

CONFLICTS PREVENTION IN TEAM- WORK

Professor Jean de PERSON
Orlèans University, France

Abstract:

Building a trust atmosphere and mobilization in a team or an organization remains the dream of every manager. This article analyses the internal mechanism of a conflict through life positions diagram in which direction and dominance diagrams appear. The first diagonal, the dominance one, reveals an animal behavior, the latter including both positive aspirations (++) quarter), and also deceptions (-- quarter).

Passing over crisis situations requires from managers to outrun, through their style and actions the dominance diagonal and pass to a game with reciprocal gaining (++) quarter), based on trust, that color relations between people and release their energy.

Keywords: conflict, team, dominance, direction, trust, mobilization

In any social group conflicts are normal things that periodically appear. There are conflicts because in one way or another it is likely to happen something to men. One of the biggest inconvenient of conflicts is that of devouring the energy.

Conflicts are defined as situations in which more persons or groups are lead by incompatible aspirations because these use the same resources or occupy the same area. It's about a psychological or physical area.

In any conflict there is a leading element, but in a divergent manner, developing rivalries. Aspirations appear as incompatible for the involved actors and the problem that occurs is that they are always real. It's not necessary to exist a lack of compatibility between aspirations in order to appear a conflict.

The conflictual situation is characterized by the following peculiarities:

- first, relations between the involved persons are full of exaggerated emotions, fury, panic or desperation.

- each actor tends to perceive in a distorted way his or her rights, abjuring rival's rights.
- in time, the conflict becomes to monopolize the entire relation: ration dominates very restrictive aspects. In most cases, it's about hostilities.

Observing the following chart, we can identify some positions, a starting point in conflicts' analysis and management.

The diagonal NW – SE will be called the dominance diagonal and the diagonal oriented from SW to NE will be called direction diagonal.

Dominance diagonal

Dominance diagonal takes extreme values between the following positions (– +) and (+ –), respectively between panic and fury feelings. This diagonal corresponds to an *animal* behavior. Most animals know very well this process: if a dog is released during the day in a yard, it usually starts to play and run most of the time. On the contrary, at night, the dog tries to hide and howls. It simulates in this way the fury because it is scared.




Figure 1. Dominance and direction diagonals

For one of the employees, life in an enterprise is like a jungle fight. The man is a wolf comparing with the others (*Homo hominis lupus est*). If you don't attack the others, you'll be the attacked one. You must place yourself in the area (+ -) otherwise you will arrive at (- +). A question arises: those who don't judge in this way are simple-minded or not.

Another example is that of the cake allegory: if you let the others to cut from the cake how much they want, you will remain only with a small piece of it. The simplicity and the evidence of this metaphor make a lot of victims.

Relations are perceived as scenes of a game with a worthless sum. The assembly of these common positions is under discussion for the situation "have", false for the situation "can" and illogical for the situation "be".

a) Considering that the global sum of things that can be changed is constant, changes within "have" domain, are generally very productive because the exchange is not identical for both parts. Neo-liberal economists are those who proved the marginal utility

decreasing law over a product, the simple share of different products leading to the improvement of everyone's satisfaction.

b) Regarding "can" situation, things are simpler because ability reflects a relation and not a thing. Things can be divided in order to be distributed meanwhile a relation has to be extended for sharing.

If one of the team members has a candle of a medium size and the others have longer candles, the former won't lose light if he lights the others' candles and the entire team will be able to see through dark. The man who is responsible uses delegation and leads a stronger team. So, he finds more time in order to practice management instead of accomplishing tasks that can now be realized by his coworkers.

c) Regarding "be" direction, even actors are rivals, changes between them strengthen each person. A person offers one euro to another person and the latter returns it to the former, each of them needing one euro in order to realize the operation. This happens in the case of changing things.

A person changes his ideas with others that offer other ideas too. Each person will now have two ideas and moreover, the two ideas offer better results than they'd be isolated. Position fluctuations on the dominance axis correspond to an animal reality met often in work world. Along the diagonal, a frequent conflict between the team members occurs, also between teams or within the firm.

Being sometimes in a dominant position, or in a dominated position, absorbed by political games in which strategies don't encourage ideas, all members involved in the conflict lose their energy fighting against their rivals. This diagonal basis on illusions. Even in the case in which the manager succeeds not to involve in intrinsic fights, and he must stay far away them, his intervention can't be effective; because he can just try to lead teams to the cooperation area.

Direction diagonal

On the other hand, the manager attracts the team along another diagonal, called by us direction diagonal: it's about the area situated between the extreme (+ +) from NE graphic part, the point in which involvement is maximal. More necessary for the team seems to be the position in the other extreme (- -). We'll further show what is the relation between the two extreme dimensions.

The quarter (+ +) is that of positive aspirations. Anyone who wants to situate in this extreme and any firm would want to see its teams occupying these positions. The situation is clear for any manager. Even when they are far away from reality, the actors occupying this position (+ +), risk to lose consistency. It's also known the fact that euphoria is connected with depression.

As André Comte-Sponville says, nothing is more deceptive for people than seeing their ideals ruined. The extreme (- -) is that of disappointments, corresponding to unfulfilled ideas. About

coworkers being at a certain time in position (- -) it is said that they are disappointed idealists. On direction diagonal, this extreme position is that of „lost direction“.

It's possible that those who were disappointed consider they have to give up their ideas. This is a serious mistake, existing the possibility that their values produce a better solution. The euphoria error doesn't correspond to having an ideal: individuals following only their needs suffer from lack of consistency don't do anything and maybe their work doesn't mean anything.

To pass through euphoria error means confusing this ideal with reality. Deception and disappointment start from here. The opposite is desired, the separation between ideals and reality, an energy waste for protecting this ideal.

Nature is always unfair; predators don't have any mercy for victims. There is no rational justification for people to continue these disgusting behaviors, human condition must rationally look at these situations and avoid them as much as possible.

Euphoria is close to deception exactly in the same manner that fury is connected to panic.

In a book with a relevant title, *The exhaust of being yourself*, the sociologist Alain Ehrenberg attracts the attention regarding the imminence of falling from the present success in depression. The sociologist suggests the fact that this malady is inherent in a society in which rules don't base any more on culpability and order but on responsibility and initiative. "It's about the energy that everyone spends for being himself".

Traditional reactions regarding forbidden rules, causes depressions produced by the individuals that are incapable to face with self development challenge. The individuals' motivation to succeed must take into account that form of inside conflict represented by aggressively and discourage.

Neurotic demobilization is placed in the area (- +) that shows the context in which the member of a team feels guilty regarding a lot of forbidden things. Depression catches also the colleagues tending to have a behavior at the other extreme (+ +) but that don't have the courage to sustain their cause.

"Be autonomous; assume your responsibility, find your self confidence for the others also gain trust!" The message is a qualitative one but it's necessary that the other collaborators be capable to adopt it. From different reasons, almost nobody has enough resources to situate during his life in area (+ +).

A manager doesn't have any reasons to ask his employees situate on this area because many people can't reach there. A certain maturity is needed. Faced with the obvious incapability to assume the values of such involvement, the weak collaborators risk to refuge to the square (- -).

The conflictual relation can be passed leaving dominance diagonal, finding a game with a null sum, respectively a reciprocal game through which the position (+ +) can be reached. And this only in the conditions of avoiding risks of falling in the extreme of the quarter (- -).

This situation in which everyone contributes to the consolidation of the work team, situation in which rivalries can also take the form of competition, not just of conflict, situation in which all the team members follow together an objective has a very simple name: trust.

Trust and mobilization

Historically speaking, society developed as it passed through a trust climate. It's about the arguments presented extremely clear by Alain Peyrefitte within French College.

For this scientist, "the economic miracle" systematically appears in the civilization history in so called trust ethos. So, first was the Dutch miracle,

based on trade religion, then the English miracle based on the industry revolution. Then the American miracle followed, this being characterized by "a business society". The Japanese miracle is connected with a collective pylon. In any case, success is due to the trust between people.

Trust is the key for social success and for the mobilization of a team. For a commercial team, for instance, trust is decisive.

Through the conditions for a trustful relation we can mention:

- Trust can't base only on a logic of individual interests;
- it pretends preferential values;
- Trust can't propagate only if there is a managerial authority.

It's obvious that the simple confrontation of individual interests can't base on a usual trust. In theory, it's well known in the economic medium the prisoner's dilemma.

Two suspects of a case are put in front of the following conditions:

- if one of the two turns in the other, the former will be released and the latter will be imprisoned;
- if everyone turns in the other, both will be locked up with a long sentence;
- if none of them turns in the other, everyone will get a minimum punishment, being released after a few days for lack of proves.

The problem arising is what will do the two prisoners, taking into account their interests. Each of them wonders what it would happen if he turned in the other. The risk for them is to get a long sentence. The selfish logic of individual interest places the two actors on the diagonal. Everyone loses in this case.

Everyone's ration will prevent them to adopt the logic (+ +), risking in this situation to remain for a long time condemned, because none of them can be sure that the other will sustain the same thing. Trust must be well supported.

In human evolution, trust passed a real history: a lot of civilizations were needed, values to permit the individuals to work together, to gain trust rather together than under the subordination of one of them. Between values there are also a lot of rivalries. To bring them in the situation of linking them, it's necessary that some reference values be superior to the others.

Virtues that favor and contribute to the establishment of trust are all natural: generosity and not selfish, sincerity, justice and not the tendency of dominate the other, but it's true the fact that these are very rare in real world.

The moral prevents people from exploit and dominate the others. Human nature doesn't belong to a civilized world: relation between the strong and the weak is dominated by the oppression of the other and law must punish this. Relation (+ +) is based on a subtlety.

Because this is not based on an immediate interest, there must be settled and guaranteed insistenty. The manager's authority is indispensable for respecting the reference values within the coordinated team.

In front of collaborator's error, the manager's role is to form him, to explain how to pass over the situation and how to proceed in order not to appear another error. But in the case of an obvious guilt, such as voluntary breaking rules of an organization game he must apply serious sentences.

Obviously, without acceptance of some circumstances, this punishment is the only solution through which correspondent values can be respected. Without the guarantee of some sentences in the case that errors appear, there is no reason for a mutual trust. There is no mobilization of people without a decisive authority, safe and imposed. Weak managers can't resist.

The condition for individuals' mobilization and the belief in its success are successful elements. The success shared with the others is itself a factor for raising the trust level.

The manager is that who assure the dynamic of the connection between trust and mobilization. If values based on trust don't exist, organization is doomed. Without internal mobilization, existent trust within the organization will also disappear.

REFERENCES

- [1] Bernoux, Ph., *La sociologie des entreprises*, Edition du Seuil, Paris, 1995.
- [2] Crozier, M., Friedberg, E., *L'acteur et le système*, Edition du Seuil, Paris, 1977.
- [3] Lenhardt, V., *Les responsables porteurs du sens*, Edition Insep, Paris, 1992.
- [4] Mintzberg, H., *Le management*, Les Editions d'Organisations, Paris, 1998.
- [5] Morin, E., *Le paradigme perdu: la nature humaine*, Edition du Seuil, Paris, 1973.
- [6] Morin, P., *L'art du manager*, Les Editions d'Organisations, Paris, 1997.
- [7] Popper, K., *L'Univers irrésolu*, Edition Hermann, Paris, 1984.