



---

## STRATEGY, IMPORTANT IN SOLVING CONFLICTS

---

**Constantina - Anca BORDUȘANU**

**“Constantin Brâncuși” University of Târgu-Jiu, Romania**

**Abstract:** *THE STRATEGY IS A RESULT OF EXPRESS OR IMPLIED NEGOTIATION. A DISTRIBUTIVE NEGOTIATION IS BASED, BASED ON THE DISCOVERY OF MULTIDIMENSIONS, WHICH ARE NOT COMPLETELY OPPOSITE. AS A RESULT, IT IS ABANDONED, WE GO TO A WIN-WIN NEGOTIATION, IN WHICH BOTH PARTIES INVOLVED WINS SOMETHING. ON THIS BASIS, IT IS FACILITATED THE HARMONIZATION OF THE INTERESTS OF THE INVOLVED PARTIES, FACILITATING THE DEVELOPMENT OF A CULTURE AND A RELATIONAL SYSTEM, PROPER TO ACHIEVING HIGH PERFORMANCE IN THE LONG TERM.*

**Keywords:** *ORGANIZATION, GROUP, CONFLICT, STRATEGY, MANAGER*

**Contact details  
of the  
author(s):** Email: [ancabordusanu@yahoo.com](mailto:ancabordusanu@yahoo.com)

### 1. INTRODUCTION

A lot of conflicts arise because we want something from those around us, we come with some pretensions, and they are not in a hurry to please us. Conflict is one of the most widespread phenomena in people's lives and communication.

Successful resolution of conflict situations requires the identification and awareness of the causes of conflicts in order to be able to act to optimize the positive effects and to minimize the negative consequences.

### 2. CLASSIFICATIONS

What are the various conflict resolution strategies available to the manager when acting as an arbitrator? The manager has a multitude of variants; options range from imposing a dispute resolution solution to encouraging the parties to the dispute to resolve the dispute on their own, with many differences between them.

Rather than compiling a long, useless list of specific strategies that are available (some of which vary by name only), it is more useful and practical to identify the main types or categories of strategies that differ significantly from one another. It will also help to harmonize different types of strategies with different conflicts to make a successful final decision.



A well-known approach to classifying and understanding mediation strategies has been to use the degree of control held by arbitrators who mediate the dispute during this process (procedures and activities involved in reaching a settlement solution) and the degree of control held by the arbitrator on obtaining the result (real resolution of the conflict) of the final decision, considered as two main dimensions. groups (RUBIN, PRUITT, KIM, 1994, p.65).

Using these two axes, different intervention strategies can be identified:

- ✓ **mediation control strategy (MCS)**
- ✓ **partial control strategy (PCS)**
- ✓ **full control strategy (FCS)**
- ✓ **low control strategy (LCS)**
- ✓ **limited control strategy (LtdCS).**

**Mediation control strategy:** The manager intervenes in the conflict by influencing the process of obtaining the final decision (namely, facilitates interaction, helps communication, explains to one party the point of view of the other party, clarifies issues, exposes rules to address the conflict, maintains order during the discussions), but does not try to dictate or impose a final decision (although he or she may propose solutions); the final decision is determined by the parties to the dispute; a high degree of control over the process, but a low control over the outcome (eg mediation, conciliation);

**Partial control strategy:** The manager intervenes in resolving the conflict by influencing the outcome of the final decision (that is when it is assumed full control over the final decision, decides, imposes the final decision on the disputed parties), but does not try to influence the process; the parties to the dispute have control over what information is presented and how it is presented; a high degree of control over the outcome, but a low control over the process (eg arbitration, adjudication, adverse interventions);

**Low control strategy:** The manager does not actively intervene in resolving the conflict; either urges the parties to resolve the dispute on their own, or remains only out of the conflict; low control over both the process and the outcome (for example, encouraging or guiding the parties to negotiate or resolve the conflict themselves, providing an incentive);

**Full control strategy:** The manager intervenes in the conflict by influencing the process and the outcome (ie, decides what information is to be presented and how it should be presented and also makes the final decision); asks the parties to the dispute specific questions about the conflict, in order to obtain information, and imposes a final decision; the manager has full control over the final decision regarding the conflict; a high degree of control over both the process and the outcome;

**Limited control strategy:** The manager intervenes in the conflict by sharing control over the process and outcome with the litigants (ie, the manager and the litigants agree on the final decision-making process and strive to reach a consensus on the decision). solving); work with litigants to help them reach a solution by facilitating interaction, helping in the communication process, discussing issues, etc .; in addition, it takes an active role in evaluating options, recommending solutions, persuading the parties to the dispute to accept them and urging them to resolve the conflict; moderate control over the managerial process and over the outcome (eg group problem solving, moderate arbitration).

Thus, a manager who uses FCS to resolve a conflict could control both the process and the outcome of the final decision: the manager can decide what information should be presented and how, ask specific questions, decide on a solution and impose. When using MCS, the manager could control only the process, but not the result. He or she could explain the views of one party to the other, clarify issues, maintain order during talks, and formulate rules for addressing the conflict.



On the contrary, under the PCS, the manager could let the litigants control the process (for example, decide what information to present and how to present it), but take full control over the outcome by deciding the final solution and imposing it on the parties to the dispute. A manager who uses LCS could urge the parties or suggest that they resolve the conflict on their own, but would not actively intervene in the conflict. Finally, when using LtdCS, the manager could share control over the process and outcome with the parties to the dispute. They would work with the manager in the event of a final decision, the manager facilitating the interaction, clarifying the issues, evaluating the options, recommending solutions and convincing the parties to accept them (eg solving problems within the group).

### 3. FORMULATION OF DECISION-MAKING RULES

Recommendations for using or avoiding control over the outcome and process for each factor indicate when different intervention strategies should be chosen. (FISHER, Ronald J. 1997a. Training as Interactive Conflict Resolution: Characteristics and Challenges, in: International Negotiation).

This logic can be contained in a set of decision-making rules, which aim at choosing the strategy. These rules represent a series of "if then" statements indicating the form of control (process, outcome) that must be chosen by the mediating manager or given to the parties to ensure the success of the intervention, for a certain status (high / low) of each factor.

Each rule contributes to the protection of one or more of the three success criteria. The rules of the importance of the conflict, the nature of the conflict and the orientation of the parties to the dispute shall focus on who controls the outcome, thus ensuring the efficiency of the resolution of the conflict.

The pressure of time and the rules of priority focus on the need for speed and the costs of delays, thus ensuring timeliness, and the rules, nature of relationships, nature of conflict and likelihood of commitment focus on ensuring acceptance and commitment of the parties to comply, - thus the commitment assumed by the disputed parties.

#### *a) The rule of the importance of the conflict*

If the importance of the conflict is great, then the chosen intervention strategy must give the manager a certain degree of control over one or both dimensions. As a result, the LCS is removed from the achievable set.

#### *b) The rule of pressure imposed by time*

If the pressure imposed by the time required to resolve the conflict is high, then the chosen intervention strategy must give the manager a certain degree of control over the process. Consequently, SCS and SCP are removed from the achievable set.

#### *c) The rule regarding the nature of the conflict*

If the conflict between subordinates is a LPC (conflict), then the chosen intervention strategy must give the manager a certain degree of control over the result. Consequently, LCS and MCS are removed from the achievable set.

The only exception to the rule is when the time pressure is low, the probability of engagement is low, but the orientation of the parties is high (the option is MCS).

If the conflict between subordinates is a LMC conflict, then the manager must allow the subordinates a certain degree of control over one or both dimensions (process and result). Consequently, the FCS is removed from the achievable set. The only exception to the rule is when time pressure is high, the likelihood of engagement is high, and the parties are unlikely to interact frequently in the future.



**d) The rule regarding the nature of the relations**

If it is likely that the subordinates (conflicting parties) will have very frequent interactions in the future, then the chosen intervention strategy must give the subordinates a certain degree of control over the result.

Consequently, DCS and PCS are removed from the achievable set. The only exception to the rule is when the time pressure is low, the probability of engagement is high, and the orientation of the parties is low (the option is PCS).

**e) Commitment probability rule**

If the probability that the subordinates (the litigants) commit to comply with the solution imposed by the manager is low, then the chosen intervention strategy must give the subordinates a certain degree of control over the result.

Consequently, DCS and PCS are removed from the achievable set.

**f) Rule of orientation of the parties to the dispute**

If the status of the conflict based on the five rules described above suggests the choice of intervention strategies that give subordinates (litigants) full control over the outcome, the manager must use the orientation of the parties as the final criterion.

If the orientation of the parties is low, the chosen intervention strategy must give the manager a certain degree of control over the result. Consequently, SCS and MCS are removed from the achievable set. If the orientation of the parties is high, the chosen intervention strategy must give the subordinates a certain degree of control over the result. So DCS and PCS are removed from the achievable set.

**g) Priority rule**

If the status of the conflict based on the previous six rules suggests that more interventions are effective, the following priority conditions must be met in order to choose a strategy.

In case of very important conflicts, when the time pressure is low and the probability of commitment is low, the manager must choose the intervention strategy that allows him / her maximum control over the process (so that by ensuring a normal and honest process, the commitment can be increased).

When the pressure imposed by time is low and the probability of commitment is high, the manager must choose the strategy that allows him / her maximum control over the result (so that the most important interests of the organization are always protected) and at the same time, to give the parties at least some control over the final decision.

When the pressure of time is high, the manager must choose the intervention strategy that requires the least time to resolve the conflict without jeopardizing the commitment of the parties to the dispute.

In case of minor conflicts, the manager must choose the strategy that requires the least amount of resources (skills, time, etc.).

**CONCLUSIONS**

Concepts such as: crisis, in general, economic, social, political, military crises, etc., conflicts, tensions, internal would be too simplistic to comprehend the complexity of contemporary realities that are increasingly manifested in practical activity. The definitions of peoples, nations, national minorities are too vague to be operative today, when we see in some analysts the tendency to globalize some issues, and the issue of globalization is increasingly relevant.



Romania consolidates its institutions of the rule of law, in the conditions of an internal political stability and a real economic development and is directly involved in the reunification of the central-south European space in the new security architecture of the continent.

In 2004, our country became a member of the North Atlantic Alliance and continues its efforts to meet the conditions necessary for accession, in 2007, to the European Union. "Membership of Euro-Atlantic and European organizations contributes directly and significantly to consolidating and ensuring Romania's national security, economic development and prosperity."

Crisis management can be understood as a process that involves organization, plans and measures designed to bring the situation under control, because the main goal of political science is to find ways to keep society in a normal state.

As we have seen, in relation to history, armed conflicts, attacks by paramilitary organizations, territorial divisions and diplomatic conflicts have not led to a solution to the problems. Thus, this paper proposes a new approach, relatively recent, much more effective: peaceful discussion between the parties, in the presence of a third party acting as mediator.

We live in the 21st century, and the world is still a scene of war. People believe that the best way to solve problems is to impose their own solutions. Any individual or entity does not accept the imposition of solutions. Decision makers need to understand when they are wrong and where they are wrong, and the best method is communication.

The purpose of this paper was to demonstrate that there are alternative methods of resolving disputes, the solution of which is of win-win type.

When there are two or more parties, directly involved in the conflict, it is best for them to generate their own solutions, because in this way they will be in line with their own perceptions of the problem.



## REFERENCES

- Nita, Mircea Aurel, *Marketing & management electoral*, Universitas XXI, Iasi, 2000.
- Nita, Mircea Aurel, *Soluții de gestionare non-adgresivă a conflictelor în contextual securității europene și transatlantice*, Pro Universitaria, 2015
- Dafinoiu, I., *Personalitatea -Metode calitative de abordare. Obsenatia și interviul*. Editura Polirom. Iași, România, 2002, p.173.
- Walton, R. E., *Managing Conflict. Interpersonal Dialogue and Third Party Roles* (Second Edition ed.). Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1987, p.92.
- Deep, S., Sussman L., *Secretul oricărui succes. Să acționăm inteligent*, București, Editura Polimark, 1996, p. 14
- Tălmăciu, I., & Mărăcine, M. , *Sources of conflicts within organizations and methods of conflict resolution. Management and Marketing Journal* , 8 , 2010, p. 123-132.
- Zlate, M., *Tratat de Psihologie Organizațional-Managerială*. Vol. I & ÎI. Editura Polirom, Iași, România, 2008.
- Șoimi Hassam, *Manipularea în negocieri*, Editura Antet București, 1993,
- Madhukar Shuckla , *Undersatanding organisation*, Pretience Hall, New Delhi, 1996, p. 203
- Pânișoară, G. , *Psihologia Organizațională*. Universitatea București, București, 2010.
- David Gamage, *Profesional development for leaders and managers*, Springer, Netherlands, 2006, p. 259.
- Borisoff, D. & Victor, D.A. , *Conflict Management: A Communication Skills Approach*. Needham Heights: Allyn & Bacon, A Viacom Company, 1998, Pp 78-80.
- Maria Montero, *Inequity Aversion May Increase Inequity*, SSRN Electronic Journal, 2016.
- Laura Vallejo-Torres, Stephen Morris, *Income-related inequity in healthcare utilisation among individuals with cardiovascular disease in england-accounting for vertical inequity*, Health Economics, vol. 22, nr. 5, 2012.
- Von Hippel, E, *The Sources of Innovation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988, 69.