2015) focused on the application of the TKI model within family businesses. This domain presents unique conflict dynamics due to the intertwining of personal and professional relationships. It is well recognized that family businesses often face more complex and emotionally charged conflicts than corporate environments, as conflicts between family members frequently carry over into business operations. Accordingly, to address these complexities, the study introduced the Baumol-Trippe Extension, an expansion of the traditional TKI model designed to account for conflict's emotional and relational aspects in family businesses. Thus, the primary objective of this study was to explore the effectiveness of the TKI model in managing conflicts within family businesses and to assess the utility of the Baumol-Trippe Extension as a tool for resolving highly emotional conflicts.

The study employed a mixed-methods approach, incorporating both qualitative and quantitative data collection methods. Family business owners and managers participated in the study, providing insights into their experiences with conflict management through qualitative interviews and completing the TKI assessment. More specifically, the Baumol-Trippe Extension introduced two new dimensions to the traditional TKI model: substance and relationship dynamics. Substance refers to the core issue at the heart of the conflict, while relationship dynamics refers to the emotional and relational factors that influence how conflict is experienced and managed.

By addressing both substance and relationship dynamics, the Baumol-Trippe Extension provides a more comprehensive approach to managing conflicts in family businesses. The results of the study further indicated that, within family business environments, where personal relationships are deeply intertwined with business operations, the traditional TKI model was often insufficient for resolving conflicts effectively.

In contrast, the Baumol-Trippe Extension, which emphasizes the emotional and relational aspects of conflict, proved to be more effective in helping family business stakeholders navigate conflicts driven by personal and emotional issues. Therefore, the study recommended that family businesses adopt the Baumol-Trippe Extension as part of their conflict management toolkit, particularly in cases where conflicts

threaten to damage both personal relationships and business operations. By incorporating substance and relationship dynamics into their conflict resolution strategies, family businesses can foster healthier relationships while ensuring the business's long-term success.

In continuation of this exploration of conflict dynamics, Mohammed et al. (2009) designed a study to investigate how cultural differences shape conflict management styles within multinational organizations. Its core objective was to explore the extent to which national culture influences the preferred approaches to resolving conflicts among employees from various countries and how these preferences may vary across different hierarchical levels within organizations. Consequently, this study sought to provide insights into the interplay between cultural values and conflict management practices, thereby offering valuable guidance for improving conflict resolution strategies in diverse work environments.

Methodologically, the study utilized a structured survey that assessed five distinct conflict management styles as defined by Thomas and Kilmann—competing, accommodating, avoiding, collaborating, and compromising. To enact this framework, the survey was distributed to various organizational-level respondents, including top management, middle management, and operational staff. This comprehensive approach was designed to capture how conflict management styles are influenced by hierarchical status and cultural background, thereby providing a thorough view of how different organizational levels approach conflict resolution.

The sample for this study included 116 respondents from various countries, such as the United Kingdom, India, France, South Africa, Germany, Holland, Australia, Nigeria, Spain, Russia, Sweden, Poland, Pakistan, Ghana, and New Zealand. The study aimed to reflect a wide spectrum of cultural perspectives on conflict management by encompassing such diverse geographical locations.

The results revealed significant correlations between conflict management styles and Hofstede's cultural dimensions. For instance, Hofstede's model describes cultural characteristics such as power distance (PDI), individualism versus collectivism (IDV), masculinity versus femininity (MAS), uncertainty avoidance (UAI), and long-term orientation (LTO), each of which was examined in relation to the conflict management styles reported by respondents.

For example, the study found a stronger preference for avoiding conflicts in countries with high power distance, such as India and South Africa. This correlation can be linked to Hofstede's description of high-power distance cultures, where there is a greater acceptance of hierarchical order and a tendency to avoid direct confrontation, which aligns with the avoidance style of conflict management. Conversely, respondents from countries with lower power distance, such as the United Kingdom, displayed a higher inclination towards competing and collaborating styles. This observation reflects Hofstede's assertion that in low-power distance cultures, there is a greater emphasis on egalitarianism and open communication, which supports more direct and assertive conflict management approaches.

Additionally, the study noted that cultures with high individualism, such as those in the United States and Australia, were more likely to adopt competing and compromising styles.

This finding corresponds with Hofstede's description of individualistic cultures, where personal goals and achievements take precedence, and conflict is often managed through direct negotiation or compromise to achieve individual objectives. Conversely, cultures characterized by high collectivism, such as India and South Africa, preferred avoiding and accommodating styles, reflecting the collectivist value of maintaining group harmony and avoiding disruption of social relationships.

Moreover, the results indicated that high uncertainty avoidance cultures, such as those in France, exhibited a preference for collaborating and compromising styles. This correlation aligns with Hofstede's view that in high uncertainty avoidance cultures, there is a tendency to seek structured and cooperative approaches to managing conflict to reduce ambiguity and maintain stability.

Considering these findings, the study underscores the importance of cultural awareness in effectively managing conflicts within multinational organizations. Therefore, organizations are advised to implement training programs that enhance employees' understanding of cultural differences and their impact on conflict management styles. Such training can help bridge cultural gaps and foster more effective conflict resolution strategies tailored to the diverse cultural backgrounds of team members.

3. Organizational Performance

Yu (2023) defined organizational performance as a vital indicator within the field of management and has played a significant role in shaping corporate strategies since the emergence of scientific management principles. However, scholars have historically presented varying perspectives based on their unique research paradigms, leading to a lack of a universally accepted definition. Yu (2023) conducted a review of the literature and revealed that the most common interpretations of organizational performance could be encapsulated as follows: organizational performance includes aspects such as organizational effectiveness, efficiency, and member satisfaction; it is perceived as the result of employees' efforts to achieve the objectives set forth by the organization; it consists of financial performance, business performance, and organizational effectiveness, with the latter reflecting the extent to which the goals of diverse internal and external stakeholders, as well as organizational conflicts, are resolved. Additionally, organizational performance is characterized by behaviors that align with strategic objectives; it is defined through three distinct dimensions: participants, system resources, and goal attainment; when the goals and expectations of an organization's stakeholders are met in a "balanced" manner, the degree of the organization's goal achievement is considered organizational performance; it encompasses both perceived organizational performance and perceived market performance; it signifies a holistic assessment of how effectively individuals meet the expectations tied to organizational goals; it indicates the accomplishment of non-financial performance objectives, such as product quality, customer satisfaction, and effective teamwork; and ultimately, organizational performance is defined as the quantitative, qualitative, efficient, and cost-effective results of an organization's activities over time, serving as a measure of the effectiveness in realizing organizational benefits.

3.1. Classification of Organizational Performance Indicators

Organizational performance indicators serve as essential measures of an organization's effectiveness and must align with the comprehensive requirements of organizational management. In the context of the organizational development process, a systematic and structured evaluation feedback system is crucial for the survival and growth of an organization. The definition of organizational performance varies according to the specific nature of the organization, leading to diverse criteria for its measurement. Consequently, the categories of organizational performance also differ. Most organizations pursue multiple goals, which may sometimes conflict with one another (Yu, 2023).

For instance, the overarching objectives of an organization can be numerous, while its short-term and subsidiary goals are likely to be varied as well, warranting thorough examination. To ensure a comprehensive

assessment, it is imperative to consider a range of indicators when evaluating organizational performance, measuring the extent to which goals are achieved, and applying certain indicators with greater emphasis. Thus, indicators should be categorized based on distinct criteria and objectives. Some indicators reflect the outcomes or objectives of the organization's activities, while others denote the conditions or means necessary for achieving these goals. Generally, indicators that are goal-oriented should carry more weight within the overall indicator system, whereas means-oriented indicators should be assigned relatively less significance (Yu, 2023). Additionally, when categorizing indicators by time, it is crucial to determine whether they assess past, present, or future performance and consider the indicators' time limit. For organizations experiencing significant fluctuations in demand, there can be considerable differences between long-term and short-term indicators (Yu, 2023).

3.2. Conflict Management Styles and Organizational Performance

The investigation by Pembri et al. (2023) delves into the theoretical connections between conflict management strategies and organizational outcomes, emphasizing how these strategies influence organizational effectiveness, productivity, and employee satisfaction. The research indicates that utilizing effective conflict resolution approaches—such as collaboration, negotiation, and compromise—generally produces positive outcomes in the workplace. These approaches enhance interpersonal relationships among team members, boost morale, and increase overall productivity. In contrast, relying on avoidance and competitive strategies can result in negative effects, including employee dissatisfaction and weakened organizational cohesion. The results indicate that organizations prioritizing collaborative approaches are more likely to foster a cohesive and productive work atmosphere. The study also underscores the importance of effective communication and collaborative problem-solving as vital elements in addressing conflicts within organizations. Structures promoting proactive conflict resolution and encouraging teamwork are crucial, as they improve employee interactions and nurture a positive organizational culture. Additionally, training initiatives aimed at enhancing interpersonal skills can greatly empower employees, equipping them with the essential capabilities to navigate conflicts successfully while promoting a culture of respect and understanding.

The study also advocates the necessity of conflict resolution training for both employees and management. This training is vital to effectively manage immediate conflicts and foster a culture where conflict management aligns with the organization's broader objectives.

Equipping individuals with the necessary skills to address issues as they arise encourages a sense of responsibility and ownership among team members. They ultimately lead to increased job satisfaction and improved retention rates.

Similarly, Schaubhut (2007) examines how organizational roles and demographic characteristics shape preferences for conflict management. This exploration lends further credence to the theoretical structure of the Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Management Model (TKI). Research indicates that individuals occupying leadership positions, including executives, generally favor assertive strategies for conflict resolution. Approaches such as competition and collaboration are frequently emphasized, largely due to their ability to enable prompt and efficient decision-making in urgent situations.

Conversely, employees in lower-level positions frequently demonstrate a tendency to favor passive approaches to conflict management, such as avoidance and accommodation. This behavior indicates a willingness to leave the resolution of conflicts to those in higher authority. These insights reveal the impact

of hierarchical structures on the preferences for managing conflicts within the workplace. The understanding derived from this observation emphasizes the importance of developing tailored strategies that address employees' diverse needs and roles throughout the organization. Emphasizing the significant role of hierarchical status and demographic factors in shaping conflict management preferences. It highlights the necessity for customized conflict management strategies across various organizational levels.

These studies collectively affirm that conflict management styles play a crucial role in shaping organizational dynamics and employee behavior. Strategies that are well-suited to the organizational framework and can be tailored to meet the varied needs of employees tend to enhance overall performance positively. By prioritizing approaches that foster mutual respect and cooperation, organizations can more effectively utilize conflict as an opportunity for growth and development.

4. Discussion

Conflict management is essential to organizational dynamics, significantly influencing various performance indicators, including productivity, efficiency, and employee morale. Within the framework of the Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Management Model, five distinct styles—competing, accommodating, avoiding, collaborating, and compromising—are identified, each serving unique functions based on situational demands. Grasping these styles and their uses is crucial for organizations aiming to enhance their performance results.

The collaborating style, characterized by high levels of assertiveness and cooperativeness, is crucial for fostering a constructive workplace environment. It also encourages open dialogue and collaborative problem-solving. This approach allows individuals to tackle intricate challenges by integrating various viewpoints, enhancing interpersonal relationships, and promoting unity within the team. Organizations that embrace collaborative conflict resolution frequently witness significant improvements in employee morale, as team members feel valued and engaged in the decision-making process. Higher morale, in turn, enhances productivity because employees are more likely to be engaged and committed to their roles.

On the other hand, the accommodating style emphasizes high cooperativeness with low assertiveness, where individuals prioritize others' needs over their own, placing emphasis on maintaining harmony within relationships. This approach is especially beneficial in hierarchical or culturally sensitive environments, where mutual respect and understanding are crucial. While accommodating can be beneficial for maintaining relationships, an over-dependence on this approach may result in diminished individual motivation or job engagement, especially if employees begin to feel undervalued over time. This approach is especially effective in family-owned enterprises, where personal dynamics are closely linked to professional responsibilities. However, when used too frequently, accommodation can unintentionally impact productivity by diminishing the importance of individuals' perspectives.

Moving forward, the competing style, which is marked by high assertiveness but low cooperativeness, is often applied in high-stakes situations requiring quick decision-making. Although it can be effective in achieving rapid resolutions, its confrontational nature may create tension and reduce trust among team members. However, the overuse of this style may strain organizational relationships, underscoring the importance of using this approach selectively to protect the organization's culture and relational stability.

Conversely, the avoiding style, marked by low levels of assertiveness and cooperativeness, typically defers conflict management, leading to unresolved issues building up over time. While avoidance can offer

temporary relief from tension, it poses a threat to the overall organizational performance if conflicts are not resolved. This style may be suitable for minor issues; however, if used excessively, it can detrimentally affect team cohesion and efficiency, as unresolved issues may negatively impact team interactions.

Meanwhile, the compromising style seeks to find a middle ground between assertiveness and cooperativeness, aiming for outcomes that both parties can agree upon through moderate concessions. It can resolve conflicts quickly, but it might not fully address deeper issues, which could weaken the organization's cohesion over time. Compromise can be effective when fast solutions are required but may leave parties dissatisfied if core issues remain unresolved. Finally, while each of the five conflict management styles has unique strengths and weaknesses, after examining all the styles, it becomes evident that collaborating and accommodating styles are particularly effective in creating a supportive workplace environment.

By emphasizing these strategies, organizations can foster a culture characterized by teamwork, respect, and open communication. Such a cultural transformation can result in improved key performance indicators, including employee morale, job satisfaction, and productivity. Ultimately, it is crucial to tailor conflict management styles to the specific context of each situation to enhance engagement, sustain productivity, and improve overall organizational performance.

5. Conclusions

This research highlights the importance of conflict management styles in enhancing organizational performance. The Thomas-Kilmann model identifies five unique styles—competing, accommodating, avoiding, collaborating, and compromising—each providing distinct advantages depending on the specific situations and organizational objectives. Although the competing, compromising, and avoiding styles can be advantageous in certain scenarios, the collaborating and accommodating styles are particularly noteworthy for their capacity to foster a culture of teamwork and open communication.

Effective conflict navigation requires organizational leaders to select the most appropriate style for each situation skillfully. Emphasizing collaborative and accommodating strategies can foster a more favorable work environment, thereby improving productivity, innovation, and employee satisfaction. By implementing training programs that enhance employees' conflict-resolution capabilities, organizations can enable their teams to participate in constructive dialogues and cooperative problem-solving, thereby transforming conflicts into opportunities for growth.

As organizations face more complicated and varied challenges, it is crucial to understand different ways to manage conflict. Using these management styles effectively can help foster sustainable growth and transform conflicts into chances for improvement rather than barriers to success. Future studies should explore how conflict management styles relate to performance in various organizational settings to identify best practices and frameworks that can be applied successfully.

References

- Appelbaum, S. H., Abdallah, C., & Shapiro, B. T. (1999). The self-directed team. *Team Performance Management*, 5(2), 60–77. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13527599910268940>
- Blain, N. Goodman, J. & Lowenberg, J. (1987). Mediation, conciliation, and arbitration. *International Labour Review*, 126, 179-198.

Deutsch, M. (1973). The resolution of conflict: Constructive and destructive processes.

Earnest, G. W., & McCaslin, N. L. (1994). Extension administrators approach to conflict management: A study of relationships between conflict management styles and personality type. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 35(3), 18–22. <https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.1994.03018>

Fisher, R.J. (1990). *The social psychology of intergroup and international conflict resolution*. Springer-Verlag.

Folger, J. P., Poole, M. S., & Stutman, R. K. (2009). *Working through conflict: Strategies for relationships, groups, and organizations* (6th ed.). Library of Congress Cataloging.

Fritchie, R., & Leary, M. (1998). *Resolving conflicts in organizations*. Lemos & Crane.

Green, C. (2012). Examples of four types of conflict. *Human Resources*.

Hussein, A. F. F., & Al-Mamary, Y. H. S. (2019). Conflicts: Their types, and their negative and positive effects on organizations. *International journal of scientific & technology research*, 8(8), 10-13.

Jones, G. R. & George, J. M. (2008). *Contemporary management* (5th ed.). McGraw Hill Companies.

Jones, R. E., & White, C. S. (1985). Relationships among personality, conflict resolution styles, and task effectiveness. *Group & Organization Studies*, 10(2), 152–167. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105960118501000204>

Jumawan, J., Hadita, H., Febrianti, B., Noviyanti, D., Asmarani, D., Pratiwi, D., & Permatasari, E. (2024). Pengaruh manajemen konflik, perubahan organisasi dan budaya organisasi terhadap kinerja karyawan. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, 2(1), 23-34. <http://j-economics.my.id/index.php/home/article/view/106>

Kilag, O. K., Largo, J., Rabillas, A., Kilag, F., Angtud, M. K., Book, J. F., & Sasan, J. M. (2024). Administrators' conflict management and strategies. *International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability, and Excellence*, 1(1), 60–67.

Kreitner, R., Kinicki, A., & Cole, N. (2007). *Fundamentals of organizational behaviour: Key concepts, skills, and best practices* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill Ryerson.

Kochan, T. A. (1974). A theory of multilateral collective bargaining in city governments. *ILR Review*, 27(4), 525–542. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001979397402700403>

Larfela, R. A. (1988). Interdepartmental conflict. *IPM Manpower Journal*, 2, 29-32.

Lewis, D. S., French, E., & Steane, P. (1997). A culture of conflict. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 18(1), 275-282. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437739710176211>

Lovelace, K., Shapiro, D. L., & Weingart, L. R. 2001. Maximizing cross-functional new product groups' innovativeness and constraint adherence: A conflict communications perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44, 779-793.

Mohammed, U. K., White, G. R., & Prabhakar, G. P. (2009). Culture and conflict management style of international project managers. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 3(5). <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v3n5p3>

Neupane, A. (2022). An overview of Organizational Conflict. *Quest Journals Journal of Research in Business and Management*, 10(8), 2347–3002. <https://www.questjournals.org/jrbm/papers/vol10-issue8/1008145149.pdf>

Nurjanah, S. (2022). Manajemen konflik dalam kisah Qabil dan Habil serta relevansinya dengan pendidikan Islam. *Journal of Islamic Education & Management*, 1(2), 1-15.

- Phillips, E., & Cheston, R. (1979). Conflict resolution: What works?. *California Management Review*, 21(4), 76–83. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41164837>
- Pembi, S., Ikemefuna, M., Kibikiwa, G. M., & Zoakah, J. D. (2023). Conflict in organisations: An examination of its types, sources, effects and management strategies. *Organization and Human Capital Development*, 2(1), 53–65. <https://doi.org/10.31098/orcadev.v2i1.1231>
- Robbins, S. P. (2005). *Organizational behavior* (11th ed.). Pearson Education, Inc.
- Safi, R., & Khairkhwa, M. (2024). Impact of conflict management practices on employee performance in organizations. *Journal for Research in Applied Sciences and Biotechnology*, 3(3), 253–257. <https://doi.org/10.55544/jrasb.3.3.39>
- Schaubhut, N. A. (2007). Thomas-Kilmann conflict mode instrument. *CPP Research Department*. <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=c66b5c029273e62f57f469ea565cb05f7b051dbc>.
- Thakore, D. (2013). Conflict and conflict management. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, 8(6), 07-16. <https://doi.org/10.9790/487x-0860716>
- Thomas, K. W., Kilmann, R. H., CPP, Inc., & Xicom, Incorporated. (2008). *Thomas-Kilmann conflict mode instrument profile and interpretive report*. <https://lig360.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/Conflict-Styles-Assessment.pdf>
- Tjosvold, D., Andrews, R., & Jones, H. (1983). Cooperative and competitive relationships between leaders and subordinates. *Human Relations*, 36(12), 1111-1124.
- Tjosvold, D. (1986). The dynamics of interdependence in organizations. *Human Relations*, 39(6), 517-540.
- Tjosvold, D., & Tsao, Y. (1989). Productive organizational collaboration: The role of values and cooperation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 10(2), 189-195. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2488244>
- Tjosvold, D. (2008). The conflict-positive organization: It depends upon us. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 29(1), 19-28.
- Trippe, B., & Baumuel, D. (2015). Beyond the Thomas-Kilmann model: Into extreme conflict. *Negotiation Journal*, 31(2), 89–103. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nejo.12084>
- Usendok, I. G. (2022). Organizational conflict and employee job performance: A case study of Akwa Ibom State University. *European Journal of Business and Innovation Research*, 10(3), 10-25.
- Whetten, D. A., & Cameron, K. S. (2012). Managing power and conflict in the workplace. *Introduction to International Organizational Behavior*, 13, 160-209.
- Yu, B. (2023). Antecedents of organizational performance: A literature review. *Advances in Economics, Management and Political Sciences*, 9(1), 20–30. <https://doi.org/10.54254/2754-1169/9/20230345>