Conflict Management In Event Performance Teams

[1]*Anjali Malik

Abstract
The term "conflict" tends to bring forth negative feelings in and of itself. It reminds us of shouting matches and possible emotional harm. However, disagreement may boost team effectiveness if it is utilised deliberately and managed well. The capacity to have healthy disagreements is crucial to the growth of high-performing teams. When people's worldviews intersect, conflict is inevitable. Although this may very well turn out badly, there are a few of important instances in which disagreement really helps teams succeed.

Keywords: *Conflict, relatively negative reactions, arguments, strategically, managed, improved, performance, constructive, development,*

Introduction

Various inter-organizational disputes have arisen as a consequence of the construction industry's fast expansion of complicated projects throughout the globe. Many factors, including the conflict management style of team leaders, the kind of disagreement, the attitudes of team members in dealing with conflict, and so on, may determine whether or not disputes between team members have a negative impact on project performance in the industry.

However, people have a variety of conflict-management strategies they may use in social and professional settings. disputes are resolved, productivity is increased, team members' confidence in their own abilities is bolstered, and the probability of new disputes is reduced, all of which contribute to the long-term financial success of the business.

Various theoretical approaches have been developed for resolving interpersonal conflict. These theories expand upon the ground-breaking work of Blake and Mouton (1964), who identified five distinct conflict management strategies: forcing, retreating, smoothing, compromise, and confronting.

When one side believes that another's activities have a negative impact on its own interests, that's when conflict arises (Wall & Callister, 1995). This means that conflict is a process involving two or more parties, whereby one group must see the acts of the other as inimical to its own. Conflict has been shown to be an integral part of human connection and a feature of all collaborative activities.

Previous research has shown that the way a team handles disagreement has a major effect on its productivity. Conflict, however, is considered as having both negative and positive effects in certain team-based workplaces.

Team members' expectations about how their actions would effect their objectives substantially affects the dynamics of interactions and the outcomes of conflict management (Deutsch, 1990).

Previous research has shown that cultural differences increase the likelihood of conflict escalation (Fisher, 1990). As a result, while leading ethnic teams, various cultures may use varying strategies for resolving conflicts. It has also been observed that the way a team handles disagreement has a significant impact on the results the team achieves.

(i) Inertia Overcome: In today's fast-paced corporate environment, it's nearly always riskier to preserve the status quo or get complacent than to address disagreement head-on. However, many groups still believe that arguments always end badly.

But let's take a moment to see the good side: arguments are sometimes required for the development of new ideas and the promotion of fruitful discussion. To the contrary, it is through conflict that teams learn to work together to find solutions that foster compromise and innovation.

Groups only grow into something greater than the sum of their parts via healthy disagreements. This is how concepts that seem diametrically opposed may really enhance, challenge, and teach one another. And in the best case, it helps make a wiser choice overall.

---

[1] *Asst. Professor, School of Management, Graphic Era Hill University, Dehradun Uttarakhand India

(ii) It improves team trust: Building trust and cohesiveness among a team is another critical component of successful collaboration. Teams that learn to accept and navigate disagreements strengthen their bonds and better understand one another.

To accept disagreement out of curiosity and without demanding an apology is to embrace conflict. Team members' responses become adaptive (rather than catastrophic) when they get used to adversity and provocation.Ultimately, teams whose members feel safe speaking their minds to one another are the ones who will see the greatest gains in productivity. They get stronger as a result of avoiding complacency and enhancing their capacity for group decision making.

Stressful situations are commonplace for event planners. Disagreements are inevitable in a field that relies on the cooperation of hundreds of people to pull out a single event. The following are some suggestions for dealing with workplace disagreements and avoiding them in the future.

1. Set Expectations: When people go into a scenario with divergent expectations, tensions arise. I've lost track of the amount of times I've arrived to a worksite with one set of expectations and found something quite different. Keep everybody on the same page via open, consistent communication to lessen the chances of a disagreement arising. Consider what could matter to everyone involved. Here are a few examples.
a) Roles inside organisations: there is some room for interpretation when it comes to job names. The film industry's equivalent of a "Production Manager" differs greatly from their counterparts in the theatre. Because most of us operate across many disciplines, misunderstandings are inevitable. Clarity is required. Better still, put it in writing. Don't simply assume everyone is in the loop.
b) The primary objective of any production, as far as I'm aware, is to stage a successful performance. However, the customer may have other, perhaps more significant objectives. I've worked on several projects that sounded and looked amazing technically but didn't generate leads, revenue, or brand awareness for the customer. Even if your team isn't directly tasked with attaining these objectives, discussing them will help set the stage for the work that needs to be done.
c) Conduct Befitting the SituationThe working climate at various events varies greatly. The mood of the work site should be communicated to your workforce. We'll look at two examples from the actual world now.

2. Perspective Shift: One of the least-used but most effective ways to get to the bottom of a disagreement is to modify one's point of view. Every person has their own agenda while dealing with a certain circumstance. Instead of focusing on your own wants, why not consider those of the people in your life?

Something that looks little to you might be a major life change for someone else. Pose these inquiries to yourself to start framing things differently.
i. If anything goes wrong, who will holler at this person?
ii. When I ask someone about my profession, I want to know what they think.
iii. In his or her opinion, where does the project stand right now? Where does it stand in terms of time and money?
iv. How does he or she handle pressure while on the job?
v. How would you describe the mood here at work?

The degree to which you meet, exceed, or fall short of a person's expectations may have a significant impact on how that person responds to you. Avoid taking the offensive. Listen with the intent of understanding before speaking.

3. Don't React Emotionally: Another challenging task in actual use. Disputes can escalate rapidly. It's human nature to act defensively and strike back when you feel threatened. It's easy to make a big deal out of something that's actually not that big of a deal. Take a deep breath before you explode. This disagreement probably has nothing to do with you. It's not meant to be seen as a criticism on you as an individual. Overreacting and incorrectly placing blame are both common reactions to stress. Try to keep in mind what exactly is going on, what needs doing, and what choices you now have. After the event has concluded, we may debrief and handle any remaining issues.

4. Knowledge are Resources used for Re-solving Issue : We've all argued passionately on both sides of this issue.
Superior outcomes may be achieved via the usage of High Performance Teams (HPTs) due to the increased levels of innovation and teamwork that they foster.

A team is able to function effectively when its members:
a) Focus on what you want to accomplish and do what it takes to get there.
b) Recognise the value of each team member's contributions.
c) have confidence in one another because they have "bought into" a set of common assumptions about how to conduct themselves in a collaborative setting.
d) Possess the requisite abilities (or "set") to effectively participate in team activities.

However, many businesses put too much emphasis on individual incentive systems (such setting personal objectives as part of an annual review) that not only don't promote team victories but actively encourage going against the 'greater good' for one's own benefit. Therefore, there is a tension between demanding accountability from an individual and motivating optimal group effort.

Culture clashes and personal conflicts: Disagreement is inevitable in groups due to the fact that individuals have varying personalities and value systems. Furthermore, high-performing individuals tend to be very competitive, both between themselves and with others both within and outside the organisation. By recognising conflict as a means of testing ideas and concepts, for example, HPTs are able to handle these tensions in a positive and productive manner. But too frequently, team disagreement is overlooked, unrecognised, or buried, leading to a breakdown in communication and a mishmash of efforts.

Lindred Greer, a professor at Stanford University, identifies four prevalent forms of team conflict:
a) Task incompatibility: deciding between two equally viable options, say, X and Y. This style of argument is frequently the most productive since it helps to define the problems at hand and highlight potential trouble spots.
b) Disagreement about the team's process for collaborating, such as how often to meet and who should do what.
c) Relationship Discord: Differences in character and chemistry
d) An example of a status conflict is an argument over where to hold a meeting when the real issue is that one person doesn't feel like they're getting the respect they deserve from the group.

Cultural differences and the stresses of working remotely or virtually may amplify these impacts. They may lead to high levels of stress, poor performance, and possibly the dissolution of the team if they are not handled.

Defusing conflicts : Strong displays of adverse emotions (as opposed to reasonable conversation), such as individuals becoming furious, are warning indications for difficulties inside an HPT. Furthermore, teams are in danger when members argue over trivial matters, develop apparent subgroups that continuously challenge one another, or both. In order to deal with these problems,
a) Identifying the specific activity, process, connection, or status at issue helps everyone involved.
b) determining whether or not a 'hidden agenda' exists (i.e., whether or not the debate is indeed about the stated topic). and
c) knowing how upset the persons involved are and acting accordingly. The next step is to bring the concerns to light so they may be discussed and resolved directly. Team building exercises, personality assessments, and an outside facilitator (or mediator, in extreme circumstances) may all play a role here.

Transitory teams and permanent team building : Teams are often short-lived because of the high turnover rate of employees in most businesses; it is unusual for a team of six persons to remain together for more than six to twelve months. Therefore, teams are always going through the "storming, forming, norming, and (if you're fortunate) the "performing" group development cycle that was initially postulated by Tuckman in 1965. The more senior members of a team also tend to form their own subgroup, or "inner circle," which may cause friction with the rest of the group. The 'HPT' will only be a short-term phenomenon unless the leader considers such events to be the norm and takes measures to counter them. Therefore, 'team building' events, in their many forms, must be an ongoing endeavour rather than a one-time occurrence.

Team size and 'social loafing' : The Ringelmann Effect, often called social loafing, is another element that undermines team productivity. When more individuals work together on a job (pulling a rope), less effort is required overall, as discovered by Ringelmann (1913). He discovered that eight people couldn't pull as hard as just four.

University of Massachusetts at Amherst researcher (Ingam) discovered in the 1970s that the impact was caused by members of the bigger group taking less personal responsibility for the outcome. Although there are many more variables at play in the workplace than in a laboratory setting, Ingams's study reveals that smaller teams are typically more productive than bigger ones when all other factors are equal. Methods to counteract "social loafing" include publishing individual performance data and/or clearly outlining roles and duties so that everyone in the team is aware of their teammates' progress.

The Physical Environment and Encouraging Teamwork: The environment in which a team works may have a significant effect on its productivity. Better teamwork may be achieved by a well-designed workplace, as advocated by author Anat Lechner in her article "Better Teamwork by Workplace Design." For instance:

Historical Perspective Conflict Resolution: Thomas (1976, referenced in Rahim &Magner, 1995) examined and improved the methods developed by Blake and Mouton to manage disputes within teams.Thomas classified conflict resolution strategies along two fundamental aspects, and he categorised these strategies into five distinct categories.

a) Cooperation, whereby people care more about their contemporaries than they do about themselves;
b) Confidence in oneself when external factors are less important

The five conflict resolution styles proposed by Rahim and Magner (1995)—cooperative, competitive, welcoming, avoiding, and compromising—are dependent on the extent to which a person engages in cooperativeness or assertiveness.

Cooperative approach to Conflict Management and Team Coordination: According to Deutsch's (1990) theory of interdependence in conflict management, when people respect one another's skills and choices, they are more likely to work together to resolve conflicts and reach their goals (Tjosvold et al., 2001).

People are more inclined to work together to resolve conflicts when they recognise their dependence on the skills, knowledge, and resources of others. As a result, they may eventually reach a point when dispute resolution via cooperative means is important to maintain a long-term relationship and continue to work together effectively. Project managers that use a cooperative conflict management approach are seen as more effective leaders and are more forthcoming when dealing with disagreement.

In addition, it is possible to draw the conclusion that mutual dependency facilitates cooperative conflict management, which may lead to improved project coordination. It has been discovered that in collectivist countries like China, where empirical research has been conducted, team members who work together to resolve conflicts report feeling more valued and respected, which in turn improves their productivity as a unit (Chen &Tjosvold, 2002).

In order to realise competing ideas, include competing points of view, create workable alternatives, and fortify personal connections, a cooperative approach promotes open communication. As a consequence, everyone involved may go away satisfied (Walton & McKersie, 1965).

By remembering the team's common goals, members may work together to find solutions to conflicts. In order to build up a solution that benefits everyone involved, they will show that they are looking for input from others, are open to considering alternatives, and are willing to compromise (Deutsch, 1990; Tjosvold, 1985). Cooperative behaviour involves talking to one another, considering what others are saying, coming to a consensus, and coming up with solutions that benefit everyone involved (Ayoko, 2016; Sanders & Schyns, 2006).

High team performance and positive individual behaviour are both associated with an association conflict management approach (Tjosvold, Poon, & Yu, 2005).

Team performance may be enhanced when members learn to work together to resolve conflicts (Tjosvold, Hui, & Yu, 2003). In particular, proponents of cooperative methods of conflict management point to increased team effectiveness, more invention and creativity, and more fruitful goal attainment as benefits.

Competitive approach to Conflict Management and Team Coordination: Members of a team become more self-reliant when exposed to competitive conflict. Win-lose situations have been connected to a competitive personality (high care for self and low compassion for others). This is a combative strategy that will only end in submission by one side.

Some strategies that fall under this category that were outlined by Yang, Cheng, and Chuang (2013) are: communicating directly about the issues at hand; disagreeing with the other party's opinion and remaining firmly planted in one's own position; and attempting to seize control of the communication channels.

Managers or team leaders that use this approach sometimes try to force their own ideas or values on their employees, leading to tension and potentially negative outcomes. Leaders that place an emphasis on competition risk distracting their teams from their primary objective. They often see conflict as a zero-sum game in which they can only lose if the opposing side triumphs. This hinders open dialogue and allows the more powerful side to impose their will on the issue. People who value autonomy above interdependence are more likely to adopt a competitive stance when resolving conflicts, as this approach boosts the likelihood of a victory for one party over the other.

Avoiding Approach to Conflict Management and Team Coordination : The goal of the avoidance strategy is to rapidly resolve disagreements with as little discussion as possible. The premise of the conflict-avoidant approach to management is that potential problems and solutions should not be addressed openly. It is characterised by a lack of self- and other-care and a focus on avoiding direct confrontation with the situation at hand by, for example, ignoring it or changing the topic. Disengagement, buck-passing, and sidestepping are all analogies used to describe this method of handling conflicts (Rahim, 2002). Those who use this approach to dispute resolution hide their feelings and make no

overt displays of rage or frustration. They tend to behave as if they don't care about anything, even their own well-being or the well-being of their teammates.

Conflict resolution in East Asian environments tends to be avoided. Individuals in East Asian collectivist societies are assumed to place a premium on their dependency on one another and to openly acknowledge this fact (Tjosvold, 2008; Tjosvold et al., 2001). Consequently, some individuals may embrace this method of dispute resolution only in an effort to preserve their relationships, despite the fact that doing so might lead to the dysfunctional functioning of the project team as a whole.

Accommodating Approach to Conflict Management and Team Coordination: Lower decision quality is often associated with an accommodating style (low self-concern and high other-concern) (Kuhn & Poole, 2000). This is due to an imprecise appraisal of alternatives and one-sided functions of giving in to others.

One who is accommodating puts the needs of others above her own. It is common practise to use this approach when resolving problems with superiors, especially when those superiors are seen as overbearing.

Moreover, a compromising stance has been seen in cases when individual goals and the goals of the project, organisation, or even a minority group are at odds with one another. It's linked to agreeing with the other party's decisions, being passive in the face of another's arguments or statements, and putting one's own needs and wants on hold in order to meet those of the other person (Liu, Fu, & Liu, 2009). It's possible that actions like this might hinder the team's efficiency.

Compromising Approach to Conflict Management and Team Coordination: The midway ground between self-interest and other-interest is where the compromise conflict management technique resides. Moderate focus is shown on seeking mutual agreements, but less enthusiasm is shown for collaborating to accomplish them, which is indicative of a compromising strategy. Pruitt, Kim, and Rubin (2004) describe this approach as a "half-hearted" solution to a problem. Through the process of compromise, in which each side may forego certain essential aspirations or aims in exchange for a less-than-ideal outcome (Rahim &Magner, 1995), it is possible that both parties will come out ahead.

This approach is prevalent when people's initial desire to investigate and address the underlying reasons of a disagreement wanes. The goal of a compromising strategy is to find a quick and temporary solution to the conflict at hand while still respecting the interests of both parties (Liu et al., 2009). This can be accomplished through a variety of strategies, including recognising the importance of justice, offering advice on trade-offs, increasing gains and decreasing losses, meeting the parties halfway, dividing the costs of variations, and more. Different from previous approaches, it prioritises both the needs of the person and those of the community (Gross & Guerrero, 2000).

Conclusion

The primary goal of this study was to analyse how team coordination and, by extension, performance are affected by the conflict management methods used by team leaders in temporary organisations using ethnic teams in the construction sector. The effects of team coordination as a moderator on conflict resolution and productivity have been studied in this article.

According to the results, team leaders in the Malaysian construction industry's multicultural temporary organisations choose avoidance and cooperative methods to conflict management.

Similar results were found by Deutsch (1990) and Sanders and Schyns (2006) in Western organisational contexts regarding the cooperative method of conflict resolution and its effect on overall team performance; similarly, Tjosvold et al. (2005), Tjosvold (2008), and Ayoko (2016) focused on East Asian countries and the Australasian continent; however, these studies were conducted in different contexts and did not include temporary organisations.

Yet, in contrast to what is given and claimed by Rahim (2002), our results on the impact of the avoiding conflict management style provide practical weight to the proposals of Chen et al. (2016) and Fisher et al. (2011). Therefore, the conclusion is that equity-based, win-win outcomes in relationships might be illusory and an ideal normative mutuality in relationships can never be realised if the ideal aims of the team members of the temporary organisation and of the project are non-commensurable. Therefore, avoiding conflict resolution may be seen as beneficial for both the persons involved and the enterprise as a whole.

References
[1]. Why does conflict actually make a team better? https://www.vantageleadership.com/our-blog/conflict-actually-make-team-better/#:~:text=Constructive%20conflict%20is%20precisely%20what,is%20better%20because%20of%20it.

[2]. Effective Techniques for Event Managers to Resolve Team Conflicts https://www.eventdrive.com/en/ressources/blog/how-to-avoid-conflicts-team-event-planners

[3]. Resolving Problems with High Performance Teams https://www.boulden.net/blog/resolving-problems-with-high-performance-teams/

[4]. Conflict Management, Team Coordination, and Performance Within Multicultural Temporary Projects: Evidence From the Construction Industry https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/8756972818818257

[5]. Ayoko O. B. (2016). Workplace conflict and willingness to cooperate: The importance of apology and forgiveness. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 27(2), 172–198.

[6]. Banks G. C., Pollack J. M., Seers A. (2016). Team coordination and organizational routines: Bottoms up—and top down. *Management Decision*, 54(5), 1059–1072.

[7]. Baron R. A. (1988). Attributions and organizational conflict: The mediating role of apparent sincerity. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 69, 272–279.

[8]. Blake R. R., Mouton J. S. (1964). *The managerial grid*. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.

[9]. Chen A. S., Hou Y.-h., Wu I.-h. (2016). Handling conflict at work—The impact of active and agreeable conflict styles. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 27(1), 50–61.

[10]. Chen G., Tjosvold D. (2002). Conflict management and team effectiveness in China: The mediating role of justice. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 19(4), 557–572.

[11]. Chen S.-Y., Uen J. F., Chen C.-C. (2016a). Implementing high performance HR practices in Asia: HR practice consistency, employee roles, and performance. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 33(4), 937–958.

[12]. Chen Y. Q., Zhang Y. B., Zhang S. J. (2014). Impacts of different types of owner-contractor conflict on cost performance in construction projects. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 140(6), 04014017.

[13]. Cheung C. C., Chuah K. B. (1999). Conflict management styles in Hong Kong industries. *International Journal of Project Management*, 17(6), 393–399.

[14]. Chin W. W. (1998). Issues and opinion on structural equation modelling. *MIS Quarterly*, 22(1), vii–xvi.

[15]. Chin W. W. (2010). How to write up and report PLS analyses. In Vinzi V. E., Chin W. W., Henseler J., Wang H. (Eds.), *Handbook of partial least squares: Concepts, methods and application* (pp. 645–689). New York, NY: Springer.

[16]. Chiocchio F., Forgues D., Paradis D., Iordanova I. (2011). Teamwork in integrated design projects: Understanding the effects of trust, conflict, and collaboration on performance. *Project Management Journal*, 42(6), 78–91.

[17]. Coetzer G. H., Trimble R. (2010). An empirical examination of the relationship between adult attention deficit, cooperative conflict management and efficacy for working in teams. *American Journal of Business*, 25(1), 25–34.

[18]. De Dreu C. K. W. (2007). Cooperative outcome interdependence, task reflexivity, and team effectiveness: A motivated information processing perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(3), 628–638.

[19]. De Dreu C. K. W., Gelfand M. J. (2008). *The psychology of conflict and conflict management in organizations*. New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

[20]. Department of Statistics Malaysia. (2018). Retrieved from https://www.dosm.gov.my/v1/

[21]. Deutsch M. (1990). Sixty years of conflict. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 1(3), 237–263.

[22]. Efron B., Tibshirani R. J. (1993). *An introduction to the bootstrap* (Monographs on statistics and applied probability, #57). New York, NY: Chapman & Hall.

[23]. Fehr E., Gachter S. (2000). Cooperation and punishment in public goods experiments. *The American Economic Review*, 90(4), 980–994.

[24]. Fisher R., Ury W., Patton B. (2011). *Getting to yes: Negotiation agreement without giving in*. New York, NY: Penguin Group.

[25]. Fisher R. J. (1990). The social psychology of intergroup and international conflict resolution. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.

[26]. Fornell C., Larcker D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobserved variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18, 39–50.

[27]. Gefen D., Straub D. W., Boudreau M.-C. (2000). Structural equation modeling and regression: Guidelines for research practice. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 4, 1–79.

[28]. Gobeli D. H., Koenig H. F., Bechinger I. (1998). Managing conflict in software development teams: A multilevel analysis. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 15(5), 423–435.

[29]. Green S. B. (1991). How many subjects does it take to do a regression analysis? *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 26(3), 499–510.

[30]. Gross M. A., Guerrero L. K. (2000). Managing conflict appropriately and effectively: An application of the competence model to Rahim's organizational conflict styles. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 11(3), 200–226.

[31]. Hackman J. R. (1983). The design of effective work groups. In Lorsch W. W. (Ed.), *Handbook of organizational behavior* (pp. 315–342.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.