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Conflict Management may be regarded as an approach to the management of conflict that provides a strategic framework to support short to long-term business goals and outcomes. The approach is concerned with the concept of conflict and strategies to managing conflict in deep.

In the wake of completing this course, students for semester VII are expected to:

1. Students will gain an understanding of and proficiency in major theories of conflict and its resolution in the context of globalization. They will be able learn how to critically assess the role of material factors, irrationality, identity, and subjective justice. Students will also learn to differentiate between structural and relational sources of conflict and effectively discuss the dynamics of conflict settings and underlying theories of change regarding potential interventions. They will understand the relationship of theory to practice and vice-versa.

2. Students will develop applied skills in conflict analysis, negotiation, communication, cross-cultural interactions, and will strengthen their ability to work effectively with groups in diverse contexts. They will also learn key basic skills in mediation, dialogue, facilitation, and other core processes in the field.

3. Students will acquire an understanding of the conflict resolution field, its history, institutions (including donors, policy institutions, and implementers), and current ethical and practical debates.

4. Students will learn how to conduct a conflict analysis in community settings and to apply theory to practice. They will cultivate an
understanding of third party roles, the complexity of intervening in conflict
settings, and core ethics, such as do no harm and cultural sensitivity.

5. Students will explore how to integrate conflict resolution skills and
principles across diverse sectors. They will also gain the ability to discuss
the challenges and opportunities in integrative peace building.

6. Students will hone their reading, writing, research, and oral
communication skills. They will begin to think holistically about conflicts
and know how to gather data from primary and secondary sources.

7. Students will be introduced to the basic aspects of conflict related
research such as conflict assessments, community mapping, exploring the
roles and needs of multiple parties, and examining potential intervention
roles.
**Course Schedule**

Class 1. Introduction to Conflict Management Course, Assignment and Study Assessment  
Class 2. Anatomy of conflict resolution and management  
Class 3. Dimension of Conflict management  
Class 4. Settlement and Resolution procedure  
Class 5. Independent study  
Class 6. Independent study  
**Class 7. Mid Exam**

Class 8. Papers discussion  
Class 9. Papers discussion  
Class 10. Independent study  
Class 11. Independent study  
Class 12. Individual Paper presentation  
Class 13. Individual Paper presentation  
Class 15. Individual Paper presentation  
**Class 16. Final Examination**

**Class Procedures**

1. **Presence.** Students are required to attend lectures at least 80% of total lectures held. Any violation against this rule may cause the ineligibility to get a final grade.

2. **Class participation.** Students are highly expected to contribute ideas, thoughts, experiences, and arguments to the class discussion. Although overviews of key points and issues are provided, we require
that students comprehend the materials in details, raise questions and ideas, and create a “lively” class, meaning that students must read and prepare readings assigned prior to coming to the class.

3. **An experiential approach.** Continuously and consistently, students are assigned to do assignment and report the findings to the lecturer. Students will be randomly distributed into groups that consist of four members.

4. **Internet exploration.** Students are encouraged to harness the advancement of information and communications technology (ICT) in exploring knowledge and opportunities. Remember that in current circumstances, a clever person is not she who can answer all questions; rather, it is she who knows where to find answers.

### Assessment

- Class participation/Discussion 15%
- Presentations 20%
- Mid-term examination (**UTS**) 30%
- Final examination (**UAS**) 35%

### Assignment: Research proposal-paper.

An individual proposal of research project is to be submitted, describing your interest to certain topic in conflict management. Late submissions will not be accepted without the prior approval of the lecturer. All requests for extensions should be directed to lecturer by e-mail at least one week before the due date for submission. Extensions will be granted for medical reasons upon receipt of a medical certificate, or in exceptional circumstances in consultation with the lecturer. For the research report, you are required to write a report similar to a research paper. It should include:
1. Abstract: It describes the main synopsis of your paper.

2. Introduction: It provides background information necessary to understand the research and getting readers interested in your subject. The introduction is where you put your problem in context and is likely where the bulk of your sources will appear.

3. Methods: Describe your methods relevant to your project, and refer readers to your references for further details.

4. Results and Discussion: This section is the most important part of your paper. It is here that you demonstrate the work you have accomplished on this project and explain its significance. The quality of your analysis will impact your final grade more than any other component on the paper.

5. Conclusion: The conclusion should give your reader the points to “take home” from your paper. It should state clearly what your results demonstrate about the problem you were tackling in the paper. It should also generalize your findings, putting them into a useful context that can be built upon. All generalizations should be supported by your data, however; the discussion should prove these points, so that when the reader gets to the conclusion, the statements are logical and seem self-evident.

6. Bibliography: Refer to any reference that you used in your assignment. Citations in the body of the paper should refer to a bibliography at the end of the paper.

**Grading Systems**

- E~F means at least one of assignment and test found plagiarism
- D (50-59) means that you are able to summarize and order readings relevant to the topic.
- C (60-69) means that you do this with some greater precision and flair or more comprehensively and/or accessibly.
- B (70-79) indicates that you have shown evidences of substantial and well argued independence of thoughts, insightful evaluation, or original research.
- A (80-100) indicates that you have added significant new values to existing knowledge or understanding through logic or evidence of some ingenuity, creativity, or excellence.

**Guidelines for Written Work, Assessment, and Plagiarism**

At the undergraduate level, a high quality presentation and content is required. All works should be typewritten, proofread, and checked for accuracy before submission. Marks will be deducted for lack of referencing. Faculty of Economics, Yogyakarta State University has strict rules regarding honesty in assessment. All students should be aware of the rules concerning misconducts in assessment, which prohibit certain behaviors, such as:

- No part of the work has been copied from any other person’s work except where due acknowledgement is made in the text,
- No part of the work has been written by any other person except where such collaboration has been authorized by the lecturer concerned, and
- No part of the work has been submitted for assessment in another course in this or another part of the university except where authorized by the lecturer concerned.
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION TO CONFLICT MANAGEMENT

Etymologically deriving from the Latin conflictus, which means the act of striking together from confligere to strike together, from com + fligere to strike, conflict arises in relationships and it is a universal human experience. Jeong states that traditionally conflict arises where there exist competition for resources, value differences and adversarial relationships and the term conflict means incompatibility of goals between parties. Moreover, just as the relationships take on many forms, so do the ways in which conflict is managed or resolved.

Conflict is an interactive process manifested in incompatibility, disagreement, or dissonance within or between social entities (i.e. individual, group, organization). Conflict occurs when one or (two) social entity (ies):

- is required to engage in an activity that is dissimilar with his or her needs or interests.
- Holds behavioral preferences, the satisfaction of which is incompatible with another person’s implementation of his or her preferences
- Wants some mutually desirable resource that is in short supply, such that the wants of everyone may not be satisfied fully
- Possesses attitudes, values, skills, and goals that are salient in directing one’s behavior but that are perceived to be exclusive of the attitudes, values, skills, and goals held by the other(s)
- Has partially exclusive behavioral preferences regarding joint actions; and
- is interdependent in the performance of functions or activities.

Why Workplace Conflict is may be because of scarce and insufficient resources; such as time, status or budgets: because of values; such as political preferences, religious beliefs, deep rooted moral values: and
because of insights, facts, perceptions, world views and may be because of any possible combination of these issues.

Scholars define Types of Conflict as Affective Conflict / Relationship Conflict, Substantive Conflict / Task Conflict, Conflict of Interest / Clash of Interests, and Conflict of Values. Affective Conflict / Relationship Conflict occurs when two interacting social entities, while trying to solve a problem together, become aware that their feelings and emotions regarding some or all the issues are incompatible such as Psychological conflict, Relationship conflict, Emotional conflict, and Interpersonal conflict. Substantive Conflict / Task Conflict occurs when two or more organizational members disagree on their task or content issues such as task conflict, cognitive conflict, and Issue conflict. Conflict of Interest / Clash of Interests occurs "when each party, sharing the same understanding of the situation, prefers a different and Some -what incompatible solution to a problem involving either a distribution of scarce resources between them or a decision to share the work of solving it. The argument of managers A and B for the same General Manager’s job exemplifies a conflict of interest. Conflict of Values occurs when two social entities differ in their values or ideologies on certain issues. The ideological disagreement of supervisors A and B on the question of “compensatory hiring” is an example of value conflict.

Levels of Conflict are include Intrapersonal Conflict (Within one’s personality), Interpersonal Conflict (Among persons), Intra-group Conflict (With in group) and Inter-group Conflict (Among persons). Intrapersonal Conflict is also known as intra-individual or intra-psychic conflict. It occurs when an organizational member is required to perform certain tasks and roles that do not match his or her expertise, interests, goals, and values. Interpersonal Conflict is also known as dyadic conflict. It refers to conflict between two or more organizational members of the same or different hierarchical levels or units.he studies on superior–subordinate conflict relate
to this type of conflict. Intra-group Conflict also known as intradepartmental conflict. It refers to conflict among members of a group or between two or more subgroups within a group in connection with its goals, tasks, procedures, and so on. Such a conflict may also occur as a result of incompatibilities or disagreements between some or all the members of a group and its leader(s). Inter-group Conflict is also known as interdepartmental conflict. It refers to conflict between two or more units or groups within an organization. Conflicts between line and staff, production and marketing, and headquarters and field staffs are examples of this type of conflict. On special type of intergroup conflict is between labor and management.

Conflict Management Theories and and Recent Changes in Literature. Conflict management gets achieved in various ways that include the following:

1. Competing. This managing approach proceeds from self-centered needs over the other party. It is generally characterized by aggressive communication behavior that is threatening and seeking control. Those who manage conflict this way generally fear losing control over the other party and demonstrate a lack of interpersonal skills. Such a person experiences constant tension, anger and disapproval. As a result, the conflict management by competing fails to satisfactorily resolve or manage conflict.

2. Accommodating. According to Gonclaves, accommodating means smoothing. Those who manage conflict by accommodating others are mostly concerned with preserving relationship. Although such an approach promotes goodwill and peace, it often comes at the cost of low-assertiveness with high-cooperativeness.

3. Avoiding. The approach of avoiding comes from a negative perception of conflict. Gonclaves suggests that this method is used when the conflict
involves issues of low importance, or to reduce tensions, or even to buy time. This approach is also used when a person is a low power position with control over the situation. However, those choosing to manage conflict this way often convey negativism, critical and sarcastic comments, or that they are becoming passive aggressive. Consequently, this may lead to hostility and hurt feeling with ongoing unresolved issues.

4. Compromising. The approach of compromising consists of a series of tradeoffs. Those employing this style, according to Gonclaves, always strive to find a middle ground. It is thus characterized as a fairly assertive and cooperative style, with a goal to reach mutual agreements. Nevertheless, if this approach is used excessively or exclusively, it may lead to simply making everybody happy, without resolving the original conflict.

5. Collaborating. Finally, the collaborating method includes listening to needs and goals towards a common goal. Collaboration means reaching a better solution through communication and cooperation. This results in win-win management. This is based on effective listening, confronting the situations in a non-threatening way.

Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Assertive</th>
<th>Low Assertive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competing</td>
<td>Avoiding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromising</td>
<td>Accommodating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Cooperative</th>
<th>High Cooperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competing</td>
<td>Collaborating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding</td>
<td>Accommodating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Thomas Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument is a model for handling conflict. The model organizes five conflict management styles based on two dimensions: assertiveness and cooperativeness. By knowing your own default patterns you improve your self-awareness. Once you are aware of your own patterns, you can pay attention to whether they are working for you and you can explore alternatives. By using a scenario-based approach, you can choose more effective conflict management styles and test their effectiveness for you and your situations.

Recent literature draws more attention to the importance of intrapsychic movements and the inner experiences of a human being in the conflict management process. Meier and Boivin's findings, for instance, show how the ten participants who resolve their intrapersonal conflicts are likely to resolve conflict interpersonally better than the other ten participants who failed their intrapersonal conflicts. This finding enhances the understanding of how intrapersonal conflict may contribute to interpersonal conflict management.

The focus of the studies has thus moved beyond merely dealing with the behavioral styles of conflict management and entered the realm of addressing the internal dynamics of human beings who are involved in conflict management. This change in literature comes with a deeper understanding of internal dynamics which includes feelings, moods and emotions and their functions and impacts on conflict management. Leslie Greenburg's writings predominantly derive conflict resolution from within and they are process-oriented. His approach is oriented to looking at how conflict resolution reaches integration through experiential process. In the same vein, Jones emphasizes the significance of the role of emotion in conflict management by defining feelings, moods and emotion. According to Jones, emotion is comprised of three components cognitive, physiological, and behavioral. Emotion is differentiated from affect, moods and feelings. For
Jones, feelings are defined as sensations that do not necessarily have cognitive components. Moods, continues Jones, are differentiated from emotions from the perspective of duration and intensity with moods being of longer duration and significantly less intensity. The basic position of both Greenburg and Jones is to highlight emotion as an integral component for the process of conflict management and this integrative approach is likely to bring up a win-win conflict management which is mutually beneficial and may eventually result in transformation and healing for both parties.

Conflict management is the process of limiting the negative aspects of conflict while increasing the positive aspects of conflict. The aim of conflict management is to enhance learning and group outcomes, including effectiveness or performance in organizational setting (Ra him, 2002, p. 208). Properly managed conflict can improve group outcomes (Alpert, Osvaldo, & Law, 2000; Booker & Jame son, 2001; Ra-him & Bono ma, 1979; Kuhn & Poole, 2000; Church & Marks, 2001).

Supervisors spend more than 25% of their time on conflict management, and managers spend more than 18% of their time on relational employee conflicts. This has doubled since the 1980s. Reasons for this are "the growing complexity of organizations, use of teams and group decision making, and globalization." (Lang, 2009, p. 240) Conflict management is something that companies and managers need to deal with. Conflict significantly affects employee morale, turnover, and litigation, which affects the prosperity of a company, either constructively or destructively. (Lang, 2009, p. 240) Turnover can cost a company 200% of the employee’s annual salary. (Maccabeus & Shudder, p. 48)

While no single definition of conflict exists, most definitions involve the following factors: there are at least two independent groups, the groups perceive some incompatibility between themselves, and the groups interact with each other in some way (Putnam and Poole, 1987). Two example
definitions are, "process in which one party perceives that its interests are being opposed or negatively affected by another party" (Wall & Callister, 1995, p. 517), and "the interactive process manifested in incompatibility, disagreement, or dissonance within or between social entities" (Rahim, 1992, p. 16).

There are several causes of conflict. Conflict may occur (Rahim, 2002, p. 207) when:

1. A party is required to engage in an activity that is incongruent with his or her needs or interests.
2. A party holds behavioral preferences, the satisfaction of which is incompatible with another person's implementation of his or her preferences.
3. A party wants some mutually desirable resource that is in short supply, such that the wants of all parties involved may not be satisfied fully.
4. A party possesses attitudes, values, skills, and goals that are salient in directing his or her behavior but are perceived to be exclusive of the attitudes, values, skills, and goals held by the other(s).
5. Two parties have partially exclusive behavioral preferences regarding their joint actions.
6. Two parties are interdependent in the performance of functions or activities.

The overarching hierarchy of conflict starts with a distinction between substantive (also called performance, task, issue, or active) conflict and affective (also called relationship) conflict. If one could make a distinction between good and bad conflict, substantive would be good and affective conflict would be bad.[ambiguous] Substantive and affective conflict are related (De Drue and Weingart, 2003).
Substantive conflict involves disagreements among group members about the content of the tasks being performed or the performance itself (DeChurch & Marks, 2001; Jehn, 1995). This type of conflict occurs when two or more social entities disagree on the recognition and solution to a task problem, including differences in viewpoints, ideas, and opinions (Jehn, 1995; Rahim, 2002). Affective conflict deals with interpersonal relationships or incompatibilities not directly related to achieving the group's function (Behfar, Peterson, Mannix, & Trochim, 2008; Amason, 1996; Guetzhow & Gyr, 1954; Jehn, 1992; Pinkley, 1990; Priem & Price, 1991. Both substantive and affective conflict are negatively related to team member satisfaction and team performance (De Drue and Weingart, 2003). Contradicting this, 20% (5 of 25) of the studies used showed a positive correlation between substantive conflict and task performance.

Organizational conflict, whether it be substantive or affective, can be divided into intraorganizational and interorganizational. Interorganizational conflict occurs between two or more organizations (Rahim, 2002), for example, when different businesses compete against one another. Intraorganizational conflict is conflict within an organization, and can be further classified based on scope (e.g. department, work team, individual). Other classifications are interpersonal, intragroup and intergroup conflict. Interpersonal conflict refers to conflict between two or more individuals (not representing the group they are a part of). Interpersonal conflict is divided into intragroup and intergroup conflict. Intragroup personal conflict occurs between members of the same group. Intergroup personal conflict occurs between groups (Rahim, 2002).

Conflict resolution involves the reduction, elimination, or termination of all forms and types of conflict. When people talk about conflict resolution they tend to use terms like negotiation, bargaining, mediation, or arbitration. Businesses can benefit from appropriate types and levels of conflict. That is
the aim of conflict management, and not the aim of conflict resolution. Conflict management does not imply conflict resolution. Conflict management minimizes the negative outcomes of conflict and promotes the positive outcomes of conflict with the goal of improving learning in an organization. (Rahim, 2002, p. 208) Organizational learning is important. Properly managed conflict increases learning by increasing the amount of questions asked and encourages people to challenge the status quo (Luthans, Rubach, & Marsnik, 1995).

There have been many styles of conflict management behavior that have been researched in the past century. One of the earliest, Mary Parker Follett (1926/1940) found that conflict was managed by individuals in three main ways: domination, compromise, and integration. She also found other ways of handling conflict that were employed by organizations, such as avoidance and suppression.

Blake and Mouton (1964) were among the first to present a conceptual scheme for classifying the modes (styles) for handling interpersonal conflicts in five types: forcing, withdrawing, smoothing, compromising, and problem solving. In the 1970s and 1980s, researchers began using the intentions of the parties involved to classify the styles of conflict management that they would include in their models. Both Thomas (1976) and Pruitt (1983) put forth a model based on the concerns of the parties involved in the conflict. The combination of the parties concern for their own interests (i.e. assertiveness) and their concern for the interests of those across the table (i.e. cooperativeness) would yield a particular conflict management style. Pruitt called these styles yielding (low assertiveness/high cooperativeness), problem solving (high assertiveness/high cooperativeness), inaction (low assertiveness/low cooperativeness), and contending (high assertiveness/low cooperativeness). Pruitt argues that problem-solving is the preferred method when seeking mutually beneficial options.
Khun and Poole (2000) established a similar system of group conflict management. In their system, they split Kozan's confrontational model into two sub models: distributive and integrative.

- **Distributive** - Here conflict is approached as a distribution of a fixed amount of positive outcomes or resources, where one side will end up winning and the other losing, even if they do win some concessions.

- **Integrative** - Groups utilizing the integrative model see conflict as a chance to integrate the needs and concerns of both groups and make the best outcome possible. This model has a heavier emphasis on compromise than the distributive model. Khun and Poole found that the integrative model resulted in consistently better task related outcomes than those using the distributive model.

DeChurch and Marks (2001) examined the literature available on conflict management at the time and established what they claimed was a "meta-taxonomy" that encompasses all other models. They argued that all other styles have inherent in them into two dimensions - activeness ("the extent to which conflict behaviors make a responsive and direct rather than inert and indirect impression") and agreeableness ("the extent to which conflict behaviors make a pleasant and relaxed rather than unpleasant and strainful impression"). High activeness is characterized by openly discussing differences of opinion while fully going after their own interest. High agreeableness is characterized by attempting to satisfy all parties involved.

In the study they conducted to validate this division, activeness did not have a significant effect on the effectiveness of conflict resolution, but the agreeableness of the conflict management style, whatever it was, did in fact have a positive impact on how groups felt about the way the conflict was managed, regardless of the outcome.
ahim (2002) noted that there is agreement among management scholars that there is no one best approach to how to make decisions, lead or manage conflict. In a similar vein, rather than creating a very specific model of conflict management, Rahim created a meta-model (in much the same way that DeChurch and Marks, 2001, created a meta-taxonomy) for conflict styles based on two dimensions, concern for self and concern for others.

Within this framework are five management approaches: integrating, obliging, dominating, avoiding, and compromising. Integration involves openness, exchanging information, looking for alternatives, and examining differences so solve the problem in a manner that is acceptable to both parties. Obliging is associated with attempting to minimize the differences and highlight the commonalities to satisfy the concern of the other party. When using the dominating style one party goes all out to win his or her objective and, as a result, often ignores the needs and expectations of the other party. When avoiding a party fails to satisfy his or her own concern as well as the concern of the other party. Lastly, compromising involves give-and-take whereby both parties give up something to make a mutually acceptable decision. (Rahim, 2002).

**How to manage conflict**

Overall conflict management should aim to minimize affective conflicts at all levels, attain and maintain a moderate amount of substantive conflict, and use the appropriate conflict management strategy—to effectively bring about the first two goals, and also to match the status and concerns of the two parties in conflict (Rahim, 2002).

In order for conflict management strategies to be effective, they should satisfy certain criteria. The below criteria are particularly useful for not only conflict management, but also decision making in management.
1. Organization Learning and Effectiveness- In order to attain this objective, conflict management strategies should be designed to enhance critical and innovative thinking to learn the process of diagnosis and intervention in the right problems.

2. Needs of Stakeholders- Sometimes multiple parties are involved in a conflict in an organization and the challenge of conflict management would be to involve these parties in a problem solving process that will lead to collective learning and organizational effectiveness. Organizations should institutionalize the positions of employee advocate, customer and supplier advocate, as well as environmental and stockholder advocates.

3. Ethics - A wise leader must behave ethically, and to do so the leader should be open to new information and be willing to change his or her mind. By the same token subordinates and other stakeholders have an ethical duty to speak out against the decisions of supervisors when consequences of these decisions are likely to be serious. "Without an understanding of ethics, conflict cannot be handled" (Batcheldor, 2000).

Steps to Manage

The first step is reactionary by assessing and reacting to the conflict. The second step is proactive by determining how the employee reacted to the decision. The manager tries to take (create) a new approach, and once again tries to discern how the employee reacts. Once the manager feels that the best decision for the organization has been chosen, and the employee feels justified, then the manager decides if this is a single case conflict, or one that should be written as policy. The entire process starts as a reactive situation but then moves towards a proactive decision. It is based on obtaining an outcome that best fits the organization, but emphasizes the perception of justice for the employee. The chart below shows the interaction of the procedures.
Maccoby and Studder identify five steps to managing conflict. (Maccoby & Studder, p. 50)

1. Anticipate – Take time to obtain information that can lead to conflict.
2. Prevent – Develop strategies before the conflict occurs.
3. Identify – If it is interpersonal or procedural, move to quickly manage it.
4. Manage – Remember that conflict is emotional
5. Resolve – React, without blame, and you will learn through dialogue.

Melissa Taylor’s research on Locus of Control is directly related to individual abilities of communication, especially as it pertains to interpersonal conflict. She also states that conflicts should be solution driven which are creative and integrative. They should be non-confrontational, and they should still maintain control, utilizing non-verbal messages to achieve the outcome. (Taylor, p. 449)

Rahim, Antonioni, and Psenicka’s 2001 article deals with two types of leaders. Those that have concern for themselves, and those that have concern for others. (Rahim, Antonioni & Psenicka, 2001, p. 195). They also have degrees of conflict management style.

1. Integrating involves opening up, creating dialogue, and exploring differences to choose an effective solution for both groups. “This style is positively associated with individual and organizational outcomes.” (Rahim et al., p. 197)
2. Obliging tries to find the same interests of the parties, while trying to minimize the true feeling of the conflict, to satisfy the other party.
3. Dominating is a coercive manager who forces their own way.
4. Avoiding is ignoring the problem in hopes that it will go away.
5. Compromising is a manager that is willing to make concessions and the employee makes concessions for a mutual agreement. (Rahim et al., p. 196)
The avoiding and dominating styles are considered ineffective in management. The following chart shows the interaction between the styles. (Rahim et al., p. 196)

**International Conflict Management**

Special consideration should be paid to conflict management between two parties from distinct cultures. In addition to the everyday sources of conflict, "misunderstandings, and from this counterproductive, pseudo conflicts, arise when members of one culture are unable to understand culturally determined differences in communication practices, traditions, and thought processing" (Borisoff & Victor, 1989). Indeed, this has already been observed in the business research literature. Renner (2007) recounted several episodes where managers from developed countries moved to less developed countries to resolve conflicts within the company and met with little success due to their failure to adapt to the conflict management styles of the local culture.

As an example, in Kozan's study noted above, he noted that Asian cultures are far more likely to use a harmony model of conflict management. If a party operating from a harmony model comes in conflict with a party using a more confrontational model, misunderstandings above and beyond those generated by the conflict itself will arise. International conflict management, and the cultural issues associated with it, is one of the primary areas of research in the field at the time, as existing research is insufficient to deal with the ever increasing contact occurring between international entities.

**Application at Higher education**

With only 14% of researched universities reporting mandatory courses in this subject, and with up to 25% of the manager day being spent on dealing with conflict, education needs to reconsider the importance of this subject.
The subject warrants emphasis on enabling students to deal with conflict management. (Lang, p. 240). "Providing more conflict management training in undergraduate business programs could help raise the emotional intelligence of future managers." The improvement of emotional intelligence found that employees were more likely to use problem-solving skills, instead of trying to bargain. (Lang, p. 241)

Students need to have a good set of social skills. Good communication skills allow the manager to accomplish interpersonal situations and conflict. Instead of focusing on conflict as a behavior issue, focus on the communication of it. (Myers & Larson, 2005, p. 307). With an understanding of the communications required, the student will gain the aptitude needed to differentiate between the nature and types of conflicts. These skills also teach that relational and procedural conflict needs a high degree of immediacy to resolution. If these two conflicts are not dealt with quickly, an employee will become dissatisfied or perform poorly. (Myers & Larson, p. 313)

It is also the responsibility of companies to react. One option is to identify the skills needed in house, but if the skills for creating workplace fairness are already lacking, it may be best to have an outside organization assist. These are called "Developmental Assessment Centers".

According to Rupp, Baldwin, and Bashur, these organizations "have become a popular means for providing coaching, feedback, and experiential learning opportunities." (Rupp, Baldwin & Bashshur, 2006, p. 145) Their main focus is fairness and how it impacts employee’s attitudes and performance. These organizations teach competencies and what they mean. (Rupp et al., p. 146) The students then participate in simulations. Multiple observers assess and record what skills are being used and then return this feedback to the participant. After this assessment, participants are then given another set of simulations to utilize the skills learned. Once again they receive additional
feedback from observers, in hopes that the learning can be used in their workplace.

The feedback the participant receives is detailed, behaviorally specific, and high quality. This is needed for the participant to learn how to change their behavior. (Rupp et al., p. 146) In this regard, it is also important that the participant take time to self-reflect so that learning may occur. Once an assessment program is utilized, action plans may be developed based on quantitative and qualitative data. (Rupp et al., p. 159)

Application at Counseling

When personal conflict leads to frustration and loss of efficiency, counseling may prove to be a helpful antidote. Although few organizations can afford the luxury of having professional counselors on the staff, given some training, managers may be able to perform this function. Nondirective counseling, or "listening with understanding," is little more than being a good listener—something every manager should be.

Sometimes the simple process of being able to vent one's feelings—that is, to express them to a concerned and understanding listener, is enough to relieve frustration and make it possible for the frustrated individual to advance to a problem-solving frame of mind, better able to cope with a personal difficulty that is affecting his work adversely. The nondirective approach is one effective way for managers to deal with frustrated subordinates and co-workers.

There are other more direct and more diagnostic ways that might be used in appropriate circumstances. The great strength of the nondirective approach (nondirective counseling is based on the client-centered therapy of Carl Rogers), however, lies in its simplicity, its effectiveness, and the fact that it deliberately avoids the manager-counselor's diagnosing and interpreting emotional problems, which would call for special psychological training. No
one has ever been harmed by being listened to sympathetically and understandingly. On the contrary, this approach has helped many people to cope with problems that were interfering with their effectiveness on the job.
CHAPTER 2: ANATOMY OF CONFLICT RESOLUTION AND MANAGEMENT

Perspective on conflict

Conflict theory sees society as a dynamic entity constantly undergoing change as a result of competition over scarce resources. Conflict theory sees social life as a competition, and focuses on the distribution of resources, power, and inequality. The Conflict Perspective or conflict theory, derives from the ideas of Karl Marx, who believed society is a dynamic entity constantly undergoing change driven by class conflict. Whereas functionalism understands society as a complex system striving for equilibrium, the conflict perspective views social life as competition. According to the conflict perspective, society is made up of individuals competing for limited resources (e.g., money, leisure, sexual partners, etc.). Competition over scarce resources is at the heart of all social relationships. Competition, rather than consensus, is characteristic of human relationships. Broader social structures and organizations (e.g., religions, government, etc.) reflect the competition for resources and the inherent inequality competition entails; some people and organizations have more resources (i.e., power and influence), and use those resources to maintain their positions of power in society.

C. Wright Mills is known as the founder of modern conflict theory. In his work, he believes social structures are created because of conflict between differing interests. People are then impacted by the creation of social structures, and the usual result is a differential of power between the "elite" and the "others". Examples of the "elite" would be government and large corporations. G. William Domhoff believes in a similar philosophy as Mills and has written about the "power elite of America". Sociologists who work
from the conflict perspective study the distribution of resources, power, and inequality. When studying a social institution or phenomenon, they ask, "Who benefits from this element of society?"

While functionalism emphasizes stability, conflict theory emphasizes change. According to the conflict perspective, society is constantly in conflict over resources, and that conflict drives social change. For example, conflict theorists might explain the civil rights movements of the 1960s by studying how activists challenged the racially unequal distribution of political power and economic resources. As in this example, conflict theorists generally see social change as abrupt, even revolutionary, rather than incremental. In the conflict perspective, change comes about through conflict between competing interests, not consensus or adaptation. Conflict theory, therefore, gives sociologists a framework for explaining social change, thereby addressing one of the problems with the functionalist perspective.

Predictably, conflict theory has been criticized for its focus on change and neglect of social stability. Some critics acknowledge that societies are in a constant state of change, but point out that much of the change is minor or incremental, not revolutionary. For example, many modern capitalist states have avoided a communist revolution, and have instead instituted elaborate social service programs. Although conflict theorists often focus on social change, they have, in fact, also developed a theory to explain social stability. According to the conflict perspective, inequalities in power and reward are built into all social structures. Individuals and groups who benefit from any particular structure strives to see it maintained. For example, the wealthy may fight to maintain their privileged access to higher education by opposing measures that would broaden access, such as affirmative action or public funding.
Managing intractable conflict

Conflicts are not inherently intractable or inherently co-operative. Some conflicts erupt and are settled peacefully within a short time; others simply defy any attempt at termination. Generally speaking, we can say that conflicts over deep-rooted issues (e.g. identity and human needs) tend to generate more strife and violence and become protracted. Intractable conflicts are not just longer-lasting conflicts, they are also more likely to be violent and destructive, and of course more difficult to deal with or manage. We use the term intractable conflicts to describe conflicts that sink into self-perpetuating violent interactions in which each party develops a vested interest in the continuation of the conflict. Deep feelings of fear and hostility coupled with destructive behavior make these conflicts very difficult to deal with, let alone resolve. We do not, however, mean to imply that such conflicts can never be managed. Intractable conflicts have features in common with other conflicts. As such, we must accept the possibility that intractable conflicts can be managed and resolved.

An intractable conflict is thus, first and foremost, a process (not just a single violent episode) of competitive relationships that extend over a period of time, and involves hostile perceptions and occasional military actions. The term itself acts as an integrating concept connoting processes where states become enmeshed in a web of negative interactions and hostile orientations. This pattern is repeated, indeed worsened, every so often, with the parties involved unable to curb, or manage, the escalation of their relationships. Given the characteristics of intractable conflicts, the lack of contact between the parties, the hostility and repeated violence, it seems plausible to suggest that one path out of this dilemma would be to accept some form of third-party mediation. Third parties can play a very useful role in the context of intractable conflicts.
Characteristics of Intractable Conflicts

Intractable conflicts are clearly different from other conflicts. The major characteristics of intractable conflicts can be summarized as follows:

1. In terms of actors, intractable conflicts involve states or other actors with a long sense of historical grievance, and a strong desire to redress or avenge these.

2. In terms of duration, intractable conflicts take place over a long period of time.

3. In terms of issues, intractable conflicts involve intangible issues such as identity, sovereignty, or values and beliefs.

4. In terms of relationships intractable conflicts involve polarized perceptions of hostility and enmity, and behavior that is violent and destructive.

5. In terms of geopolitics, intractable conflicts usually take place where buffer states exist between major power blocks or civilizations.

6. In terms of management, intractable conflicts resist many conflict management efforts and have a history of failed peacemaking efforts.

Where these are the accepted norms of interaction, a sustained effort at resolution must come from outside, for a variety of suitable third parties. Whichever way we look at them, intractable conflicts pose the greatest danger to the international system. Some recent studies point out that much of the violence in international relations can be accounted for by the behavior of a few states locked in intractable conflicts. Therefore, finding ways to manage or transform these conflicts into something more constructive is of great importance.

Conflict Resolution

‘Needs-based’, ‘cooperation-based’ or ‘interest-based’ conflict resolution (hereafter referred to as conflict resolution) developed as a discipline following World War II. Conflict resolution as a discipline diverged
from power-based conflict theory, which dominated and still dominates political science, and international relations; and converged from psychology and sociology, which was interested in group dynamics, motivation and relationships between institutional structures. Normative political theory saw conflict as a competitive struggle to be won by one side. In contrast, needs-based conflict resolution theorists developed a cooperative approach to conflict resolution, focusing on fundamental human needs, to encourage ‘win-win solutions’. Nonviolence, cooperation and the belief in the essential goodness of humanity are basic principles of this approach to conflict resolution.

The foundations of this discipline have their origins in the Judeo-Christian culture that developed in Europe and North America and were particularly shaped in the twentieth century by the first and second world wars. Principal antecedents of conflict resolution included philosopher and sociologist Georg Simmel (1858-1914) and Gestalt (influential on social psychology) psychologist Kurt Lewin (1890-1947). Modern conflict resolution scholars, often quote George Simmel. Simmel, perceived conflict (kampf) as “designed to resolve divergent dualisms”, that is conflict was designed to resolve two different set of principles. Lewin saw conflict as a situation of “tension” which was caused by a number of factors including the degree to which the needs of a person were in a “state of hunger or satisfaction”. On the other side of the Atlantic in Norway, Johan Galtung, a sociologist, identified steps to peace, introduced a broader notion of violence which encompasses those “avoidable insults to basic human needs”. These basic needs included security and identity. Galtung goes on to categorize violence into two forms: direct violence and structural violence. The former includes the everyday notion of violence, whereby an individual or group suffers physical or emotional pain as the result of direct action. Structural violence is caused by the institutions and structures of society which result in inequality
or “oppression” among individuals. Galtung classified peace into two forms: ‘positive peace’ and ‘negative peace.’ Negative peace, according to Galtung, fits essentially the colloquial perception of peace as an end to war. Positive peace includes not only the absence of war, but the absence of structural violence. That is positive peace is the absence of violence, in all its forms and as such has greater value in the long-term as it removes the factors which lead to direct violence. This was Galtung’s genius to merge his dual definition of violence with his dual concept of peace. However, critics of Galtung, such as Kenneth Boulding complain of his overly “taxonomical” approach and his “constant” use of “dichotomies”

John Burton synthesized the main theoretical assumptions of conflict resolution, which are known as ‘human needs theory’. This theory operates on the premise that a pre-condition for the resolution of conflict is that fundamental human needs be met. Burton adopted eight fundamental needs from the basis of the work by the American sociologist Paul Sites and introduced one further need of his own. Those adopted needs included control, security, justice, stimulation, response, meaning, rationality and esteem/recognition. Burton’s additional need was ‘role-defence;’ the need to defend one’s role. Burton called these “ontological needs” as he regarded them as a consequence of human nature, which were universal and would be pursued regardless of the consequence. Antecedents to human needs theory came from a variety of disciplines. In the biological and sociobiological disciplines conflict is perceived to result from competition over scarce resources as a result of common needs. Burton distinguishes ontological needs from values and interests. He defines ontological needs as non-negotiable; values as offering some limited opportunities for negotiation; and interests as negotiable issues. Burton distinguishes conflict from the related term of ‘dispute’. He defined ‘conflict’ as an action over these non-negotiable human needs, whereas a ‘dispute’ was over negotiable values. Burton
distinguishes conflict resolution, from the related terms of conflict management and conflict settlement. To Burton conflict resolution solved deep seemingly intractable issues, whereas settlement only addressed the superficial factors of conflict. Burton was not without controversy. His notion of needs falls under criticism especially from those cultural anthropologists and relativists, who were (and still are) resistant to universal values, among those were fellow members of the Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution, Kevin Avruch and Peter Black. Despite this Burton had many supporters who applied his methods in other international conflicts. These included people like Herbert Kelman in Palestine-Israel, Edward Azar in Lebanon and Vamik Volkan in Cyprus.

Roger Fisher in 1978 a law professor collaborated in the founding of the Harvard Negotiation Project (HNP), and he was a significant figure in the founding of the Programme on Negotiation (PON) at the Harvard Law School in 1983. Roger Fisher’s approach to conflict resolution (or negotiation) was popularized which introduced the term ‘principled-negotiation.’ The principle-based approach aims to resolve conflict by deferring judgement to a moral principle. Such an approach advocates the need for interest-based negotiations in contrast to those based on a ‘position’. For example Fisher would suggest that an interest would include issues like security, esteem and pleasures, whereas positions would define how one achieved those interests.

Fisher encourages the need for empathy and asks the question – “why does one hold one position, and another hold a different one”? Fisher suggests that empathy allows parties to discern the underlying interest which by creativity may result in amicable solutions (what this author would refer to as ‘re-negotiated positions) to each party. Like Burton, Fisher defines the most powerful interests as human needs, which he identifies as security, economic-well-being, a sense of belonging, recognition, and control over one’s life.
In the 1990s scholars began to refer to conflict resolution with terms such as ‘conflict transformation’ and ‘peace-building’. Keeping with the spirit of Georg Simmel, such terms denote methods of encouraging constructive results from conflict for all parties. John Paul Lederach, Robert Baruch-Bush, Joseph Folger, R. Vayrynen and Peter Wallensteen may be described as adherents of the conflict transformation school. In conflict transformation, conflict is not seen as a final state, but a “dynamic process…wherein as one problem is solved a new one emerges”. Similarly, the symbolism of the Chinese character for ‘crisis’ provides cross-cultural evidence of an optimistic notion of conflict and conflict transformation, as the character “simultaneously means opportunity”.

In what may be a dramatic creative input to conflict resolution scholarship are provided by lessons from critical and cosmopolitan theory. This is part of the post-modern sociological or philosophical perspective that concludes that mediators can be charged with: enlarging the boundaries of political community, overcoming sectional and factional differences, expanding the domain of moral responsibility…and promoting relations which conform to some standards of international order. This alternative to realist international relations theory is heavily influenced by the philosophy of Jurgen Habermas and his interpreters in the field of international relations such as Andrew Linklater and David Held.

**Methods of Needs-Based Conflict Resolution**

The main methods of needs-based conflict resolution are: integrative bargaining (Roger Fisher’s principled negotiation); analytic or interactive problem-solving (John Burton and Herb Kelman); and the human relations workshops (Leonard Doob). The integrative bargaining process, sometimes called principled negotiation, involves negotiation in which the focus is on “merits of the issues and the parties try to enlarge the available ‘pie’ rather
than stake claims to certain portions of it”. That is integrative bargaining involves “both concession making and searching for mutually profitable solutions”. Integrative bargaining tries to move beyond position-based bargaining and determine underlying interests. Interactive or analytic problem-solving is a “form of third-party consultation or informal mediation…it is a needs-based approach to resolving conflict”. It begins with an analysis of the political needs and fears. This approach was pioneered by John Burton, and extended by Herbert Kelman. It is a “nontraditional, nongovernmental approach emphasizing analytical dialogue and problem-solving”. This process is known by former American diplomat Joseph Montville as the “track two,” or a grass root method of conflict resolution, in contrast to governmental diplomacy which is known as “track one diplomacy”.

**Anatomy of Industrial Conflict**

Industrial conflicts can be classified into four groups:

1. Interest Dispute: These are the disputes that arise out of deadlocks in negotiations.
2. Grievance Disputes: These are the disputes that arise from day to-day grievances.
3. Unfair Labor Practices: These are the disputes that arise from the acts of interference with the exercise of right to organize etc.
4. Recognition Dispute: These are the disputes that arise due to the recognition of trade union as bargaining agent.

**Definition of Dispute**

Any dispute or difference between employers and employers or between employers and workmen or between workmen and workmen, which is connected with the employment or non-employment or the terms of employment or with the conditions of labor of any person. Dispute must be
between: employer and employer, employer and workmen, or Workmen and workmen

The term Industrial Dispute as analyzed by courts and on the basis of which the principles of Industrial Dispute are as under:
1. The dispute must affect large group of workmen
2. The dispute should be taken-up by Union or others on behalf of workers.
3. Demands should be for redress and grievance
4. The parties to the union must be directly involved
5. Individual dispute referred by government for adjudication cannot be converted into industrial dispute.

Features of Industrial conflicts:

- Devoid of cost i.e. long drawn conflicts
- Labor pressure by the management pressure of lock out.
- Most of the strikes are political strikes
- Lockouts more frequent in eastern region

Causes of Industrial Conflicts included Industrial Factors, Management’s attitude towards workers, Government machinery and other causes. Industrial factors are included:
1. Terms of employment and condition of employment;
2. Dismissal or non employment of any person
3. Registered agreements, settlement and awards;
4. Demarcation of the function of an employee;
5. Demand for higher wags according to rise in prices and living standard.
6. Due to influx of educated class of employees there is self consciousness of one’s rights
7. The trade union often failed to safeguard the interest of the workers due to rivalry, multiplicity and non-recognition as bargaining agent.

8. Compulsory adjudication, working on the basis of caste or community divides the workers and industrial conflicts may set in.

9. Union workers are working with ulterior motives.

However, the Management attitude towards labor are included:

- Management refusal to talk with the union representative in case of any dispute
- Management unwillingness to recognize union
- Even after recognition of the trade union leaders, the management don’t delegate authority to their representative to settle the dispute
- Sometimes, favor of management by the trade union leaders enraged the workers.
- Management’s insistence that they are the only authority for recruitment promotions etc.
- Management negative attitude to offer right benefits to the employees

Government Machinery factors are:

- Irrelevancy to meet the requirement of present industrial climate;
- Inability to understand the development of industrial promotion
- Non-implementation of the rules and regulations by employers and no action on the part of government.
- Improper functioning of conciliation machinery
- Non-provision of the number of officials as required for early settlements of industrial disputes.
And other causes are affiliation of trade unions with different political parties created problems in settling the disputes, political instability, and rampant corruption etc.

**Five Approaches to Conflict Resolution**

An appreciation of conflict resolution styles is integral to understanding the communication process. While the names may differ slightly, there are five major responsive approaches to managing conflicts. There is no right or wrong conflict resolution style, and each conflict participant is capable of choosing the approach she deems most appropriate in any given situation. In the workplace, a manager should understand each of these approaches to help parties resolve conflicts that arise on the job.

**Accommodating:** The accommodating approach emphasizes cooperation instead of assertiveness. A person places his interests last and allows the other party to further her interests. The accommodating approach often occurs when a party is not significantly invested in securing a victory, because he does not perceive the alternative option as a significant threat.

**Avoiding:** Avoiding conflict involves one of the conflicted parties avoiding communicating about or confronting the problem, hoping it will go away. By not participating in the problem-solving process, she is effectively removing herself from it. When employing this approach, the conflict might go away if the other party doesn't press for a resolution. The underlying differences between the parties are never resolved.

**Collaborating:** The collaboration style involves parties working together to resolve issues, and both sides come to the table with win-win attitudes. It is a favorable negotiation style in formal dispute resolution situations, such as mediation, where the parties employee a mediator but must agree on the final, binding resolution.
Compromise: Bargaining is the hallmark of the compromise approach to conflict resolution. The conflicting parties can identify some interests they are willing to compromise on to bring about a resolution. While the emotional level might still be high, the compromise style sometimes results in interim solutions when a full resolution is not immediately possible. Parties might reach a settlement to prevent further escalation of the conflict.

Confrontation: The confrontation style to conflict resolution entails the party placing his desires above those of all others involved in the conflict. Assertiveness is the hallmark of this approach, and those employing this style of negotiation aim to address the conflict head-on. It might involve high levels of emotions as the parties establish positions in what can sometimes evolve into hostile communications.

Conflict transformation

Conflict transformation is the process by which conflicts, such as ethnic conflict, are transformed into peaceful outcomes. It differs from conflict resolution and conflict management approaches in that it recognises "that contemporary conflicts require more than the reframing of positions and the identification of win-win outcomes. The very structure of parties and relationships may be embedded in a pattern of conflictual relationships that extend beyond the particular site of conflict. Conflict transformation is therefore a process of engaging with and transforming the relationships, interests, discourses and, if necessary, the very constitution of society that supports the continuation of violent conflict".

Conflict transformation approaches differ from those of conflict management or conflict resolution. Whereas conflict transformation involves transforming the relationships that support violence, conflict management approaches seek to merely manage and contain conflict, and conflict resolution approaches seek to move conflict parties away from zero-sum
positions towards positive outcomes, often with the help of external actors. According to Search for Common Ground, one of the oldest organizations devoted to implementing conflict transformation programs, conflict transformation initiatives are often characterized by long time horizons and interventions at multiple levels, aimed at changing perceptions and improving communications skills addressing the roots of conflict, including inequality and social injustice.

According to Berghof Foundation for Conflict Studies, conflict transformation means: A generic, comprehensive term referring to actions and processes seeking to alter the various characteristics and manifestations of violent conflict by addressing the root causes of a particular conflict over the long term. It aims to transform negative destructive conflict into positive constructive conflict and deals with structural, behavioral and attitudinal aspects of conflict. The term refers to both the process and the completion of the process. As such, it incorporates the activities of processes such as conflict prevention and conflict resolution and goes farther than conflict settlement or conflict management.

The Principles of Conflict Transformation, as developed by Trans-Conflict, go further in helping define conflict transformation:

1. Conflict should not be regarded as an isolated event that can be resolved or managed, but as an integral part of society’s on-going evolution and development;"
2. Conflict should not be understood solely as an inherently negative and destructive occurrence, but rather as a potentially positive and productive force for change if harnessed constructively;"
3. Conflict transformation goes beyond merely seeking to contain and manage conflict, instead seeking to transform the root causes of a particular conflict;"
4. Conflict transformation is a long-term, gradual and complex process, requiring sustained engagement and interaction;"

5. Conflict transformation is not just an approach and set of techniques, but a way of thinking about and understanding conflict itself;"

6. Conflict transformation is particularly intended for intractable conflicts, where deep-rooted issues fuel protracted violence;"
Scholars define conflict can come from a variety of sources:

1. Goals. Conflict can happen as a result of conflicting goals or priorities. It can also happen when there is a lack of shared goals.

2. Personality conflicts. Personality conflicts are a common cause of conflict. Sometimes there is no chemistry, or you haven’t figured out an effective way to click with somebody.

3. Scarce resources. Conflict can happen when you’re competing over scarce resources.

4. Styles. People have different styles. Your thinking style or communication style might conflict with somebody else’s thinking style or their communication style. The good news is that conflicts in styles are easy to adapt to when you know how.

5. Values. Sometimes you will find conflict in values. The challenge here is that values are core. Adapting with styles is one thing, but dealing with conflicting values is another. That’s why a particular business, group, or culture may not be a good fit for you. It’s also why “bird’s of a feather flock together” and why “opposites attract, but similarities bind.”

By embracing conflict as a part of life, you can make the most of each situation and use it as a learning opportunity or a leadership opportunity. You can also use it as an opportunity to transform the situation into something better.

**Five Dimensions of Conflict (Resolution)**

The five dimensions of conflict below chart a typical conflict, whether it is interpersonal or global.

**DIMENSION # 1: Who or how many parties are involved?**
• Internal – a conflict within oneself
• Interpersonal - a conflict between two or more individuals
• Intrac-Tion – a conflict within a group (Groups can be institutions, organizations, or any groups of people who share a specific role or identity.)
• Interg-roup – a conflict between two or more groups
• International – a conflict between two or more nations
• Global – a conflict that directly or indirectly has an effect on all people and nations in the world
• Transboundary – a conflict between groups that is based on their positions in relation to a geographical boundary

DIMENSION # 2: What are the sources of conflict? What is it over?
• Conflicts Over Resources (Human Resources; Things and Capital; Natural Resources; Land and Territory)
  o When people, groups, and nations are competing for the same resources
  o When there is a dispute over who has a right to certain resources
  o When people, groups, or nations want to take someone else’s resources or prevent someone from getting needed resources
• Conflicts Over Values (Beliefs, Choices and Perspectives, and Preferences)
  o When people, groups, and nations have relations with each other, but hold different deeply held beliefs about the role of an individual, group or family within their culture, cultural practices, politics, and religion
  o Conflicts over “what is most important”
• Conflicts Over Psychological Needs (Power and Control, Emotional Needs)
  o Conflicts related to an individual’s or group’s need for respect, love, affirmation, approval, friendship, and power over their own fates
  o Conflicts related to the need of individuals to belong and have the opportunity to develop and achieve
  o Conflicts that arise when psychological needs are not fulfilled
  o Conflicts between an individual and other people or institutions when obstacles prevent someone from having their needs met

DIMENSION #3: Relationships between/among conflicting parties.
The type of relationship that exists between conflicting parties will often determine the intensity of the conflict and its outcome. Important questions to ask include:

• What kind of climate is present between conflicting parties? How can the climate change the outcome?
  o Trusting or Suspicious
  o Friendly or Hostile
  o Open or Resistant
  o Calm or Emotionally Tense

• Do parties come to the conflict with equal power or a power imbalance? Does any one party control the resources and decision-making process?

• What is the degree of interdependence between the conflicting parties? (In other words, do the actions of one person or group seriously impact the others involved in the conflict?)
  o How often do the parties see or interact with one another?
  o Is a positive relationship valued equally by both parties?
Does each party need the cooperation of the other to achieve important goals?

- How well do the parties know one another?
  - Does the relationship matter to both or one of them? How much?
  - Does it matter if conflicting parties come from different cultures and know little about the other?

**DIMENSION #4: What is the history of the conflict?**

Usually the longer a conflict exists, the more intense and complex it becomes, and therefore, the more difficult to resolve. Yet, there is also a point when parties can become so “battle weary” that they finally see resolution as the best strategy. Factors that complicate a conflict:

- The duration of the conflict.
  - How long has the conflict continued?
  - Are the original parties still actively involved in the conflict?

- The frequency of the conflict.
  - How often has the conflict reemerged?
  - Are there periods when the conflict escalated to severe levels?
  - Did this conflict develop in stages?

- The intensity of the conflict.
  - How life threatening is the conflict?
  - Is the conflict emotionally or ideologically charged?

- The perception of the conflict by both those directly involved and those who witness it but do not feel directly affected by it.
  - Do people “see” the conflict as serious or irrelevant? (Conflicts can remain unresolved when there is little or no pressure to address them – when people from ‘inside’ or ‘outside’ the conflict don’t perceive it to be compelling enough to resolve.)
Conflicts are not always visible, or easily identifiable. In these situations, the conflict remains, even though it is hidden from view or ignored.

*The historical conflict between Israel and Palestine is a good example for discussing this dimension.

DIMENSION # 5: The Process: How do we choose to deal with the conflict?
In every conflict, all parties involved make choices to take some action they think will help them get what they want and need. These choices may be spontaneous or calculated, constructive or destructive. Conflicts can develop in stages and consequently may involve many different responses as the conflict proceeds. Some of those choices are:

- Avoidance – deny, ignore, or back off the conflict
- Diffuse the conflict – postpone, wait, gather data, or check it out
- Engage in the conflict – methods might include:
  - Direct Force or Competition
  - Accommodation – to adapt or adjust
  - Compromise
  - Use Collaborative Problem-Solving

Practice Restorative Justice- valuing community continuity and well-being in the solution.

Identity

*PERSON, as I take it, is the name for this self. Wherever a man finds what he calls himself, there, I think, another may say is the same person. It is a forensic term, appropriating actions and their merit; and so belong only to intelligent agents, capable of a law, and happiness, and misery. This personality extends itself beyond present existence to what is past, only by consciousness, -- whereby it becomes concerned and accountable; owns and*
imputes to itself past actions, just upon the same ground and for the same reason as it does the present. All which is founded in a concern for happiness, the unavoidable concomitant of consciousness; that which is conscious of pleasure and pain, desiring that that self that is conscious should be happy. And therefore whatever past actions it cannot reconcile or APPROPRIATE to that present self by consciousness, it can be no more concerned in it than if they had never been done: and to receive pleasure or pain, i.e. reward or punishment, on the account of any such action, is all one as to be made happy or miserable in its first being, without any demerit at all. For, supposing a MAN punished now for what he had done in another life, whereof he could be made to have no consciousness at all, what difference is there between that punishment and being CREATED miserable? And therefore, conformable to this, the apostle tells us, that, at the great day, when everyone shall 'receive according to his doings, the secrets of all hearts shall be laid open.' The sentence shall be justified by the consciousness all person shall have, that THEY THEMSELVES, in what bodies soever they appear, or what substances soever that consciousness adheres to, are the SAME that committed those actions, and deserve that punishment for them.

In philosophy, the issue of personal identity concerns several loosely related issues, in particular persistence, change, sameness, and time. Personal identity is the distinct personality of an individual and is concerned with the persisting entity particular to a given individual. The personal identity structure appears to preserve itself from the previous version in time when it is modified. It is the individual characteristics arising from personality by which
a person is recognized or known. Generally, it is the unique numerical identity of persons through time. That is to say, the necessary and sufficient conditions under which a person at one time and a person at another time can be said to be the same person, persisting through time.[note 5] In the modern philosophy of mind, this concept of personal identity is sometimes referred to as the diachronic problem of personal identity. The synchronic problem[note is grounded in the question of what features or traits characterize a given person at one time. Identity is an issue for both continental philosophy and analytic philosophy. A question in continental philosophy is in what sense can the contemporary conception of identity be maintained, while many prior propositions, postulates, and presuppositions about the world are different.

In another concept of mind, the set of cognitive faculties are considered to consist of an immaterial substance, separate from and independent of the body. If a person is then identified with their mind, rather than their body—if a person is considered to be their mind—and their mind is such a non-physical substance, then personal identity over time may be grounded in the persistence of this non-physical substance, despite the continuous change in the substance of the body it is associated with. The mind-body problem concerns the explanation of the relationship, if any, that exists between minds, or mental processes, and bodily states or processes. One of the aims of philosophers who work in this area is to explain how a non-material mind can influence a material body and vice-versa.

However, this is not uncontroversial or unproblematic, and adopting it as a solution raises questions. Perceptual experiences depend on stimuli which arrive at various sensory organs from the external world and these stimuli cause changes in mental states; ultimately causing sensation. A desire for food, for example, will tend to cause a person to move their body in a manner and in a direction to obtain food. The question, then, is how it can be possible
for conscious experiences to arise out of an organ (the human brain) possessing electrochemical properties. A related problem is to explain how propositional attitudes (e.g. beliefs and desires) can cause neurons of the brain to fire and muscles to contract in the correct manner. These comprise some of the puzzles that have confronted epistemologists and philosophers of mind from at least the time of René Descartes.

**Power**

In social science and politics, power is the ability to influence the behavior of people. The term authority is often used for power perceived as legitimate by the social structure. Power can be seen as evil or unjust, but the exercise of power is accepted as endemic to humans as social beings. In the corporate environment, power is often expressed as upward or downward. With downward power, a company's superior influences subordinates. When a company exerts upward power, it is the subordinates who influence the decisions of the leader (Greiner & Schein, 1988).

The use of power need not involve coercion (force or the threat of force). At one extreme, it more closely resembles what everyday English-speakers call influence, although some authors make a distinction between power and influence – the means by which power is used (Handy, C. 1993 Understanding Organisations). Much of the recent sociological debate on power revolves around the issue of the enabling nature of power. A comprehensive account of power can be found in Steven Lukes Power: A Radical View where he discusses the three dimensions of power. Thus, power can be seen as various forms of constraint on human action, but also as that which makes action possible, although in a limited scope. Much of this debate is related to the works of the French philosopher Michel Foucault (1926–1984), who, following the Italian political philosopher Niccolò Machiavelli (1469–1527), sees power as "a complex strategic situation in a
given society social setting”. Being deeply structural, his concept involves both constraint and enablement. For a purely enabling (and voluntaristic) concept of power see the works of Anthony Giddens.

People use power more than rewards, threats, and information to influence people.[citation needed] In everyday situations people use a variety of power tactics to push or prompt people into particular action. There are plenty of examples of power tactics that are quite common and employed every day. Some of these tactics include bullying, collaboration, complaining, criticizing, demanding, disengaging, evading, humor, inspiring, manipulating, negotiating, socializing, and supplicating. These power tactics can be classified along three different dimensions: softness, rationality, and laterality (Falbo & Pepalu, 1980; Raven et al., 1998).

Soft tactics take advantage of the relationship between person and the target. They are more indirect and interpersonal (e.g. collaboration, socializing). Conversely, hard tactics are harsh, forceful, direct, and rely on concrete outcomes. However, they are not more powerful than soft tactics. In many circumstances, fear of social exclusion can be a much stronger motivator than some kind of physical punishment.

**Five bases of power**

Social psychologists John R. P. French and Bertram Raven, in a now-classic study (1959),[9] developed a schema of sources of power by which to analyse how power plays work (or fail to work) in a specific relationship. According to French and Raven, power must be distinguished from influence in the following way: power is that state of affairs which holds in a given relationship, A-B, such that a given influence attempt by A over B makes A’s desired change in B more likely. Conceived this way, power is fundamentally relative – it depends on the specific understandings A and B each apply to their relationship, and, interestingly, requires B’s recognition of a quality in A.
which would motivate B to change in the way A intends. A must draw on the 'base' or combination of bases of power appropriate to the relationship, to effect the desired outcome. Drawing on the wrong power base can have unintended effects, including a reduction in A's own power. French and Raven argue that there are five significant categories of such qualities, while not excluding other minor categories. Further bases have since been adduced – in particular by Morgan (1986: ch.6), who identifies 14, while others have suggested a simpler model for practical purposes – for example, Handy (1976), who recommends three.

1. Legitimate power. Also called "Positional power," it is the power of an individual because of the relative position and duties of the holder of the position within an organization. Legitimate power is formal authority delegated to the holder of the position. It is usually accompanied by various attributes of power such as uniforms, offices etc. This is the most obvious and also the most important kind of power.

2. Referent power. Referent power is the power or ability of individuals to attract others and build loyalty. It's based on the charisma and interpersonal skills of the power holder. A person may be admired because of specific personal trait, and this admiration creates the opportunity for interpersonal influence. Here the person under power desires to identify with these personal qualities, and gains satisfaction from being an accepted follower. Nationalism and patriotism count towards an intangible sort of referent power. For example, soldiers fight in wars to defend the honor of the country. This is the second least obvious power, but the most effective. Advertisers have long used the referent power of sports figures for products endorsements, for example. The charismatic appeal of the sports star supposedly leads to an acceptance of the endorsement, although the individual may have little real credibility outside the sports arena. Abuse is possible when someone that is likable,
yet lacks integrity and honesty, rises to power, placing them in a situation to gain personal advantage at the cost of the group's position. Referent power is unstable alone, and is not enough for a leader who wants longevity and respect. When combined with other sources of power, however, it can help you achieve great success.[

3. Expert power. Expert power is an individual's power deriving from the skills or expertise of the person and the organization's needs for those skills and expertise. Unlike the others, this type of power is usually highly specific and limited to the particular area in which the expert is trained and qualified. When you have knowledge and skills that enable you to understand a situation, suggest solutions, use solid judgment, and generally outperform others, people will have reason to listen to you. When you demonstrate expertise, people tend to trust you and respect what you say. As a subject matter expert, your ideas will have more value, and others will look to you for leadership in that area.

4. Reward power. Reward power depends on the ability of the power wielder to confer valued material rewards, it refers to the degree to which the individual can give others a reward of some kind such as benefits, time off, desired gifts, promotions or increases in pay or responsibility. This power is obvious but also ineffective if abused. People who abuse reward power can become pushy or became reprimanded for being too forthcoming or 'moving things too quickly'. If others expect that you'll reward them for doing what you want, there's a high probability that they'll do it. The problem with this basis of power is that you may not have as much control over rewards as you need. Supervisors probably don't have complete control over salary increases, and managers often can't control promotions all by themselves. And even a CEO needs permission from the board of directors for some actions. So when you use up available rewards, or the rewards don't have enough perceived value to others, your
power weakens. (One of the frustrations of using rewards is that they often need to be bigger each time if they're to have the same motivational impact. Even then, if rewards are given frequently, people can become satiated by the reward, such that it loses its effectiveness.)

5. Coercive power. Coercive power is the application of negative influences. It includes the ability to demote or to withhold other rewards. The desire for valued rewards or the fear of having them withheld that ensures the obedience of those under power. Coercive power tends to be the most obvious but least effective form of power as it builds resentment and resistance from the people who experience it. Threats and punishment are common tools of coercion. Implying or threatening that someone will be fired, demoted, denied privileges, or given undesirable assignments – these are examples of using coercive power. Extensive use of coercive power is rarely appropriate in an organizational setting, and relying on these forms of power alone will result in a very cold, impoverished style of leadership.

**Counter power**

The term 'counter-power' (sometimes written 'counterpower') is used in a range of situations to describe the countervailing force that can be utilised by the oppressed to counterbalance or erode the power of elites. In the book Counterpower: Making Change Happen, a definition rooted in the political science literature is offered. Reflecting the categories of power presented by Mann (ideological, economic, military), Toffler (knowledge, wealth, violence), Gramsci and others, Gee asserts that movements can use 'Idea Counterpower', 'Economic Counterpower' and 'Physical Counterpower' to challenge the power of ruling elites. A more general definition has been provided by the anthropologist David Graeber as 'a collection of social institutions set in opposition to the state and capital: from self-governing
communities to radical labor unions to popular militias'.[33] Graeber also notes that counter-power can also be referred to as 'anti-power' and 'when institutions [of counter-power] maintain themselves in the face of the state, this is usually referred to as a 'dual power' situation'. Although the term has come to prominence through its use by participants in the global justice/anti-globalization movement of the 1990s onwards,[34] the word has been used for at least 60 years; for instance Martin Buber's 1949 book 'Paths in Utopia' includes the line 'Power abdicates only under counter-power'

**Structure**

Structure is a fundamental, tangible or intangible notion referring to the recognition, observation, nature, and permanence of patterns and relationships of entities. This notion may itself be an object, such as a built structure, or an attribute, such as the structure of society. From a child's verbal description of a snowflake, to the detailed scientific analysis of the properties of magnetic fields, the concept of structure is now often an essential foundation of nearly every mode of inquiry and discovery in science, philosophy, and art. In early 20th-century and earlier thought, form often plays a role comparable to that of structure in contemporary thought. The neo-Kantianism of Ernst Cassirer (cf. his Philosophy of Symbolic Forms, completed in 1929 and published in English translation in the 1950s) is sometimes regarded as a precursor of the later shift to structuralism and post-structuralism

The description of structure implicitly offers an account of what a system is made of: a configuration of items, a collection of inter-related components or services. A structure may be a hierarchy (a cascade of one-to-many relationships), a network featuring many-to-many links, or a lattice featuring connections between components that are neighbors in space. A social structure is a pattern of relationships. They are social organizations of
individuals in various life situations. Structures are applicable to people in
how a society is as a system organized by a characteristic pattern of
relationships. This is known as the social organization of the group.
Sociologists have studied the changing structure of these groups. Structure
and agency are two confronted theories about human behavior. The debate
surrounding the influence of structure and agency on human thought is one of
the central issues in sociology. In this context, agency refers to the individual
human capacity to act independently and make free choices. Structure here
refers to factors such as social class, religion, gender, ethnicity, customs etc.
that seem to limit or influence individual opportunities.
CHAPTER 4: SETTLEMENT AND RESOLUTION PROCEDURE

Negotiation & Mediation

Negotiation is a dialogue between two or more people or parties, intended to reach an understanding, resolve point of difference, or gain advantage in outcome of dialogue, to produce an agreement upon courses of action, to bargain for individual or collective advantage, to craft outcomes to satisfy various interests of two people/parties involved in negotiation process. Negotiation is a process where each party involved in negotiating tries to gain an advantage for themselves by the end of the process. Negotiation is intended to aim at compromise. Negotiation occurs in business, non-profit organizations, government branches, legal proceedings, among nations and in personal situations such as marriage, divorce, parenting, and everyday life. The study of the subject is called negotiation theory. Professional negotiators are often specialized, such as union negotiators, leverage buyout negotiators, peace negotiators, hostage negotiators, or may work under other titles, such as diplomats, legislators or brokers.

Negotiation can take a wide variety of forms, from a trained negotiator acting on behalf of a particular organization or position in a formal setting, to an informal negotiation between friends. Negotiation can be contrasted with mediation, where a neutral third party listens to each side's arguments and attempts to help craft an agreement between the parties. It can also be compared with arbitration, which resembles a legal proceeding. In arbitration, both sides make an argument as to the merits of their case and the arbitrator decides the outcome. This negotiation is also sometimes called positional or hard-bargaining negotiation. Negotiation theorists generally distinguish
between two types of negotiation. Different theorists use different labels for the two general types and distinguish them in different ways.

Distributive negotiation is also sometimes called positional or hard-bargaining negotiation. It tends to approach negotiation on the model of haggling in a market. In a distributive negotiation, each side often adopts an extreme position, knowing that it will not be accepted, and then employs a combination of guile, bluffing, and brinksmanship in order to cede as little as possible before reaching a deal. Distributive bargainers conceive of negotiation as a process of distributing a fixed amount of value. The term distributive implies that there is a finite amount of the thing being distributed or divided among the people involved. Sometimes this type of negotiation is referred to as the distribution of a “fixed pie.” There is only so much to go around, but the proportion to be distributed is variable. Distributive negotiation is also sometimes called win-lose because of the assumption that one person’s gain results in another person’s loss.

A distributive negotiation often involves people who have never had a previous interactive relationship, nor are they likely to do so again in the near future. Simple everyday examples would be buying a car or a house. Integrative negotiation is also sometimes called interest-based or principled negotiation. It is a set of techniques that attempts to improve the quality and likelihood of negotiated agreement by providing an alternative to traditional distributive negotiation techniques. While distributive negotiation assumes there is a fixed amount of value (a “fixed pie”) to be divided between the parties, integrative negotiation often attempts to create value in the course of the negotiation (“expand the pie”). It focuses on the underlying interests of the parties rather than their arbitrary starting positions, approaches negotiation as a shared problem rather than a personalized battle, and insists upon adherence to objective, principled criteria as the basis for agreement. The word integrative implies some cooperation. Integrative negotiation often
involves a higher degree of trust and the forming of a relationship. It can also involve creative problem-solving that aims to achieve mutual gains. It is also sometimes called win-win negotiation.

A number of different approaches to integrative negotiation are taught in a variety of different books and programs. See, for example, Getting to YES, Mutual Gains Approach, Program on Negotiation, Gould Negotiation and Mediation Teaching Program. Scholars who have contributed to the field of negotiation include Roger Fisher and William Ury; Holly Schroth and Timothy Daynot at UC Berkeley; Gerard E. Watzke at Tulane University; Sara Cobb at George Mason University; Len Riskin at the University of Missouri; Howard Raiffa at Harvard, Robert McKersie and Lawrence Susskind at MIT; Adil Najam and Jeswald Salacuse at The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy and John D. Males.

**Negotiation tactics**

There are many different ways to categorize the essential elements of negotiation. One view of negotiation involves three basic elements: process, behavior and substance. The process refers to how the parties negotiate: the context of the negotiations, the parties to the negotiations, the tactics used by the parties, and the sequence and stages in which all of these play out. Behavior refers to the relationships among these parties, the communication between them and the styles they adopt. The substance refers to what the parties negotiate over: the agenda, the issues (positions and - more helpfully - interests), the options, and the agreement(s) reached at the end. Another view of negotiation comprises four elements: strategy, process, tools, and tactics. Strategy comprises the top level goals - typically including relationship and the final outcome. Processes and tools include the steps that will be followed and the roles taken in both preparing for and negotiating with the other parties. Tactics include more detailed statements and actions and
responses to others’ statements and actions. Some add to this persuasion and influence, asserting that these have become integral to modern day negotiation success, and so should not be omitted.

Adversary or partner? The two basically different approaches to negotiating will require different tactics. In the distributive approach each negotiator is battling for the largest possible piece of the pie, so it may be quite appropriate - within certain limits - to regard the other side more as an adversary than a partner and to take a somewhat harder line. This would however be less appropriate if the idea were to hammer out an arrangement that is in the best interest of both sides. A good agreement is not one with maximum gain, but optimum gain. This does not by any means suggest that we should give up our own advantage for nothing. But a cooperative attitude will regularly pay dividends. What is gained is not at the expense of the other, but with him.

Employing an advocate. A skilled negotiator may serve as an advocate for one party to the negotiation. The advocate attempts to obtain the most favorable outcomes possible for that party. In this process the negotiator attempts to determine the minimum outcome(s) the other party is (or parties are) willing to accept, then adjusts their demands accordingly. A "successful" negotiation in the advocacy approach is when the negotiator is able to obtain all or most of the outcomes their party desires, but without driving the other party to permanently break off negotiations, unless the best alternative to a negotiated agreement (BATNA) is acceptable. Skilled negotiators may use a variety of tactics ranging from negotiation hypnosis,[citation needed] to a straightforward presentation of demands or setting of preconditions, to more deceptive approaches such as cherry picking. Intimidation and salami tactics may also play a part in swaying the outcome of negotiations. Another negotiation tactic is bad guy/good guy. Bad guy/good guy is when one negotiator acts as a bad guy by using anger and threats. The other negotiator
acts as a good guy by being considerate and understanding. The good guy blames the bad guy for all the difficulties while trying to get concessions and agreement from the opponent. Another negotiation is leaning back and whispering. This establishes a dominant physical position thus intimidating your counterpart.

**Types of Negotiators**

Three basic kinds of negotiators have been identified by researchers involved in The Harvard Negotiation Project. These types of negotiators are: Soft bargainers, hard bargainers, and principled bargainers.

1. **Soft.** These people see negotiation as too close to competition, so they choose a gentle style of bargaining. The offers they make are not in their best interests, they yield to others’ demands, avoid confrontation, and they maintain good relations with fellow negotiators. Their perception of others is one of friendship, and their goal is agreement. They do not separate the people from the problem, but are soft on both. They avoid contests of wills and will insist on agreement, offering solutions and easily trusting others and changing their opinions.

2. **Hard.** These people use contentious strategies to influence, utilizing phrases such as “this is my final offer” and “take it or leave it.” They make threats, are distrustful of others, insist on their position, and apply pressure to negotiate. They see others as adversaries and their ultimate goal is victory. Additionally, they will search for one single answer, and insist you agree on it. They do not separate the people from the problem (as with soft bargainers), but they are hard on both the people involved and the problem.

3. **Principled.** Individuals who bargain this way seek integrative solutions, and do so by sidestepping commitment to specific positions. They focus on the problem rather than the intentions, motives, and needs of the
people involved. They separate the people from the problem, explore
interests, avoid bottom lines, and reach results based on standards (which
are independent of personal will). They base their choices on objective
criteria rather than power, pressure, self-interest, or an arbitrary decisional
procedure. These criteria may be drawn from moral standards, principles
of fairness, professional standards, tradition, and so on.

Researchers from The Harvard Negotiation Project recommend that
negotiators explore a number of alternatives to the problems they are facing
in order to come to the best overall conclusion/solution, but this is often not
the case (as when you may be dealing with an individual utilizing soft or hard
bargaining tactics) (Forsyth, 2010).

Bad faith negotiation is occurred when a party pretends to negotiate,
but secretly has no intention of compromising, the party is considered to be
negotiating in bad faith. Bad faith is a concept in negotiation theory whereby
parties pretend to reason to reach settlement, but have no intention to do so,
for example, one political party may pretend to negotiate, with no intention to
compromise, for political effect. Bad faith in political science and political
psychology refers to negotiating strategies in which there is no real intention
to reach compromise, or a model of information processing. The "inherent
bad faith model" of information processing is a theory in political psychology
that was first put forth by Ole Holsti to explain the relationship between John
Foster Dulles' beliefs and his model of information processing. It is the most
widely studied model of one's opponent. A state is presumed to be implacably
hostile, and contra-indicators of this are ignored. They are dismissed as
propaganda ploys or signs of weakness. Examples are John Foster Dulles'
position regarding the Soviet Union, or Hamas's position on the state of
Israel.
Emotion in negotiation

Emotions play an important part in the negotiation process, although it is only in recent years that their effect is being studied. Emotions have the potential to play either a positive or negative role in negotiation. During negotiations, the decision as to whether or not to settle rests in part on emotional factors. Negative emotions can cause intense and even irrational behavior, and can cause conflicts to escalate and negotiations to break down, but may be instrumental in attaining concessions. On the other hand, positive emotions often facilitate reaching an agreement and help to maximize joint gains, but can also be instrumental in attaining concessions. Positive and negative discrete emotions can be strategically displayed to influence task and relational outcomes and may play out differently across cultural boundaries.

Affect effect

Dispositional affects affect the various stages of the negotiation process: which strategies are planned to be used, which strategies are actually chosen, the way the other party and his or her intentions are perceived, their willingness to reach an agreement and the final negotiated outcomes. Positive affectivity (PA) and negative affectivity (NA) of one or more of the negotiating sides can lead to very different outcomes.

1. Positive affect in negotiation. Even before the negotiation process starts, people in a positive mood have more confidence, and higher tendencies to plan to use a cooperative strategy. During the negotiation, negotiators who are in a positive mood tend to enjoy the interaction more, show less contentious behavior, use less aggressive tactics and more cooperative strategies. This in turn increases the likelihood that parties will reach their instrumental goals, and enhance the ability to find integrative gains.[18] Indeed, compared with negotiators with negative or natural affectivity,
negotiators with positive affectivity reached more agreements and tended to honor those agreements more. Those favorable outcomes are due to better decision making processes, such as flexible thinking, creative problem solving, respect for others' perspectives, willingness to take risks and higher confidence. Post negotiation positive affect has beneficial consequences as well. It increases satisfaction with achieved outcome and influences one's desire for future interactions. The PA aroused by reaching an agreement facilitates the dyadic relationship, which result in affective commitment that sets the stage for subsequent interactions. PA also has its drawbacks: it distorts perception of self performance, such that performance is judged to be relatively better than it actually is.[16] Thus, studies involving self reports on achieved outcomes might be biased.

2. Negative affect in negotiation. Negative affect has detrimental effects on various stages in the negotiation process. Although various negative emotions affect negotiation outcomes, by far the most researched is anger. Angry negotiators plan to use more competitive strategies and to cooperate less, even before the negotiation starts.[ These competitive strategies are related to reduced joint outcomes. During negotiations, anger disrupts the process by reducing the level of trust, clouding parties' judgment, narrowing parties' focus of attention and changing their central goal from reaching agreement to retaliating against the other side. Angry negotiators pay less attention to opponent’s interests and are less accurate in judging their interests, thus achieve lower joint gains. Moreover, because anger makes negotiators more self-centered in their preferences, it increases the likelihood that they will reject profitable offers. Opponents who really get angry (or cry, or otherwise lose control) are more likely to make errors: make sure they are in your favor.[3] Anger does not help in achieving negotiation goals either: it reduces joint gains
and does not help to boost personal gains, as angry negotiators do not succeed in claiming more for themselves.\[ Moreover, negative emotions lead to acceptance of settlements that are not in the positive utility function but rather have a negative utility.\[ However, expression of negative emotions during negotiation can sometimes be beneficial: legitimately expressed anger can be an effective way to show one's commitment, sincerity, and needs.\[ Moreover, although NA reduces gains in integrative tasks, it is a better strategy than PA in distributive tasks (such as zero-sum).\[ In his work on negative affect arousal and white noise, Seidner found support for the existence of a negative affect arousal mechanism through observations regarding the devaluation of speakers from other ethnic origins.\" Negotiation may be negatively affected, in turn, by submerged hostility toward an ethnic or gender group

Research indicates that negotiator's emotions do not necessarily affect the negotiation process. Albarracín et al. (2003) suggested that there are two conditions for emotional affect, both related to the ability (presence of environmental or cognitive disturbances) and the motivation:

1. Identification of the affect: requires high motivation, high ability or both.
2. Determination that the affect is relevant and important for the judgment: requires that either the motivation, the ability or both are low.

According to this model, emotions are expected to affect negotiations only when one is high and the other is low. When both ability and motivation are low the affect will not be identified, and when both are high the affect will be identify but discounted as irrelevant for judgment. A possible implication of this model is, for example, that the positive effects PA has on negotiations (as described above) will be seen only when either motivation or ability are low.
Most studies on emotion in negotiations focus on the effect of the negotiator’s own emotions on the process. However, what the other party feels might be just as important, as group emotions are known to affect processes both at the group and the personal levels. When it comes to negotiations, trust in the other party is a necessary condition for its emotion to affect, and visibility enhances the effect. Emotions contribute to negotiation processes by signaling what one feels and thinks and can thus prevent the other party from engaging in destructive behaviors and to indicate what steps should be taken next: PA signals to keep in the same way, while NA points that mental or behavioral adjustments are needed.

Partner’s emotions can have two basic effects on negotiator’s emotions and behavior: mimetic/ reciprocal or complementary. For example, disappointment or sadness might lead to compassion and more cooperation. In a study by Butt et al. (2005) which simulated real multi-phase negotiation, most people reacted to the partner’s emotions in reciprocal, rather than complementary, manner. Specific emotions were found to have different effects on the opponent’s feelings and strategies chosen:

- Anger caused the opponents to place lower demands and to concede more in a zero-sum negotiation, but also to evaluate the negotiation less favorably. It provoked both dominating and yielding behaviors of the opponent.
- Pride led to more integrative and compromise strategies by the partner.
- Guilt or regret expressed by the negotiator led to better impression of him by the opponent, however it also led the opponent to place higher demands. On the other hand, personal guilt was related to more satisfaction with what one achieved.
- Worry or disappointment left bad impression on the opponent, but led to relatively lower demands by the opponent.
Negotiation is a rather complex interaction. Capturing all its complexity is a very difficult task, let alone isolating and controlling only certain aspects of it. For this reason most negotiation studies are done under laboratory conditions, and focus only on some aspects. Although lab studies have their advantages, they do have major drawbacks when studying emotions:

- Emotions in lab studies are usually manipulated and are therefore relatively ‘cold’ (not intense). Although those ‘cold’ emotions might be enough to show effects, they are qualitatively different from the ‘hot’ emotions often experienced during negotiations.
- In real life there is self-selection to which negotiation one gets into, which affects the emotional commitment, motivation and interests. However this is not the case in lab studies.
- Lab studies tend to focus on relatively few well defined emotions. Real life scenarios provoke a much wider scale of emotions.
- Coding the emotions has a double catch: if done by a third side, some emotions might not be detected as the negotiator sublimates them for strategic reasons. Self-report measures might overcome this, but they are usually filled only before or after the process, and if filled during the process might interfere with it.

**Team negotiations**

Due to globalization and growing business trends, negotiation in the form of teams is becoming widely adopted. Teams can effectively collaborate to break down a complex negotiation. There is more knowledge and wisdom dispersed in a team than in a single mind. Writing, listening, and talking, are specific roles team members must satisfy. The capacity base of a team reduces the amount of blunder, and increases familiarity in a negotiation.
Negotiation tactics

Tactics are always an important part of the negotiating process. But tactics don't often jump up and down shouting "Here I am, look at me." If they did, the other side would see right through them and they would not be effective. More often than not they are subtle, difficult to identify and used for multiple purposes. Tactics are more frequently used in distributive negotiations and when the focus in on taking as much value off the table as possible.[28] Many negotiation tactics exist. Below are a few commonly used tactics.

1. Auction: The bidding process is designed to create competition. When multiple parties want the same thing, pit them against one another. When people know that they may lose out on something, they will want it even more. Not only do they want the thing that is being bid on, they also want to win, just to win. Taking advantage of someone’s competitive nature can drive up the price.

2. Brinksmanship: One party aggressively pursues a set of terms to the point at which the other negotiating party must either agree or walk away. Brinksmanship is a type of “hard nut” approach to bargaining in which one party pushes the other party to the “brink” or edge of what that party is willing to accommodate. Successful brinksmanship convinces the other party they have no choice but to accept the offer and there is no acceptable alternative to the proposed agreement.

3. Bogey: Negotiators use the bogey tactic to pretend that an issue of little or no importance to him or her is very important. Then, later in the negotiation, the issue can be traded for a major concession of actual importance.

4. Chicken: Negotiators propose extreme measures, often bluffs, to force the other party to chicken out and give them what they want. This tactic can
be dangerous when parties are unwilling to back down and go through with the extreme measure.

5. Defence in Depth: Several layers of decision-making authority is used to allow further concessions each time the agreement goes through a different level of authority. In other words, each time the offer goes to a decision maker, that decision maker asks to add another concession in order to close the deal.

6. Deadlines: Give the other party a deadline forcing them to make a decision. This method uses time to apply pressure to the other party. Deadlines given can be actual or artificial.

7. Flinch: Flinching is showing a strong negative physical reaction to a proposal. Common examples of flinching are gasping for air, or a visible expression of surprise or shock. The flinch can be done consciously or unconsciously. The flinch signals to the opposite party that you think the offer or proposal is absurd in hopes the other party will lower their aspirations. Seeing a physical reaction is more believable than hearing someone saying, “I’m shocked.”

8. Good Guy/Bad Guy: The good guy/bad guy approach is typically used in team negotiations where one member of the team makes extreme or unreasonable demands, and the other offers a more rational approach.[35] This tactic is named after a police interrogation technique often portrayed in the media. The “good guy” will appear more reasonable and understanding, and therefore, easier to work with. In essence, it is using the law of relativity to attract cooperation. The good guy will appear more agreeable relative to the “bad guy.” This tactic is easy to spot because of its frequent use.

9. Highball/Lowball: Depending on whether selling or buying, sellers or buyers use a ridiculously high, or ridiculously low opening offer that will never be achieved. The theory is that the extreme offer will cause the
other party to reevaluate his or her own opening offer and move close to the resistance point (as far as you are willing to go to reach an agreement). Another advantage is that the person giving the extreme demand appears more flexible he or she makes concessions toward a more reasonable outcome. A danger of this tactic is that the opposite party may think negotiating is a waste of time.

10. The Nibble: Nibbling is asking for proportionally small concessions that haven’t been discussed previously just before closing the deal. This method takes advantage of the other party’s desire to close by adding “just one more thing.”

11. Snow Job: Negotiators overwhelm the other party with so much information that he or she has difficulty determining which facts are important, and which facts are diversions. Negotiators may also use technical language or jargon to mask a simple answer to a question asked by a non-expert.

Scholars indicate nonverbal communication in negotiation. Communication is a key element of negotiation. Effective negotiation requires that participants effectively convey and interpret information. Participants in a negotiation will communicate information not only verbally but non-verbally through body language and gestures. By understanding how nonverbal communication works, a negotiator is better equipped to interpret the information other participants are leaking non-verbally while keeping secret those things that would inhibit his/her ability to negotiate. Examples of non-verbal communication in negotiation:

1. Non-verbal “anchoring” In a negotiation, a person can gain the advantage by verbally expressing his/her position first. By “anchoring” your position, you establish the position from which the negotiation will
proceed. In a like manner, one can “anchor” and gain advantage with non-verbal (body language) cues.

a. Personal Space: The person at the head of the table is the apparent symbol of power. Negotiators can repel this strategic advantage by positioning allies in the room to surround that individual.

b. First Impression: Begin the negotiation with positive gestures and enthusiasm. Look the person in the eye with sincerity. If you cannot maintain eye contact, the other person might think you are hiding something or that you are insincere. Give a solid handshake.[38]

2. Reading non-verbal communication Being able to read the non-verbal communication of another person can significantly aid in the communication process. By being aware of inconsistencies between a person’s verbal and non-verbal communication and reconciling them, negotiators will be able to come to better resolutions. Examples of incongruity in body language include:

a. Nervous Laugh: A laugh not matching the situation. This could be a sign of nervousness or discomfort. When this happens, it may be good to probe with questions to discover the person’s true feelings.

b. Positive words but negative body language: If someone asks their negotiation partner if they are annoyed and the person pounds their fist and responds sharply, “what makes you think anything is bothering me?”

c. Hands raised in a clenched position: The person raising his/her hands in this position reveals frustration even when he/she is smiling. This is a signal that the person doing it may be holding back a negative attitude.

d. If possible, it may be helpful for negotiation partners to spend time together in a comfortable setting outside of the negotiation room.
Knowing how each partner non-verbally communicates outside of the negotiation setting will help negotiation partners to sense incongruity between verbal and non-verbal communication within the negotiation setting.

3. Conveying receptivity They way negotiation partners position their bodies relative to each other may influence how receptive each is to the other person's message and ideas.
   a. Face and eyes: Receptive negotiators smile, make plenty of eye contact. This conveys the idea that there is more interest in the person than in what is being said. On the other hand, non-receptive negotiators make little to no eye contact. Their eyes may be squinted, jaw muscles clenched and head turned slightly away from the speaker.
   b. Arms and hands: To show receptivity, negotiators should spread arms and open hands on table or relaxed on their lap. Negotiators show poor receptivity when their hands are clenched, crossed, positioned in front of their mouth, or rubbing the back of their neck.
   c. Legs and Feet: Receptive negotiators sit with legs together or one leg slightly in front of the other. When standing, they distribute weight evenly and place hands on their hips with their body tilted toward the speaker. Non-receptive negotiators stand with legs crossed, pointing away from the speaker.
   d. Torso: Receptive negotiators sit on the edge of their chair, unbutton their suit coat with their body tilted toward the speaker. Non-receptive negotiators may lean back in their chair and keep their suit coat buttoned.

Receptive negotiators tend to appear relaxed with their hands open and palms visibly displayed.
Mediation

Mediation, as used in law, is a form of alternative dispute resolution (ADR), a way of resolving disputes between two or more parties with concrete effects. Typically, a third party, the mediator, assists the parties to negotiate a settlement. Disputants may mediate disputes in a variety of domains, such as commercial, legal, diplomatic, workplace, community and family matters. The term "mediation" broadly refers to any instance in which a third party helps others reach agreement. More specifically, mediation has a structure, timetable and dynamics that "ordinary" negotiation lacks. The process is private and confidential, possibly enforced by law. Participation is typically voluntary. The mediator acts as a neutral third party and facilitates rather than directs the process.

Mediators use various techniques to open, or improve, dialogue between disputants, aiming to help the parties reach an agreement. Much depends on the mediator's skill and training. As the practice gained popularity, training programs, certifications and licensing followed, producing trained, professional mediators committed to the discipline. The benefits of mediation include:

1. Cost—While a mediator may charge a fee comparable to that of an attorney, the mediation process generally takes much less time than moving a case through standard legal channels. While a case in the hands of a lawyer or a court may take months or years to resolve, mediation usually achieves a resolution in a matter of hours. Taking less time means expending less money on hourly fees and costs.

2. Confidentiality—While court hearings are public, mediation remains strictly confidential. No one but the parties to the dispute and the mediator(s) know what happened. Confidentiality in mediation has such importance that in most cases the legal system cannot force a mediator to testify in court as to the content or progress of mediation. Many mediators destroy
their notes taken during a mediation once that mediation has finished. The only exceptions to such strict confidentiality usually involve child abuse or actual or threatened criminal acts.

3. Control—Mediation increases the control the parties have over the resolution. In a court case, the parties obtain a resolution, but control resides with the judge or jury. Often, a judge or jury cannot legally provide solutions that emerge in mediation. Thus, mediation is more likely to produce a result that is mutually agreeable for the parties.

4. Compliance—Because the result is attained by the parties working together and is mutually agreeable, compliance with the mediated agreement is usually high. This further reduces costs, because the parties do not have to employ an attorney to force compliance with the agreement. The mediated agreement is, however, fully enforceable in a court of law.

5. Mutuality—Parties to a mediation are typically ready to work mutually toward a resolution. In most circumstances the mere fact that parties are willing to mediate means that they are ready to "move" their position. The parties thus are more amenable to understanding the other party's side and work on underlying issues to the dispute. This has the added benefit of often preserving the relationship the parties had before the dispute.

6. Support—Mediators are trained in working with difficult situations. The mediator acts as a neutral facilitator and guides the parties through the process. The mediator helps the parties think "outside of the box" for possible solutions to the dispute, broadening the range of possible solutions

Principles

Principles of mediation include non-adversarialism, responsiveness, self-determination and party autonomy. Non-adversarialism is based on the
actual process of mediation. It treats the parties as collaborating in the construction of an agreement. By contrast, litigation is explicitly adversarial in that each party attempts to subject the other to its views. Mediation is designed to conclude with an agreement rather than a winner and loser. Responsiveness reflects the intent to allow the parties to craft a resolution outside of the strict rules of the legal system. A responsive mediation process also is informal, flexible and collaborative. Self-determination and party autonomy allow and require parties to choose the area of agreement, rather than ceding the decision to an outside decision-maker such as a judge. This turns the responsibility for the outcome onto the parties themselves.

Mediation Process

The mediator’s primary role is to act as a neutral third party who facilitates discussions between the parties. In addition, the mediator can contribute to the process ensuring that all necessary preparations are complete. Finally, the mediator should restrict pressure, aggression and intimidation, demonstrate how to communicate through employing good speaking and listening skills, and paying attention to non-verbal messages and other signals emanating from the context of the mediation and possibly contributing expertise and experience. The mediator should direct the parties to focus on issues and stay away from personal attacks.

1. Parties. The role of the parties varies according to their motivations and skills, the role of legal advisers, the model of mediation, the style of mediator and the culture in which the mediation takes place. Legal requirements may also affect their roles.

2. Preparation. The parties' first role is to consent to mediation, possibly before preparatory activities commence. Parties then prepare in much the same way they would for other varieties of negotiations. Parties may provide position statements, valuation reports and risk
assessment analysis. The mediator may supervise/facilitate their preparation and may require certain preparations.

3. Disclosure. Agreements to mediate, mediation rules, and court-based referral orders may have disclosure requirements. Mediators may have express or implied powers to direct parties to produce documents, reports and other material. In court-referred mediations parties usually exchange with each other all material which would be available through discovery or disclosure rules were the matter to proceed to hearing, including witness statements, valuations and statement accounts.

4. Participation. Mediation requires direct input from the parties. Parties must attend and participate in the mediation meeting. Some mediation rules require parties to attend in person. Participation at one stage may compensate for absence at another stage.

5. Preparation. Choose an appropriate mediator, considering experience, skills, credibility, cost, etc. The criteria for mediator competence is under dispute. Competence certainly includes the ability to remain neutral and to move parties though various impasse-points in a dispute. The dispute is over whether expertise in the subject matter of the dispute should be considered or is actually detrimental to the mediator's objectivity. Preparatory steps for mediation can vary according to legal and other requirements, not least gaining the willingness of the parties to participate. In some court-connected mediation programs, courts require disputants to prepare for mediation by making a statement or summary of the subject of the dispute and then bringing the summary to the mediation. In other cases, determining the matter(s) at issue can become part of the mediation itself. Consider having the mediator meet the disputants prior to the mediation meeting. This can reduce anxiety, improve settlement odds
and increase satisfaction with the mediation process. Ensure that all participants are ready to discuss the dispute in a reasonably objective fashion. Readiness is improved when disputants consider the viability of various outcomes. Provide reasonable estimates of loss and/or damage. Identify other participants. In addition to the disputants and the mediator, the process may benefit from the presence of counsel, subject-matter experts, interpreters, family, etc. Secure a venue for each mediation session. The venue must foster the discussion, address any special needs, protect privacy and allow ample discussion time. Ensure that supporting information such as pictures, documents, corporate records, pay-stubs, rent-rolls, receipts, medical reports, bank-statements, etc., are available. Have parties sign a contract that addresses procedural decisions, including confidentiality, mediator payment, communication technique, etc.

6. Meeting. The typical mediation has no formal compulsory elements, although some elements usually occur: establishment of ground rules framing the boundaries of mediation, parties detail their stories, identification of issues, clarify and detail respective interests and objectives, search for objective criteria, identify options, discuss and analyze solutions, adjust and refine proposed solutions, record agreement in writing

Individual mediators vary these steps to match specific circumstances, given that the law does not ordinarily govern mediators’ methods.

Alternatives

Mediation is one of several approaches to resolving disputes. It differs from adversarial resolution processes by virtue of its simplicity, informality, flexibility, and economy. Not all disputes lend themselves well to mediation.
Success is unlikely unless: All parties' are ready and willing to participate, All (or no) parties have legal representation. Mediation includes no right to legal counsel, All parties are of legal age (although see peer mediation) and are legally competent to make decisions.

1. Conciliation. Conciliation sometimes serves as an umbrella-term that covers mediation and facilitative and advisory dispute-resolution processes.[30] Neither process determines an outcome, and both share many similarities. For example, both processes involve a neutral third-party who has no enforcing powers. One significant difference between conciliation and mediation lies in the fact that conciliators possess expert knowledge of the domain in which they conciliate. The conciliator can make suggestions for settlement terms and can give advice on the subject-matter. Conciliators may also use their role to actively encourage the parties to come to a resolution. In certain types of dispute the conciliator has a duty to provide legal information. This helps ensure that agreements comply with relevant statutory frameworks. Therefore conciliation may include an advisory aspect. Mediation is purely facilitative: the mediator has no advisory role. Instead, a mediator seeks to help parties to develop a shared understanding of the conflict and to work toward building a practical and lasting resolution. Both mediation and conciliation work to identify the disputed issues and to generate options that help disputants reach a mutually satisfactory resolution. They both offer relatively flexible processes. Any settlement reached generally must have the agreement of all parties. This contrasts with litigation, which normally settles the dispute in favour of the party with the strongest legal argument. In-between the two operates collaborative law, which uses a facilitative process where each party has counsel.

2. Counselling. A counsellor generally uses therapeutic techniques. Some—such as a particular line of questioning—may be useful in
mediation. But the role of the counsellor differs from the role of the mediator. The list below is not exhaustive but it gives an indication of important distinctions:

- A mediator aims for clear agreement between the participants as to how they will deal with specific issues. A counselor is more concerned with the parties gaining a better self-understanding of their individual behavior.

- A mediator, while acknowledging a person’s feelings, does not explore them in any depth. A counselor is fundamentally concerned about how people feel about a range of relevant experiences.

- A mediator focuses upon participants’ future goals rather than a detailed analysis of past events. A counselor may find it necessary to explore the past in detail to expose the origins and patterns of beliefs and behavior.

- A mediator controls the process but does not overtly try to influence the participants or the actual outcome. A counselor often takes an intentional role in the process, seeking to influence the parties to move in a particular direction or consider specific issues.

- A mediator relies on all parties being present to negotiate, usually face-to-face. A counselor does not necessarily see all parties at the same time.

- A mediator is required to be neutral. A counselor may play a more supportive role, where appropriate.

- Mediation requires both parties to be willing to negotiate. Counseling may work with one party even if the other is not ready or willing to participate.
Mediation is a structured process that typically completes in one or a few sessions. Counseling tends to be ongoing, depending upon participants' needs and progress.

3. Early neutral evaluation

4. The technique of early neutral evaluation (ENE) provides early focus in complex commercial disputes, and—based on that focus—offers a basis for sensible case-management or a suggested resolution of the entire case in its very early stages. In early neutral evaluation, an evaluator acts as a neutral person to assess the strengths and weaknesses of each of the parties and to discuss the same with parties jointly or in caucuses, so that parties gain awareness (via independent evaluation) of the merits of their case. Parties generally call on a senior counsel or on a panel with expertise and experience in the subject-matter under dispute in order to conduct ENE.

5. Arbitration. Binding Arbitration is a more direct substitute for the formal process of a court. Binding Arbitration is typically conducted in front of one or three arbitrators. The process is much like a mini trial with rules of evidence, etc. Arbitration typically proceeds faster than court and typically at a lower cost. The Arbiter makes the ultimate decision rather than the parties. Arbiters’ decisions are typically final and appeals are rarely successful even if the decision appears to one party to be completely unreasonable.

6. Litigation. In litigation, courts typically impose binding decisions on the disputing parties. Courts in some cases refer litigants to mediation. Mediation is typically less costly, less formal and less complex. Unlike courts, mediation does not ensure binding agreements and the mediator does not decide the outcome.
7. Shuttle diplomacy. While mediation implies bringing disputing parties face-to-face with each other, the strategy of "shuttle diplomacy", where the mediator serves as a liaison between disputing parties, also sometimes occurs as an alternative

Facilitation

Facilitation is any activity that makes tasks for others easy, or tasks that are assisted. For example:

- Facilitation (business) is used in business and organizational settings to ensure the designing and running of successful meetings and workshops.
- Neural facilitation in neuroscience, is the increase in postsynaptic potential evoked by a 2nd impulse.
- Ecological facilitation describes how an organism profits from the presence of another. Examples are nurse plants, which provide shade for new seedlings or saplings (e.g. using an orange tree to provide shade for a newly planted coffee plant), or plants providing shelter from wind chill in arctic environments.

A person who takes on such a role is called a facilitator. Specifically:

1. A facilitator is used in a variety of group settings, including business and other organizations to describe someone whose role it is to work with group processes to ensure meetings run well and achieve a high degree of consensus
2. The term facilitator is used in psychotherapy where the role is more to help group members become aware of the feelings they hold for one another (see Group psychotherapy)
3. The term facilitator is used in education to refer to a specifically trained adult who sits in class with a disabled, or otherwise needy, student to help them follow the lesson that the teacher is giving (see Disability)

4. The term facilitator is used to describe people engaged in the illegal trafficking of human beings across international borders (see Human trafficking)

5. The term facilitator is used to describe those individuals who arrange adoptions by attempting to match available children with prospective adopters

6. The term facilitator is used to describe someone who assists people with communication disorders to use communication aids with their hands

Scholars define the Life Cycle of Conflict are included four stages. Stage One – Potential Opposition that include Communications, Structure, and Personal Variables. Stage Two – Cognition are Perceived Conflict, and Felt Conflict. Stage Three – Behavior (overt conflict; manifest) includes Accommodation, Avoidance, Compromise, Competition, and Collaboration. Stage four- outcomes are Increased Performance, Decreased Performance. Diagnosing Conflict, and Conflict Focus are argued to have positive impact to make a solution of conflict. It is focus on People-focused: “In-your-face” confrontations – high emotions fueled by moral indignation, and Issue-focused: Rational resource allocation negotiations
Table of Diagnosing Conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict Source</th>
<th>Conflict Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal differences</td>
<td>Perceptions and expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational deficiency</td>
<td>Misinformation and misrepresentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role incompatibility</td>
<td>Goals and responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental stress</td>
<td>Resource scarcity and uncertainty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kenneth Thomas draw a conflict modes included determining Your Conflict Style, Conflict Grid, Options/Styles, and When Each Style is Most Appropriate. When to Use Conflict Management Techniques one may do any approaches such as avoiding: small issue, limited time/resources, accommodating: keeping harmony, using small favor to get larger one, Competition: emergencies, when only one right way exists, prevent others from taking advantage. However when to Use Conflict Management Techniques one may do an appropriate approach such as compromising: late in conflict, when partial win is better than none for both parties, or Collaborating: for important issues when time is not a problem, where organizational support exists, when win-win solution is possible. They can use a framework for Collaborative Problem Solving with:

- Establish super-ordinate goals
- Separate the people from the problem
- Focus on interests, not positions
- Invent options for mutual gains
- Use objective criteria for evaluating alternatives
- Define success in terms of real gains, not imaginary losses
One of a concept to effective Negotiations proposed by Harvard Negotiation Project are included 3 steps: Getting to Yes Principles, barriers to Cooperation, and From Confrontation to Cooperation.

Getting to Yes Principles are consisted of Separate the people from the problem, Focus on interest; not positions, Invent options for mutual gain, and Insist on using objective criteria.

Separate the People from the Process are included Negotiations involve substantive AND relational issues and Methods to handle relational issues (See the conflict from their perspective, Active listening, Make emotional issues explicit and legitimate, Acknowledge anger and feelings). Whereas Separate the People from the Process are The KEY to resolution is to focus on substantive issue, You do not have to like someone to reach an agreement, and Dwelling on interpersonal issues clouds the negotiations.

Focus on Interests, Not Positions means Positions are how the other party has learned to express their interest, A position is a one-dimensional point from a much wider range of options. If you focus on their position, the potential answer is quite limited, The KEY is to probe and explore underlying interests, Focusing on the substantive issue helps both parties discuss the underlying factors, and Dealing with actual concerns (versus the “position”) expands the potential options for resolution. Whereas Invent Options for Mutual Gain includes The KEY is to find common ground or “points of agreement”, Good options involve some level of mutual gain or satisfaction, Use a form of brainstorming (Separate inventing from deciding, Focus on the future (not reparations), Listen actively, See the issue from their perspective)

Insist on Using Objective Criteria are The KEY is to get the parties to focus on independent standards, Fulfilling self-interest rarely works, and Parties need to ask: “How will we know this agreement is fair?” However one may have attention to the barriers and Breakthrough Strategies that included Your reaction (We are under stress, Become defensive, Strike back, Break-off
the discussion)– Go to the balcony (The KEY is to control your reaction, Find ways to “rise above” the emotions in the conflict, Approaches: Recognize your feelings, Know your “hot buttons”, Buy time (get mental distance), and Remember the goal: not to get mad or get even; but to get a good resolution), Their emotion (They have negative feelings, Anger, Hostility, Fear, Distrust) – Step to their side (They expect you to respond in kind, The KEY is to reduce the emotional content of the conflict, Approaches: Focus on listening (not reacting), Acknowledge their feelings, Focus on “yes”, not “no”), Their position (They have developed a way to describe the issue, Often they are unaware of the underlying needs and interests, Their tendency is to defend this particular view of the issue) – Reframe (The KEY is to create a problem-solving climate, Important not to encourage a “defend your initial position” situation, Approaches: Restate in more general terms, Eventually begin to restate in ways that are more easy for you to accommodate), Their dissatisfaction (Even though you may be pursuing reasonable resolutions – they may have difficulties. They may: Still see as a “win-lose” Be afraid of resolution (the view of their constituents), Stall, Want to retreat to their initial position) – Build them a bridge (Your instinct may be to push them, The KEY is to assist them in moving to a mutually acceptable resolution, Approaches: Speak to the joint benefit of certain resolutions, Help them see how a mutually beneficial option is a victory for them), and Their power (They resort to a display of power, They see meeting their self-interest as appropriate and feasible, They retreat to: Win-lose, Power language, Original position)– Educate on consequences (The danger is to escalate your rhetoric in the face of their power move, The KEY is to convince them of the need for a mutually acceptable resolution, Approaches: Help them understand the consequences of not getting a mutually acceptable resolution, Make sure they understand your BATNA, Make sure they understand the limitations of their BATNA)
Elements of Negotiations (Preparing for Negotiations) are included: Interests, Options, Alternatives, Legitimacy, Communications, Relationships, and Commitment. Interests means Who are the relevant parties?, Clarify the interests, and Underlying interests. Options is What options meet my interests and theirs?, and Possible joint gain strategies. Alternatives means what can I do if we cannot reach an agreement? My BATNA, Their BATNA. And Legitimacy includes External standards, Fairness of the process, and How they can explain their decision. Communications means Testing my assumptions, and Value of reframing. Relationship are Separate people issues from substantive issues, and Creating a stronger relationship. Commitment is Elements of the agreement, and Concluding/implementing the agreement.

Hence the key Lessons are included Conflict is a constant in our life and work, We each have pre-dispositions for handling conflict, It is important to learn to manage our use of the various styles for handling conflict, There are key principles to adopt in negotiations, There are common barriers that arise to impede effective negotiations, We can learn how to overcome or combat those barriers, There are standard elements in preparing for negotiations, and We can learn to analyze the elements in any conflict situation and better prepare ourselves to negotiate an effective resolution.
The power of being heard: The benefits of ‘perspective-giving’ in the context of intergroup conflict

Abstract
Although hundreds of dialogue programs geared towards conflict resolution are offered every year, there have been few scientific studies of their effectiveness. Across 2 studies we examined the effect of controlled, dyadic interactions on attitudes towards the ‘other’ in members of groups involved in ideological conflict. Study 1 involved Mexican immigrants and White Americans in Arizona, and Study 2 involved Israelis and Palestinians in the Middle East. Cross-group dyads interacted via video and text in a brief, structured, face-to-face exchange: one person was assigned to write about the difficulties of life in their society (‘perspective-giving’), and the second person was assigned to accurately summarize the statement of the first person (‘perspective-taking’). Positive changes in attitudes towards the outgroup were greater for Mexican immigrants and Palestinians after perspective-giving and for White Americans and Israelis after perspective-taking. For Palestinians, perspective-giving to an Israeli effectively changed attitudes towards Israelis, while a control condition in which they wrote an essay on the same topic without interacting had no effect on attitudes, illustrating the critical role of being heard. Thus, the effects of dialogue for conflict resolution depend on an interaction between dialogue condition and participants’ group membership, which may reflect power asymmetries.
The Impact of Mediation on Workplace Relationship Conflict and Return to Work Outcomes: A Snapshot Review

Abstract:
Stress triggered by workplace-based interpersonal conflict can result in damaged relationships, loss of productivity, diminished job satisfaction (Kidder, 2007) and increasingly, claims for psychological injury. While the cost and prevalence of claims for stress-related conditions in Australia varies between States, nationally the numbers are rising (Guthrie, Ciccarelli, & Babic, 2010). These claims are also likely to be difficult to manage and disproportionately costly (Haines, Williams, & Carson, 2006). Research and best practice suggests that mediation, conducted by an independent third party, may help resolve claims caused by a breakdown in workplace relationships and assist claimants in returning to work (Bingham, 2004; Bingham & Novac, 2001; Brett, Barsness, & Goldberg, 1996). Due to the subjective and emotional aspects of workplace interpersonal conflict, this review considers, in a return to work context, the relational rather than settlement-based features of mediation models.
Due to these relational and emotional aspects of intractable conflict often found in psychological injury claims (Retzinger & Scheff, 2000), the facilitative and transformative models of mediation were found to be more appropriate in resolving interpersonal conflict in the workplace (Bingham, 2004). This is illustrated using a case study of REDRESS TM, a successful workplace mediation program designed and implemented by the United States Postal Service.

„Our brothers who went to the bush“: Post-identity conflict and the experience of reconciliation in Sierra Leone
Abstract
A number of distinct sub-fields within conflict resolution share foundational theories and emerge from similar understandings of social conflict. One of the most influential of these theories assumes that conflict environments give rise to "otherizing" dynamics between competing groups. This theory assumes that conflict occurs between and further reifies identity groups. It follows from this theory that conflict resolution practice, and particularly that within the subfield of peace building, must undermine dyadic "in-group/out-group" conflict through processes of reconciliation and transitional justice. However, the theorized dynamic does not always pertain. In Sierra Leone the truth and reconciliation commission was tasked with fostering reconciliation between the perpetrators and victims of wartime violence. This article describes, however, how former combatants in Sierra Leone are described by many as brothers and friends, as opposed to hated members of a collective "other". These findings attest to a distinct lack of otherizing dynamics and demand a reconsideration of peace building practices after what are often considered "new wars" or "post-modern conflicts" in sub-Saharan Africa. The article argues that some contemporary conflicts might best be considered post-identity because they are based less on national, racial, religious, or ethnic identity than on circumstance, need, and opportunity. In addition, after post-identity conflicts truth commissions may create new competing identities, such as those between victims and perpetrators. In such cases the applied conflict resolution interventions must emerge from new conflict resolution theory which can adequately understand contemporary conflict dynamics and begin to develop on-identity focused interventions.
Gender and Conflict Transformation in Israel/Palestine

Abstract
A careful examination of women's involvement in peace building and conflict transformation in Israel and Palestine provides a unique perspective on key turning points in the history of the conflict in the past two and one-half decades, since the first Palestinian uprising, known as the Intifada. The article analyzes the changes in modes of organizing, as well as in the broader vision and key strategies of women's organizing, mostly at the grassroots level, on both sides of the Palestinian-Israeli divide. By exposing the gendered dimensions of the conflict, women activists have began to transform the cultures of their respective collectivities, ensuring that gender and other inequalities and oppressions are not overlooked. Notwithstanding the challenges facing women in both communities, the article concludes that the women who have been working for justice and peace in the region constitute a critical mass that will not only impact the nature of conflict transformation but will also be instrumental in envisioning post-conflict realities.
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