

AN ANALYSIS OF THE FUNCTIONAL ASPECTS OF  
CONFLICT IN PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT GROUPS

Dissertation for the Degree of Ph. D.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

DOLORI M. MAHON

1977



This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

AN ANALYSIS OF THE FUNCTIONAL ASPECTS OF CONFLICT  
IN PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT GROUPS

presented by

Dolori M. Mahon

has been accepted towards fulfillment  
of the requirements for

Doctor of Philosophy degree in Education Administration

Major professor

Date 11 AUGUST 1977

func

eifo

inte

plan

with

to th

the M

inter

seven

analy

preser

## ABSTRACT

### AN ANALYSIS OF THE FUNCTIONAL ASPECTS OF CONFLICT IN PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT GROUPS

By

Dolori M. Mahon

#### Purpose of the Study

The researcher's purpose in this study was to analyze functional aspects of conflict in program development groups in an effort to facilitate an increased understanding of conflict sources, intensity levels and effects on social structures such as small planning groups.

#### Design and Analysis Procedures

The study involved data collection by a triangulated approach with information from an instrument developed by the researcher sent to three hundred forty-eight program specialists who were members of the Michigan Association of State and Federal Program Specialists, interviews with questionnaire respondents and group members. Thirty-seven percent replied describing three hundred fifteen groups.

A major hypothesis and five sub-hypotheses were statistically analyzed to examine group differences derived as a result of the presence of conflict generally, and by five conflict sources. Sources



tes

ben

and

Sch

ana

det

of

tat.

resu

2

tested were: scarce resource conflict, leadership/control conflict, behavioral/environmental obstacle conflict, value differences, change and unrest oriented conflict and conflict in general.

Multivariate Analyses of Variance plus Univariate Analyses, Scheffé comparisons and frequency computations were used in the analyses. Pearson-Product Moment Correlations were calculated to determine relationships between five conflict sources.

Second and third dimensions of analysis involved discussion of questionnaire items and interviews conducted to validate quantitative data.

### Conclusions

Testing of the major hypothesis and five sub-hypotheses resulted in the following conclusions being drawn.

1. Program development groups with minimal, moderate or intense overall conflict experienced productivity differences related to group ability to: reduce initial tension and allow social interaction; develop group cohesion; agree on major topics; experience changing relationships among members; modify lack of interest; develop new programs and give incentive and direction to others.
2. When scarce resource conflict was present, groups experienced differences in productivity effecting their ability to: reduce tension and allow social interaction; develop group cohesion; experience changing relationships and agree on major topics.

prog.

32 pe

deve.

when

and g

group

views

imob.

clari

find

3. When groups experienced leadership/control conflict, altered were the group's capacity to: define and clarify objectives; reduce tension and allow social interaction; develop group cohesion; agree on major topics; complete original objectives and make possible additional funding.
4. No substantial group differences were detected when behavioral/ environmental obstacle related conflict was evidenced.
5. Differences found that altered productivity related to presence of value difference conflict were group ability to: establish regular routines; reduce initial tension and allow social interaction; develop cohesion and agree on major topics.
6. No differences related to change or unrest that was already occurring were noted.

Findings indicate that functional aspects of conflict in program development groups do exist affecting productivity positively 32 percent of the time and make their impact after the group's developmental phase is completed. Constructive functions resulted when scarce resources, struggles over leadership, value differences and general conflict were evident.

Relationships between conflict sources were moderate; all groups experienced conflict of at least moderate intensities. Interviews supported data adding that: intense conflict may cause groups to immobilize and disband reorganizing later without dissenting members; clarity of objectives affected outcomes; lay-person membership groups find value differences and unclear objectives and roles especially

di

pu

ch

in

di

re

ex

pro

dev

ker

stu

wit

difficult to resolve, and that some program specialists use conflict purposefully and constructively to initiate group effort or stimulate change.

Results indicate that group development may be difficult for individual members and that disagreement content and personal-level differences may restrict productivity more so than group or task related differences. Increased sensitivity to conflict's functionality, extent of presence, impacts and management is recommended. Training programs and management models applicable to education need to be developed, made known and evaluated. Only then can effective management skill development be considered for administrators, teachers and students as well to increase professional and personal skills in dealing with so basic and evident a concept in human nature.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE FUNCTIONAL ASPECTS OF CONFLICT  
IN PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT GROUPS

By

Dolori M. Mahon

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1977

DEDICATION

"You see why I don't want to leave -  
it's such a beautiful world."

July, 1976  
Joseph M. Schilling

. . . my grandfather, a humble man of knowledge who  
left but a rich legacy of wisdom and life principles  
to guide me. Because of him this work was undertaken  
and to his memory it is dedicated.



to

pos

exc

med

thi

has

for

Ms.

als

yea

unl

ste

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Respect and sincerity flow easily when expressing appreciation to Dr. Samuel A. Moore, II, committee chairperson, for his friendly positive and tireless interest and support. The benefit of his exceptional knowledge is a gift I will always remember and value.

I would also like to thank Dr. John H. Suehr, educator and member of the committee, for his encouragement and guidance through this and previous educational administration endeavors. Dr. Yvonne Waskin, a learned educator in her own right, is also to be thanked for her spirited interest and support, warmth and genuineness. Ms. Shirley E. Knapman, social worker, educator and researcher, who also served on the committee is due special acknowledgment in that years ago in our initial professional contact, she started it all.

But, foremost now and always is Roger--my husband, whose unlimited love, patience and personal sacrifices made this next step a reality.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	x
 Chapter	
I. THE PROBLEM. . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem. . . . .	1
Definitions . . . . .	3
Need for the Study. . . . .	6
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	7
General Statement of the Hypothesis . . . . .	8
Theoretical Background . . . . .	8
Overview of Thesis. . . . .	14
Chapter I Footnotes . . . . .	15
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .	16
Introduction. . . . .	16
The Nature of Conflict . . . . .	17
Types of Conflict . . . . .	18
Conflict Sources . . . . .	20
Conflict Escalation . . . . .	25
Communication . . . . .	26
Leadership, Power and Status . . . . .	27
Intensity Levels . . . . .	28
Induced Conflict . . . . .	29
Suppressed Conflict . . . . .	31
Functional Aspects. . . . .	33
Functional Aspects of Conflict. . . . .	34
Theoretical Models of Conflict Management . . . . .	36
Problem-Solving Models. . . . .	36
Cooperation . . . . .	37
Game Theory . . . . .	38
Scientific Method . . . . .	39
Static-Equilibrium Models. . . . .	40
Theory of Viability. . . . .	40
Mechanical and Organic Model. . . . .	40

Chapter	Page
Exit, Voice and Loyalty . . . . .	41
Other Models and Considerations . . . . .	41
Conflict Management Skill Development . . . . .	42
Group Productivity . . . . .	44
Group Process Effects . . . . .	48
Summary . . . . .	50
Chapter II Footnotes. . . . .	54
III. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	60
Overview. . . . .	60
Design . . . . .	60
Research Methodology and Approach. . . . .	60
The Target Population. . . . .	62
Procedures . . . . .	63
Major Research Hypothesis . . . . .	64
Instrumentation. . . . .	65
Rationale for Inclusion of Specific Questionnaire Items . . . . .	65
Question 1: Define and Clarify Its Objectives or Purposes? . . . . .	65
Question 3: Reduce Initial Tension Where Present and Allow More Relaxed Conversation and Social Interaction Among Members? . . . . .	66
Question 4: Experience Conflict Over Scarce Resources? (Such as Personnel, Supplies, Time, Space or Other Tangible Items) . . . . .	67
Question 5: Begin to Work Together as a Unit Rather Than as a Number of Individuals? . . . . .	67
Question 6: Experience Changing Relationships Among Its Members? . . . . .	68
Question 7: Come to Agreement on Major Topics? . . . . .	68
Question 8: Experience Conflict Over Leadership, Position, Status or Control? . . . . .	69
Question 9: Complete Its Original Objectives or Purposes? . . . . .	69
Question 10: Help to Modify Any Lack of Interest, Inertia or Outdated Procedures Within the District? . . . . .	69
Question 11: Experience Distractions Such as Interruptions, Broken Equipment, Illnesses or Other Behavior/Environmental Obstacles? . . . . .	69



Chapter	Page
Question 12: Stimulate Any Creativity or Innovation Within the District? . . . . .	70
Question 13: Become Responsible for the Development of Any New or Different Program, Curriculum, Approach or Procedure? . . . . .	70
Question 14: Experience Conflict Regarding Open or Underlying Value Differences? . . . . .	70
Question 15: Help Make Possible Additional Funding for the School District? (Such as a Grant). . .	70
Question 16: Give Direction and Incentive to Other Groups in the District? . . . . .	71
Question 17: Finding That Change or Unrest Was Occurring Within the School District? (Such as a New Superintendent, Unsettled Contract or Revised Curriculum) . . . . .	71
Question 18: Affect Any District-Wide Change? . .	71
Question 19: Effect Any Community-Wide Change? . .	72
Data Collection and Processing . . . . .	72
Statistical Analysis . . . . .	73
Summary. . . . .	73
Chapter III Footnotes . . . . .	74
IV. ANALYSIS . . . . .	77
Analysis of Data. . . . .	77
Sub-Hypothesis 1. . . . .	78
Conflict 1: Conflict Over Scarce Resources (Such as Personnel, Time, Space or Other Tangible Items)--Question 4 on the Questionnaire . . . . .	78
Sub-Hypothesis 2. . . . .	79
Conflict 2: Conflict Over Leadership, Position, Status, or Control?--Question 8 on the Questionnaire . . . . .	79
Sub-Hypothesis 3. . . . .	80
Conflict 3: Conflict Over Distractions or Behavioral/Environmental Obstacles?--Question 11 on the Questionnaire . . . . .	80
Sub-Hypothesis 4. . . . .	80
Conflict 4: Conflict Regarding Open or Underlying Value Differences?--Question 14 on the Questionnaire . . . . .	80

Chapter	Page
Sub-Hypothesis 5. . . . .	81
Conflict 5: Conflict Occurring at a Time When Change or Unrest Was Already Present--Question 17 on the Questionnaire . . . . .	81
Major Hypothesis. . . . .	81
Correlation Coefficients . . . . .	82
Analysis of Questionnaire Responses . . . . .	83
Question 1: To What Extent Did This Group Define and Clarify Its Objectives or Purposes? . . . . .	84
Question 2: To What Extent Did This Group Establish Regular Routines? (Such as Selecting the Same Leader, Meeting Time). . . . .	85
Question 3: To What Extent Did This Group Reduce Initial Tension and Allow Relaxed Conversation and Social Interaction Among Members? . . . . .	85
Question 4: To What Extent Did This Group Experience Conflict Over Scarce Resources?--Conflict 1 . . . . .	86
Question 5: To What Extent Did This Group Begin to Work Together as a Unit Rather Than as a Number of Individuals?. . . . .	86
Question 6: To What Extent Did This Group Experience Changing Relationships Among Its Members? . . . . .	87
Question 7: To What Extent Did This Group Come to Agreement on Major Topics? . . . . .	87
Question 8: To What Extent Did This Group Experience Conflict Over Leadership, Position, Status or Control?--Conflict 2 . . . . .	87
Question 9: To What Extent Did This Group Complete Its Original Objectives or Purposes?. . . . .	88
Question 10: To What Extent Did This Group Help to Modify Any Lack of Interest, Inertia or Outdated Procedures Within the District? . . . . .	88
Question 11: To What Extent Did This Group Experience Distractions or Other Behavioral/Environmental Obstacles?--Conflict 3 . . . . .	89
Question 12: To What Extent Did This Group Stimulate Any Creativity or Innovation Within the District? . . . . .	89
Question 13: To What Extent Did This Group Become Responsible for Development of New Programs, Curriculum, Approaches or Procedures? . . . . .	89
Question 14: To What Extent Did This Group Experience Conflict Regarding Open or Underlying Value Differences?--Conflict 4. . . . .	90
Question 15: To What Extent Did This Group Help Make Possible Additional Funding? . . . . .	90

Ch.

V

BIBLIO



Chapter	Page
Question 16: To What Extent Did This Group Give Direction and Incentive to Other Groups in the District? . . . . .	91
Question 17: To What Extent Did This Group Find Change or Unrest Occurring Within the School District?--Conflict 5 . . . . .	91
Question 18: To What Extent Did This Group Affect Any District-Wide Change? and Question 19: To What Extent Did This Group Affect Any Community-Wide Change? . . . . .	91
Summaries of Interviews. . . . .	92
Subject 1--Questionnaire Respondent . . . . .	92
Subject 2--Questionnaire Respondent . . . . .	93
Subject 3--Questionnaire Respondent . . . . .	93
Subject 4--Questionnaire Respondent . . . . .	94
Subject 5--Questionnaire Respondent . . . . .	95
Subject 6--Questionnaire Respondent . . . . .	96
Subject 7--Group Member . . . . .	97
Subject 8--Group Member . . . . .	98
Overview. . . . .	99
V. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . .	101
Summary of the Study. . . . .	101
Purpose . . . . .	101
Design of the Study . . . . .	101
Analysis . . . . .	102
Findings. . . . .	102
Major Hypothesis . . . . .	102
Sub-Hypothesis 1 . . . . .	104
Sub-Hypothesis 2 . . . . .	104
Sub-Hypothesis 3 . . . . .	105
Sub-Hypothesis 4 . . . . .	106
Sub-Hypothesis 5 . . . . .	106
Conclusions. . . . .	107
Interviews . . . . .	108
Recommendations . . . . .	109
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	111

Chapter	Page
APPENDICES	
Appendix	
A. Initial Letter to Program Specialists . . . . .	120
B. Follow-Up Letter . . . . .	121
C. Questionnaire . . . . .	122
D. Tables . . . . .	123

Tai

1

2

3

4

5

6

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Conflict 1--Scarce Resources . . . . .	123
2. Conflict 2--Leadership/Control . . . . .	124
3. Conflict 3--Distractions/Obstacles . . . . .	125
4. Conflict 4--Value Differences . . . . .	126
5. Conflict 5--Change and Unrest . . . . .	127
6. Conflict's Overall Effect on Productivity . . . . .	128
7. Conflict Sources Relationships . . . . .	129
8. Question 1: To What Extent Did This Group Define and Clarify Its Objectives or Purposes? . . . . .	130
9. Question 2: To What Extent Did This Group Establish Regular Routines? . . . . .	131
10. Question 3: To What Extent Did This Group Reduce Initial Tension and Allow Relaxed Social Interaction? . . . . .	132
11. Conflict 1--Question 4: To What Extent Did This Group Experience Conflict Over Scarce Resources? . . . . .	133
12. Question 5: To What Extent Did This Group Begin to Work as a Unit Versus a Number of Individuals? . . . . .	134
13. Question 6: To What Extent Did This Group Experience Changing Relationships Among Its Members? . . . . .	135
14. Question 7: To What Extent Did This Group Come To Agreement on Major Topics? . . . . .	136
15. Conflict 2--Question 8: To What Extent Did This Group Experience Conflict Over Leadership, Position, Status or Control? . . . . .	137

T

1

2

2

2.

23

24

25

26

27

28.

29.

Table	Page
16. Question 9: To What Extent Did This Group Complete Its Original Objective? . . . . .	138
17. Question 10: To What Extent Did This Group Help to Modify Any Lack of Interest, Inertia or Outdated Procedures? . . . . .	139
18. Conflict 3--Question 11: To What Extent Did This Group Experience Distractions or Other Behavioral/ Environmental Obstacles? . . . . .	140
19. Question 12: To What Extent Did This Group Stimulate Creativity or Innovation Within the District? . . . . .	141
20. Question 13: To What Extent Did This Group Develop Any New or Different Program, Curriculum, or Procedure? . . . . .	142
21. Conflict 4--Question 14: To What Extent Did This Group Experience Conflict Regarding Open or Underlying Value Differences? . . . . .	143
22. Question 15: To What Extent Did This Group Make Possible Additional Funding for the School District? . . . . .	144
23. Question 16: To What Extent Did This Group Give Direction and Incentive to Other Groups in the District? . . . . .	145
24. Conflict 5--Question 17: To What Extent Did This Group Find Change or Unrest Occurring Within the District? . . . . .	146
25. Question 18: To What Extent Did This Group Affect Any District-Wide Change? . . . . .	147
26. Question 19: To What Extent Did This Group Affect Any Community-Wide Change? . . . . .	148
27. Total Conflict . . . . .	149
28. Conflict Intensity Levels . . . . .	150
29. Directionality of Mean Differences Detected . . . . .	151

if

int

re.

and

ate

neg

con

in

zat

has

of

with

as a

## CHAPTER I

### THE PROBLEM

Conflict is the gadfly of thought. It stirs us to observation and memory. It instigates to invention. It shocks us out of sheeplike passivity, and sets us at noting and contriving . . . conflict is a sine qua non of reflection and ingenuity (Dewey, 1930).<sup>1</sup>

#### Statement of the Problem

This study is an attempt to determine the effects of conflict, if any, on group productivity and whether variables such as source or intensity of conflict can be shown to provide a significant positive relationship to productivity.

Few words in the vocabulary of educators appear as grating and threatening as conflict. The extensive chain of agreement associated with the word in general symbolizes the extent to which it is negatively regarded. Like a two-sided coin, admittedly the same coin, conflict has its functional and dysfunctional contributions as much in program development in education as in personal, social or organizational settings. Through history in numerous walks of life conflict has been evident. Educational literature however speaks very little of conflict with educational theorists not seeming to notice or deal with it especially from a constructive, or functional, view particularly as a potential tool with which to facilitate change in some instances.



s  
i  
m  
t  
t  
re  
  
ha  
de  
les  
pro  
nat  
in

Program development has become an integral part of education delivery systems during the past several decades with specific personnel, even whole departments designated in larger school districts and institutions to research, plan, implement and evaluate new or revised programs. The specialty appears to have grown dramatically particularly after having been stimulated by federal funding directed toward just that objective. Once established, program development groups appear to take on their own identity, their own growth dilemmas, and operational difficulties.

Although not yet unanimously accepted, times have vanished when educational programs are conceived remotely by a single person or select few. Instead, increasing numbers of individuals are routinely actively involved in program development. Such involvement is mandated in most federally funded programs where lay, and/or community advisory representatives are required. Quite naturally then the group has become the generally accepted, legitimate structure through which most program development occurs. Such groups are referred to in this research as program development groups.

In educational research their importance and increased use has gone relatively unnoticed. Little is documented of program development group characteristics and/or their productivity. Even less is said in educational literature of conflict's effects on group productivity perhaps partly because of: (1) conflict's threatening nature and, (2) the newness of program development group recognition in education.

I

R

r

e

"

a

o

a

"A

a

.

tr

he

re

pa

di

the

a s

and

eli

dest

### Definitions

#### I. Conflict

Most often in current literature conflict is accepted as meaning "a struggle over values and claim to scarce status, power and resources in which the aims of opponents are to neutralize, injure or eliminate their rivals" as stated by Lewis A. Coser (Coser, 1956).<sup>2</sup>

Another more recent definer, Morton Deutsch, suggests that: "Conflict exists whenever incompatible activities occur . . . an action which is incompatible with another action which prevents, obstructs, interferes with, injures, or in some way makes the other action less likely or less effective." He continues by saying that: "A conflict may arise from differences in information or beliefs . . . a conflict may reflect differences in interests, desires, or values . . . a conflict may also reflect a rivalry in which one person tries to outdo or undo the other" (Deutsch, 1971).<sup>3</sup>

Coser's definition seems to represent the view most commonly held. Another dimension might be added defining conflict as a social relationship in which incompatible interests between two or more parties (persons, groups or organizations) struggle over value differences or competition for scarce resources or a combination of these. Excluded from discussion should be interpersonal dynamics as a study in itself.

In modifying Coser still further, elimination of his negative and rather physical phrase, "opponent's aims to neutralize, injure or eliminate rivals" should be considered since this sort of total destruction is not present in every conflict struggle especially if

one

niqu

elem

II.

tion

educ

comm

ists

to fi

ject.

perso

and s

of re

any o

Michi

progr

is fu

secti

III.

be ana

one accepts varying conflict intensity levels and resolution techniques available, such as cooperation and communication.

Other theorists feel that conflict can become an essential element in group formation and the persistence of group life.

## II. Groups

Respondents are, in this study, members or leaders in educational program development groups comprised of individuals who include educators, but may also include lay persons such as parents, students, community representatives, minority representatives, and/or specialists such as lawyers, architects or legislators for example.

The groups under analysis are small in size ranging from four to fifteen persons and meet an average number of nine times per project. Educational levels of group members vary from multiple-degreed persons to those with less than a high school background. Ages, sexes and socio-economic variances also exist within the groups. The purpose of researching, planning, implementing, evaluating, terminating or any one of these tasks is the linkage for members.

Groups are to be reported by a respondent who is a member of a Michigan professional organization whose objective is to improve program development throughout the state. The reporter, or respondent, is further described in the population description in the methodology section of Chapter III.

## III. Productivity

Group productivity being assessed is bi-leveled and will thus be analyzed. The first level of productivity is group formation

related. It is a known fact that groups experience varying developmental stages and associated characteristics. Francis Trusty in his research of conflict appears to have found that productivity of groups experiencing conflict differs dependent on the group's stage of development (Trusty, 1976).<sup>4</sup>

The second level of productivity refers to overall outcomes specifically tied to the group's primary objective and terminal efforts. The answer to the question, "did this group complete its original objectives or purposes?" would be an example of this level of productivity.

#### IV. Communication

Communication will be taken to mean verbal symbolic interaction among group members recognizing nonverbal communication as playing a role, but sensing a need to limit the very broad, general possibilities nonverbal communication might open and the difficulty associated in measuring it by the chosen measurement technique.

#### V. Resources

Resources referred to in the research will be of two types: physical and nonphysical, or less tangible in nature. Examples of physical resources might be money, place, personnel and time while nonphysical resources might include more theoretical concepts such as self-esteem, position, power or prestige.

### Need for the Study

An Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) search of the literature going back to November, 1966 was completed. Eighty-three (83) articles were uncovered dealing with conflict in education. An examination of doctoral dissertations via Datrix Information Services was also done yielding several additional documents of interest. On investigation of the literature, it appears that only a few theorists have dealt with conflict in a positive vein and as a change-producing concept. The majority of educational references focus on racial, administrator-teacher conflict or student dissent with emphasis on avoidance or quick resolution rather than any analysis of conflict functions.

An extensive manual search of general social conflict materials was also done because of the broad nature of the topic and for an overall knowledge base. Data, from primary source references, were located of relevance to the study and definitions, as cited, emerged. A more complete summary of the literature is included in Chapter II of this document.

Models and concepts, however, on which to base conflict research appear to be minimal and their development repeatedly encouraged. For example, Raymond Mack and Richard Snyder specifically feel that conflict theory has been inadequately conceptualized and theorized and that: (1) research has been slow to develop within the disciplines, (2) concepts are often only implicit, (3) theories are not guided with hypotheses, power and significance, and (4) that few case materials are based on comparative types of conflicts, unifying



concepts and general hypotheses that have been developed (Mack and Snyder, 1957).<sup>5</sup>

Ralf Dahrendorf labels conflict theory as being at a very rudimentary state and sees a need to analyze it further. He feels it needs to be asked what forms of struggles (conflict) exist and how group conflict affects change in social structure (Dahrendorf, 1968).<sup>6</sup>

To test the notion of functionality of conflict in small groups would seem sorely needed and yet an enormous task unless scope is limited narrowly. A few very specific needs emerged repeatedly. The need to examine sources of conflict, intensity levels and how conflict affects group productivity seem most critical. Fred Jandt would agree since he feels conflict may very well be related to productivity (Jandt, 1973).<sup>7</sup>

### Purpose of the Study

It is hoped that this analysis of functional aspects of conflict in program development groups will facilitate an increased understanding of conflict sources, intensity levels and positive attributes as they affect social structures such as small groups. It is hoped the results of the study will be of use to educational program developers working with such planning groups, and will help expand their skills in recognizing conflict's presence and influence on productivity.

Not to be included in the study are a number of variables known to be present in groups such as leadership, membership

characteristics, communication patterns, tasks, or organizational characteristics (Perry, 1976).<sup>8</sup>

Instead, the researcher will analyze fourteen group-related and task-related outcomes measuring productivity common to program development groups in educational settings in hopes of generalizing findings to similar groups. It is realized that further research could be undertaken to control for the variables mentioned that would be contributory and hoped that this study will stimulate interest in so doing among educators.

### General Statement of the Hypothesis

The study will be a two-fold endeavor in which both questionnaire and interview techniques will be employed. For the statistical portion of the study, a hypothesis has been developed which relates to the target population of Michigan program specialists who are members of a professional organization dedicated to program development. The hypothesis is designed to determine whether the presence of conflict has effect on group productivity. A specific concern dealt with is productivity differences in groups experiencing intense conflict of five types versus those groups evidencing minimal amounts of conflict. The hypothesis will be restated in statistical, testable format in Chapter III.

### Theoretical Background

However primitive, one of the first political historians to formulate a theory concerned with the origin of a state based on

1

1  
s  
s  
h  
p  
tt  
sc  
pi  
Am  
sc

conflict was Ibn Khaldun of Tunis who lived between 1332-1406. Looking at agricultural villages and nomadic groups he sketched an outline of patterns of conflict between them (Schofield, 1975).<sup>9</sup>

In Germany in the early 1900s, Georg Simmel (1858-1918) defined sixteen propositions dealing with conflict and groups that still represent the basis for social conflict theory. The propositions constituted the first organized series of ideas researched. They remain only minimally tested by applied researchers in the social sciences.

In 1907, the newly organized American Sociological Society had social conflict as its conference topic of discussion. Thomas N. Carver assigned importance for the Society to the study of conflict in his central paper. Leading sociologists of the time did not choose to question the assigned emphasis. In 1930, the Society had its twenty-sixth annual meeting. At that time President Howard Odum stated in his address that: "Social conflict (again the main topic) is sociologically an unexplored field . . . the sociology of conflict has yet to be written." Over twenty-three years had passed and little progress had been made (Coser, 1956).<sup>10</sup>

Jessie Bernard, writing in the American Journal of Sociology twenty years later yet, once more asked: "Where is the modern sociology of conflict?" He went on to say, "Since the time of early pioneers as Small, Park and Ross little progress has been made. American sociologists in recent years have been content to leave the scientific study of conflict where Simmel left it." This meant that

in the mid 1950s conflict theory was essentially unexplored (Coser, 1956).<sup>11</sup>

It was not until 1956 when Coser, using Simmel's original sixteen propositions, took on the task of updating and clarifying the propositions. Titles of his restatements are cited:

Proposition 1: Group-Binding Functions of Conflict

Proposition 2: Group-Preserving Functions of Conflict and the  
Significance of Safety-Valve Institutions

Proposition 3: Realistic and Nonrealistic Conflict

Proposition 4: Conflict and Hostile Impulses

Proposition 5: Hostility in Close Social Relationships

Proposition 6: The Closer the Relationship, the More Intense the  
Conflict

Proposition 7: Impact and Function of Conflict in Group Structures

Proposition 8: Conflict as an Index of Stability of Relationships

Proposition 9: Conflict with Out-Groups Increases Internal  
Cohesion

Proposition 10: Conflict with Another Group Defines Group  
Structure and Consequent Reaction to Internal  
Conflict

Proposition 11: The Search for Enemies

Proposition 12: Ideology and Conflict

Proposition 13: Conflict Binds Antagonists

Proposition 14: Interest in Unity of the Enemy

Proposition 15: Conflict Establishes and Maintains Balance of  
Power

**Proposition 16: Conflict Creates Associations and Coalitions**

(Coser, 1956).<sup>12</sup>

One of the reasons Coser undertook to clarify and update Simmel's well formulated findings may have been concern regarding a significant change that had occurred with regard to conflict's connotation in sociology which may have been closely related to what was occurring in the field itself.

Early, first generation American sociologists viewed conflict much as Simmel did having decided positive functions such as the central explanatory category for the analysis of social change and progress. This group was referred to as "the reformers" who sought social change and fully recognized conflict's potential for a role in that process.

Coser describes two types of "reformers" that existed:

1. structural reformers who included such leading figures of the time as Ward, Small, Ross, Veblen and Cooley, and who believed in social change through social structure change while,
2. detail reformers, like Sumner, Giddings and Park, felt adjustments within current structures were more in order (Coser, 1956).<sup>13</sup>

Ever increasingly sociologists, including the foremost Weberian scholar Talcott Parsons, began to describe conflict as endemic and problematic. Parsons discussed racial and religious antagonisms with emphasis on conflict's disruptive elements--causing tensions and strains. Medical analogic views grew as a result and

use of the term "disease" to describe conflict resulted. Those who supported the "disease" connotation were: George Lundberg whose orientation was toward communication and adjusting to conflict, and Elton Mayo, who first used the label "social disease," promoted "equilibrium" or "social health" as its counterpart primarily from a management oriented point of view.

Lloyd Warner was equally negative as he discussed class conflict, while Kurt Lewin was concerned with avoiding conflict by group skills while at the same time appeared contradictory to this view occasionally in his writings.

The change in view may have been related to what was happening in sociology research. As a shift from structural reform to an adjustment orientation within structures occurred, an accompanying change in the type of research being done took place. A switch from "pure" academic research to applied research came about perhaps due to increased financial support from a large number of private and public bureaucracies. As financial support for researched changed so did the researcher's audience and perspective. A certain loss of freedom on the part of theorists to elect his/her own areas of interest resulted. It was in this setting that conflict came to be redefined no longer capable of positive or functional aspects, but as being totally dysfunctional and "disease" like.

It was not until 1956 when Coser restated Simmel's propositions that interest was rekindled in returning the concept to its original functional connotation. Since then a number of modern theorists

h

t

c

c

c

a

a

W

de

kn

it

de

to

ti

ren



using the propositions as a theoretical base, are gradually offsetting the setback and loss of theory development years.

It is toward the purpose of renewing the earlier connotation of conflict that this research is slanted. Accepting the functional, or constructive, definition of conflict clarified by Coser, several of Simmel's propositions will be described. An itemized narrative analysis of questionnaire and interview responses is planned centered around the following findings:

1. whether conflict does, in fact, exist within small educational program development groups,
2. to what levels, or degrees of intensity, does it exist,
3. what sources of conflict are most prevalent, and
4. what effects, if any, does conflict have on group productivity.

A hypothesis relating the presence of conflict to productivity will be statistically tested. Conflict's effects, if any, on group development will also be discussed hoping to contribute to our present knowledge of group processes.

By so researching a relatively untouched area for educators, it is hoped future research will ensue related to conflict theory development. It is also hoped that the study will be relevant enough to draw the attention of education administrators to: (1) the relatively new area of program development group process and (2) the renewed interest in the functional aspects of conflict.

### Overview of Thesis

In Chapter II of the thesis pertinent literature is reviewed with a summary given. In the summary there is an indication as to the overall current stance of theory development dealing with group productivity and conflict. The design of the study in Chapter III includes description of the target population including its demography. Also cited are data collection measures, the design including a stated testable null and alternative hypothesis, variables, significance level and data analysis motif. As in previous chapters, a summary is provided.

Chapter IV sets forth the analysis of results and gives an order of presentation of data, including statement of sub-hypotheses, restatement of the major hypothesis, interpretation of results, narrative discussion of questionnaire responses and interview summaries.

The summary and conclusion in Chapter V finalize the thesis by stating implications for future research.

Bibliography and appendices follow.

## CHAPTER I FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>John Dewey, Human Nature and Conduct (New York: The Modern Library, 1930), p. 30.

<sup>2</sup>Lewis A. Coser, The Functions of Social Conflict (New York: The Free Press, 1956), p. 8.

<sup>3</sup>Morton Deutsch, "Toward an Understanding of Conflict," International Journal of Group Tensions 1 (1971):42-54.

<sup>4</sup>Francis Trusty, interview held at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, March 16, 1977.

<sup>5</sup>Raymond W. Mack and Richard C. Snyder, "The Analysis of Social Conflict--Toward an Overview and Synthesis," Journal of Conflict Resolution 1 (1957):212-248.

<sup>6</sup>Ralf Dahrendorf, Social Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Societies (Stanford: Stanford Press, 1968).

<sup>7</sup>Fred A. Jandt, Conflict Resolution through Communication (New York: Harper & Row, 1973), p. 154.

<sup>8</sup>The process of transition from conflictual to conforming action reflects Weber's concepts of "charisma" and "routinization of charisma" and suggests that the behavior of an organization, particularly one dedicated to reform, may be associated with its age according to Lorraine R. Perry, "Strategies of Black Community Groups," Social Work (May 1976):211.

<sup>9</sup>Dee Schofield, "Conflict Management in Education," School Leadership Digest (Arlington, Virginia: National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1975), p. 13.

<sup>10</sup>Coser, The Functions of Social Conflict, p. 15.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 16.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., pp. 13-14.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., pp. 16-18.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

#### Introduction

Throughout history a voluminous collection of conflict literature has been written recording political science, sociology, psychology, management and social work research. Comparatively, a far lesser amount of education research has been completed concerned with conflict characteristics. An Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) search located eighty-three (83) articles related to conflict, a number of which discussed conflict's effects on productivity. A Datrix II University Microfilm search of dissertations was also completed that yielded ten (10) additional articles of value. Other general conflict sources also were located. Studies relating to the nature of conflict, its types and sources, group communication, leadership, power, value differences, intensity levels, escalation, induced and suppressed conflict will be reviewed.

A list of the functional aspects of conflict also will be developed with supporting theorists named. A number of more prevalent theoretical models of conflict will be cited along with reports on conflict management skill development. These will be followed by research reports of studies done specifically on group productivity and group process effects on productivity.

### The Nature of Conflict

The nature of conflict would be and has been debated, researched, hashed and thrashed about over centuries. Is conflict a process, relational state, feeling, set of behaviors or what? (Miller, 1974).<sup>1</sup> No clarification it seems yet has been universally accepted, nor perhaps will it ever be. A number of theorists, however, have spoken descriptively of its characteristics and nature which may be the only, and best, way to discuss so general a concept.

An early prominent and respected sociologist, Robert E. Park, reported that conflict represents a very basic form of human interaction. In speaking of individual, or intra-personal conflict, he felt that only where there is a conflict of behaviors can there be conditions for rational conduct (Park, 1941).<sup>2</sup>

Louis Kriesberg, a modern day sociologist, agreed and sensed social conflict all about us, particularly present in human relations. He did not imply that every relationship is entirely or even partly conflicting all the time. Nor did Kriesberg mean that every underlying conflicting relationship will be expressed with the same degree and kind of hostility or violence (Kriesberg, 1973).<sup>3</sup>

Examining the nature of conflict from an individual-organizational perspective, Chris Argyris stated that, "There is always," in his words, "a basic incongruency between the needs of a mature personality and the requirements of a formal organization." So it would seem, as Raymond A. Ehrle summarized consistent thinking of a number of theorists, that conflict is definitely part of human nature and not to be construed as inherently bad (Argyris, 1957)<sup>4</sup> (Ehrle, 1971).<sup>5</sup>

### Types of Conflict

Six levels of conflict are generally recognized. They represent the individual and his/her interactions with other individuals, the group and its interaction with other groups, and the organization and its interaction with other organizations. They are respectively: intrapersonal conflict, interpersonal conflict, intragroup and intergroup conflict, and intraorganizational conflict and interorganizational conflict. The level most frequently referred to in this study is intragroup conflict, conflict within the group with conflicting behaviors or attitudes occurring between members for the most part.

Kurt Lewin felt that the type of conflict depended on the situation and he described three fundamental types attaching valences to each. One he labeled 2+ conflict and used it to represent those situations where a party is located midway between two equally positive stimuli. He cites as an example the jackass standing midway between two haystacks, each equally desired. A 2- type of conflict would again be a midway position, but between two equally negative, or punishing, conditions while the third type is used to describe a conflict situation where one stimulus is of positive value and one of negative quality (Lewin, 1954).<sup>6</sup>

Looking at types of conflict from a different perspective were Harold Guetzkow and John Gyr who, in their analysis of conflict in decision-making groups, established two types of conflict in a way prior researchers had referred to as realistic and non-realistic. In the past realistic conflict was in reference to the group's task while non-realistic conflict dealt with personality dynamics and differences not part of the group's objectives (Guetzkow and Gyr, 1954).<sup>7</sup>

Guetzkow and Gyr labeled conflict associated with intellectual opposition among participants on items related to the agenda's content as substantive conflict and those emotional clashes involving interpersonal struggles as affective conflict. Affective conflict centered about solving the group's agenda problems.

In another study, Harold Guetzkow, this time with Harry E. Collins, continued investigation of substantive and affective conflict. They located the presence of either substantive and affective conflict when: (1) little personal or self-oriented needs are expressed, (2) self needs are expressed and satisfied in the meeting's regular course, (3) generally a pleasant atmosphere exists and members recognize the need for unified action, and (4) the group's activity is understandable, orderly and focused on one issue at a time (Collins and Guetzkow, 1964).<sup>8</sup>

Substantive conflict alone was found when: (1) facts were available and used, (2) the chairperson aided the group by proposing solutions and worked with an agenda, and (3) members felt warm and friendly toward each other. Affective conflict was present in situations where: (1) members withdrew and were able to handle only discrete, simple agenda items, (2) members withdrew and had little interest, and (3) members withdrew from interpersonal contact with each other (Collins and Guetzkow, 1964).<sup>9</sup>

In their excellent resource book on conflict, Gerald I. Miller and Herbert W. Simon quoted Louis R. Pondy's 1967 study of organizational conflict and listed five useful conflict descriptors:

(1) latent conflict--conflict having underlying sources such as

competition for scarce resources, drives for autonomy and divergence of subunit goals, (2) perceived conflict--with or without latent conflict conditions present which is usually handled by semantics or communication (the speech field has done extensive work in developing this descriptor), (3) felt conflict--involving the affective domain and personality, dysfunctional aspects of conflict and venting of anxieties seen as necessary to maintain internal equilibrium, (4) manifest conflict--perceived as being present, knowingly induced to frustrate another's goals. A result of this type of conflict may be interpersonal conflict, and (5) conflict aftermath--resolution, cooperative relationships and task completion are included (Miller and Simon, 1974).<sup>10</sup>

#### Conflict Sources

Equality and homogeneity seem to be more often the exception rather than the rule in groups in conflict, particularly with regard to values and beliefs. People differ, values differ. Value differences are a source of conflict. Morton Deutsch in defining conflict says, "A conflict may arise from differences in information or belief . . . a conflict may reflect differences in interests, desires or values . . . a conflict may occur as a result of scarcity of resources such as money, time, space, position . . . a conflict may also reflect a rivalry in which one person tries to outdo or undo the other" (Deutsch in Jandt, 1973).<sup>11</sup>

Though value differences exist everywhere they seem more pronounced in different cultural settings especially where a number of diverse cultural groups are combined such as in the American operated



educational institutions in other countries. Samuel A. Moore speaking about cultural differences as a positive force for change, described constraints experienced by the educational institution, and multi-cultural coalitions that are quick to develop. Such coalitions Moore felt are geared toward effectiveness rather than efficiency, and help to reduce attention to differences that exist by emphasizing and heightening similarities. This he sees as beneficial to change saying that, "Doting upon differences among people tends to do little more than accentuate abrasiveness in relationships" (Moore, 1975-76).<sup>12</sup>

Kriesberg discusses value differences but from a totally different dimension. Dissensus, he stated, is when people differ about what is worth striving for and how to get what they want, while consensus exists when people agree, but a supply of what is sought is limited such as wealth, power or prestige (Kriesberg, 1973).<sup>13</sup>

The more fixed the size of the "pie," or resource, the more intense the conflict so says Clark Kerr in his discussion of industrial conflict. He reported conflict in a more violent way and wrote that, "Conflict behaviors are designed to destroy, injure, thwart or control another party or parties." It is agreed that some conflicts can be violent and involve different patterns of behaviors. Irvin Janis described such patterns of emotional behaviors in man as either that of avoidance, immobility, docility, apathy or depression, and aggressive irritability present in the face of conflict (Kerr, 1954),<sup>14</sup> (Janis, 1954).<sup>15</sup>

In 1974 Stephen P. Robbins, a modern day model developer, described in his conflict management book three main sources of

organizational conflict. Inadequate communication within the organization, he felt, was a very significant source of difference. Another source he gave was that of organizational structure itself--"is the organizational framework adequate and/or appropriate to satisfy objectives?" needs to be asked. The third source of conflict Robbins stated was diversity of personnel within the organization and the contributing behavioral factors of each organization member. All three sources are no doubt interrelated. Robbins also felt that the larger the organization, the greater the likelihood of existence of conflict at any time (Robbins, 1974).<sup>16</sup>

Earlier research dealing with conflict management grew out of Apollo projects. As a result of analysis of conflict that was occurring, time management systems were developed such as PERT and a number of others. In the analysis of conflict itself however, a number of observations were made and reported by David L. Wilemon in the form of propositions that contribute to our knowledge of conflict sources and characteristics. In the Journal of Management Studies, Wilemon wrote, "Managing Conflict in Temporary Management Systems." Program development groups, which this study examines, are in some respects temporary systems directed toward a single objective by "one time go-around" efforts. So, it becomes important to cite Wilemon's findings:

1. The greater the diversity of disciplinary expertise, the greater potential for conflict to develop. This statement is certainly supported by Robbins as has been discussed.
2. The lower the project manager's authority, reward and punishment power, the greater the potential for conflict. John R. P.

French, Jr. and Bertram H. Raven would be supportive of this particular proposition as a result of their analysis of six social power bases used in establishing group norms and maintaining standards. The six power bases they named were reward, coercion, referent, expertise, legitimate and informational power. They learned that reward as a power base was useful when based on the member's perception of others to give rewards.

3. The less the specific objectives are understood, the greater the potential for conflict to develop.
4. The greater the role ambiguity, the greater the potential for conflict to develop. Richard E. Walton's study of 300 managers from five departments within the same industrial company validated this proposition. In an attempt to explain variances in interdepartmental conflict across individuals and across departments, he found that factors that accounted for conflict were ambiguity in department jurisdiction, physical obstacles that blocked communication, and inequitable work loads (Walton, 1969).<sup>17</sup>
5. Agreement on goals reduces conflict potential.
6. The more a member of a functional area perceives the project as adversely usurping their traditional roles, the greater the potential for conflict.
7. The lower the need for interdependence, the greater potential for dysfunctional conflict.

8. Presence of high level management will tend to increase conflict, while projects experience less conflict under a task-oriented project manager of a lower level (Wilemon, 1973).<sup>18</sup>

Herbert Sheppard felt that power and control are prime sources of conflict. Writing in a British sociology journal about American approaches to conflict he reports that, "Conflict relations always involve attempts to gain control of scarce resources and position, or to influence behavior in certain directions; hence, a conflict relationship always involves the attempt to acquire or exercise power or the actual acquisition or exercise of power" (Sheppard, 1954).<sup>19</sup>

Perceptual differences might well be still another source of conflict according to Warren G. Bennis. He says it all in one clear sentence, "where you are determines how you see things, just as where you sit determines where you stand." It would seem then that roles are very much entwined in conflicts that exist within organizations (Bennis, 1976).<sup>20</sup>

Intragroup conflict, such as that experienced in family conflict and analyzed in this study, was studied by Edward Zuckerman who found that conflict was strongly affected by the task at hand and the number of interruptions or obstacles experienced during efforts to complete the task (Zuckerman, 1975).<sup>21</sup>

Another contributing factor that can be categorized as a conflict source is that of existing change or unrest. A. Otto Dahlke found that in his study of race and minority riots one of the six factors involved in the escalation of conflict was whether the period was one during which change and mobility was already occurring. He

felt those conditions capable of predicting whether riots would be probable (Dahlke, 1952).<sup>22</sup>

James Coleman examined community conflict and wrote an excellent current reference discussing conflict patterns and conflict arousing events. He felt that regardless of its source, community conflicts tend to be similar from initiation through outcome. He felt that conflict arises from events that effect community members' lives differently on which action can be taken. He found that the course of conflict can be predicted with crucial points present where intervention can best be used. In discussing sources, Coleman stated that there are four general areas capable of arousing conflict: (1) economic events occurring within the community, (2) events centering around local power or authority, (3) events touching on cultural values and belief systems, and (4) actions of controversial groups and/or personalities. He continued by stressing that any one or a combination of these has equal conflict arousal potential (Coleman, 1957).<sup>23</sup>

### Conflict Escalation

In conflict escalation, once hostility builds conflict sources become diffuse making it impossible to separate "brief differences" from personality differences for example. Nicholas A. Flannick also examined escalation by an intensive study of long-term disruptive incidents in several urban secondary schools of one large city. He found patterns of development as did Coleman. As conflict escalated he noted issues tended to generalize away from the original concern and that new and different issues arise. He found that when disagreement intensifies into overt hostility groups begin taking sides. More

extreme leadership steps to the fore, social relations polarize and traditional groups become involved or immobilized completely. He also found that word-of-communication begins to replace formal media and that the use of outside groups develops (Flannick, 1973).<sup>24</sup>

### Communication

Timothy M. Ashmore no doubt would agree with Coleman in regard to a shift in the type of communication that occurs during the time of conflict. As a result of his study of small groups experiencing conflict as a function of prior interaction, he found that communication during conflict lacked simple statements of disfavor or disagreement and that content seemed to take on a heavy use of clarification and excessive use of simple agreement statements. In his analysis however he found that prior interaction and communication between group members were not important factors in how individuals handled conflict (Ashmore, 1976).<sup>25</sup>

Considering conflict, but with regard to communication effects, Robert Bales suggested that to help solve difficulties that arise use of common language should be employed with frequent definitions given; excessive use of schedules, fact-finding procedures, recording and reporting should also be implemented (Bales, 1960).<sup>26</sup>

Without adequate group interaction, according to Bernard M. Bass, ability to solve problems may be limited. Interaction between group members is a function of size he reported. A larger group will tend to interact more as will those who are closer in distance, closer in intimacy level and homogeneity of characteristics (Bass, 1960).<sup>27</sup>

In an attempt to establish validity of a set of instructions directing a group's problem-solving behavior, Jay Hall found that the control group which was uninstructed (and without therefore specific directions) responded to internal conflict with compromises which may have eased group tensions, but did not improve the group's decisions. Instructed groups (the experimental group) used conflict to their advantage as an opportunity for creativity. It would seem then that adequate communication and directives are important to a group's performance (Hall, 1971).<sup>28</sup>

Harold J. Leavitt might well concur since the results of his study are in agreement. His analysis of certain communication patterns on group performance revealed that, "cooperative action by a group of individuals having a common objective requires a certain minimum of communication," and that each member needs to feel touched by some part of a network of communication. Leavitt found that group communication patterns were affected by members' accuracy, total activity and satisfaction with the group. Communication was also affected by leader emergency and organization of the group. The position the individual occupied within the group influenced his/her leadership opportunities, satisfaction, quantity of activity and contributions. The leadership role is one of providing centrality for the group it seemed (Leavitt, 1974).<sup>29</sup>

#### Leadership, Power and Status

Robert Bales also examined the notion of centrality and discovered that the group leader's role took on status with centralization.

As group members' roles became more specific, the leader's control became increasingly strained and coordination became more important. As directive control decreases, so did the leader's social status within the group. As directive control increased, so did the leader's social status, but relationships within the group became strained. Group leaders have a need however for power and control for specific tasks Bales declared after learning that equal power among group members makes accomplishment of unpleasant, and/or dangerous tasks difficult (Bales, 1955).<sup>30</sup>

### Intensity Levels

Studies of degree or intensity of conflict and its effect have not produced consistent findings. Leon Festinger and Eliot Aronson concurred when they stated that,

Experimental work on the relationship between extent of disagreement and amount of opinion change has not yielded very consistent results. Sometimes greater disagreement seems to result in more opinion change and sometimes in less opinion change.

They gave two reasons for their statement. First of all they found that if disagreement is too extreme to be reasonable, its content will be ignored or made negligible and derogation of the disagreeing persons by the group will occur (Festinger and Aronson in Cartwright and Zander, 1960).<sup>31</sup>

On investigation of large school systems with special problems of teacher militancy and organizational conflict, John O. Andes, Roe L. Johns, and Ralph B. Kimbrough found that high levels of intensity of conflict may divert urban school district administrators and personnel energies away from the primary goal to the point of becoming



nonproductive. Conflict can be very energy and time demanding. They studied thirty types of conflict in five large urban school districts in 1969-70. They found that when conflict reached crucial stages often organizational restructuring was required. While they felt that the current structure either contributed to the intensity or did not function to reduce the degree of conflict, William L. Boyd in his study of community status and conflict in suburban school politics determined that structural effects were unreliable predictors of the intensity of conflict. Groups in conflict with the school administration more often attained their goals than did administration (Andes, Johns, and Kimbrough, 1971),<sup>32</sup> (Boyd, 1972).<sup>33</sup>

#### Induced Conflict

Molly Vogt, quoted by Stephen P. Robbins, calls herself an "interactionist" and says, "the absence of conflict in an organization almost inevitably indicates stagnation, and at times it may be necessary to stimulate conflict to revitalize the system." She would agree then with Andes, et al. whose findings of the need to restructure an unresponsive organization suggested this be done by creating conflict. Vogt continues and says, "Thus, the management of conflict, by stimulation or resolution, will probably become an essential activity in dealing with problems and sets of problems encountered in systems in the future" (Robbins, 1974).<sup>34</sup>

The idea of purposefully stimulating conflict may not seem admissible to most. Two researchers, David J. Kirby and Robert L. Crain, carefully studied the functions of conflict in ninety-one

cities experiencing conflict over school desegregation. Their conclusions were reported at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting in Chicago in 1974. Stated hypotheses were: (1) that a non-issue is made more salient by powerless groups by conflict-raising tactics, (2) pressures of conflict as a tradition facilitate other change, (3) grass roots activity with some elite support is generally ignored by other elites, (4) that conflict is dysfunctional if decisions require informal consensus since political leaders simply withdraw, and (5) that conflict increasing tactics are helpful in compulsory attendance groups where members cannot withdraw and must settle the conflict. Their findings were in support of hypotheses 2, 4, and 5. The area of induced or stimulated conflict seems relatively unspoken of outside racial themes, yet appears to be in practice however, covertly. It is anticipated that future research will begin to examine induced conflict more closely (Kirby and Crain, 1974).<sup>35</sup>

Harold J. Johnson, in a social psychology study, induced conflict in subjects to determine its effects on decision-making and found that conflict resulted in higher levels of physiological arousal even with little anticipation of punishment. When tasks became difficult for experimental subjects, they behaved very differently. He noted that they began to withdraw, became agitated, aggressive and manifested seemingly unrelated behavior. Some initiated previously effective defense reactions under conflict conditions (Johnson, 1963).<sup>36</sup>

Both John W. Thibaut and John Coules support Johnson's notice of aggressive behavior in subjects under conflict and review for us that frustration-aggression theorists believe that aggressive

tendencies may be aroused by blocking any goal-directed behavior. They added that overt acts of aggression, including verbal communication for example, will tend to reduce the level of hostile tension in the aggressor. Perhaps when conflict management specialists urge communication of differences they are operationalizing the premise of encouraging aggression venting to minimize conflict intensity (Thibaut and Coules, 1952).<sup>37</sup>

### Suppressed Conflict

Suppression of perceived, potential or real conflict was studied by Norman Maier as a factor affecting creative group problem-solving. He determined that idea and opinion differences among group members need not lead to dissatisfaction and unpleasant experiences, but rather can lead to constructive and creative problem-solving if not suppressed (Maier, 1962).<sup>38</sup>

Warren Bennis, as previously mentioned, in a discussion of loyalty views loyalty as muffled dissent. Bennis probably would argue vehemently against suppression and plan against it. To exemplify this stance he mentions his open advocacy and use of individuals he refers to in a role of "domesticated dissent." These individuals act informally as devil's advocates on the fringes of an organization. The function of these people is to report suppressed, or otherwise unreported, dissent. He warns that excessive use of such individuals in this role has the capacity of making it powerless and risks the chance of the dissenter becoming unheard in time and with over use. He feels such persons act as organizational "gatekeepers," allowing

new ideas to enter through stimulation from their usual "outside-the-organization" interests and loyalties. Such individuals are generally abrasive to others in the organization, good problem identifiers, have low organization loyalty and low goal commitments. They assist as sensors of perceptual differences that may be present or information's inaccessibility (Bennis, 1976).<sup>39</sup>

In discussing strategies for action in cases of racial conflicts, F. D. Freeman suggested that to reduce or remove sources of conflict may not aid resolution. Suppression, however, does occur quite commonly in groups (Freeman, 1951).<sup>40</sup>

Situations where a party will accept others' opinions and essentially suppress their own feelings as an effect of group pressure were described by Solomon E. Asch. Asch felt that personal judgments are modified and distorted frequently by group pressure especially when: (1) evidence is convincing for acceptance of the group's position, (2) evidence is unclear and ambiguous, (3) a discrepancy between the individual's opinion is great, (4) the individual's self-confidence is low regarding the correctness of his/her position, and (5) when an individual is aware that others know that their opinion differs from others (Asch in Cartwright and Zander, 1960).<sup>41</sup>

Saul Bernstein in a very readable and comprehensive chapter on conflict, self-determination and social work cites Kurt Lewin's thoughts and warns that conflict is an ideal state toward which one should aspire or from which one should run, but that it may be the only way to "unfreeze" or loosen up relationships and social structures so that they then become reachable by attempts to produce change (Bernstein, 1967).<sup>42</sup>

"In order to achieve constructive results, there is a need for professional behavior rooted in careful diagnosis," Bernstein stated, "as well as for a point of view that regards conflict as congenial." He also feels that social workers, for example, tend to be more receptive to working with conflicts in clients than to the same situations in their own agencies and among colleagues.

Not as clearly discussed in conflict literature is when conflict exists which does not come out into the open, in other words latent conflict. This potential sort of conflict is apt to exist when great inequality of power is present and the weaker party fears expression of his/her position. Bernstein stated that race relations in the United States is an example of this type of suppression of conflict. He also stated that when one of the parties, usually the dominant one, does not perceive that a conflict exists suppression may occur. And, while often times suppressed, Bernstein agrees with other theorists, conflict is a basic and pervasive fact of life permeating every human area. While not the totality of our existence, it represents a large and significant enough part to be a challenge and warrant awareness, particularly as to its functional aspects.

#### Functional Aspects

Below is a summary chart of a number of functional aspects of conflict that researchers have addressed over the past sixty years. Upon examining such a listing of constructive aspects, it is well to remember to not overlook the potential destructive sides. Conflict is also capable of destroying people, twisting emotions and ideas, and

seriously entangling relationships. Conflict then, is not an ideal state toward which one should aspire or from which one should run as stated above, but a concept to be recognized as a potential means and stimulus for a number of the functions cited when cautiously and professionally considered.

### Functional Aspects of Conflict

#### Chart

<u>Function</u>	<u>Supporting Theorist</u>
1. helps to revitalize a system	Stephen P. Robbins
2. assists understanding of social problems	Ralf Dahrendorf
3. provides means for avoiding ossification and ritualism within organizations	Melville Dalton
4. services as a foundation for society's social and political institutions	Karl Marx
5. constitutes a major source of large-scale societal change	Karl Marx
6. produces the movement which makes sociological history by constituting the struggle	Karl Marx
7. may be the first birth pang of a new institutionalized pattern	Karl Marx
8. sets boundaries by strengthening group cohesiveness and separateness	Lewis A. Coser
9. reduces tension and permits maintenance of social interaction under stress	Clark Kerr and Lewis Coser
10. establishes group norms	Otto Kahn-Freund
11. helps prevent stagnation	Stephen P. Robbins
12. initiates change	Mark Chesler
13. facilitates change	Ralf Dahrendorf

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 14. stirs observation and memory; instigates to invention; shocks passivity; begins noting and contriving; is the basis of reflection and ingenuity | John Dewey  |
| 15. constitutes fundamental social-interaction process  | Robert Dubin  |
| 16. clarifies objectives  | Arthur Kornhauser,<br>Robert Dubin and<br>Arthur Ross |
| 17. helps to reduce subordination in relationships by increasing agreement  | Aage B. Sorensen                                      |
| 18. restrains violence through conflicting allegiances  | Max Gluckman  |
| 19. maintains and re-establishes equilibrium (as an earthquake might)   | Max Gluckman  |
| 20. is essential to progress  | Rensis Likert   |
| 21. leads to ever-changing relationships  | Karl Marx   |
| 22. represents both a consequence and cause of social change  | Gerda Smith   |
| 23. resolves divergent dualisms   | Georg Simmel  |
| 24. establishes a way of achieving some kind of unity   | Georg Simmel  |
| 25. helps to resolve tension between contrasts  | Georg Simmel  |
| 26. helps to determine the position of participants and the distance between them   | Georg Simmel  |
| 27. acts as a safety valve through which tension is relieved  | Georg Simmel  |
| 28. proves our strength and control over circumstances  | Georg Simmel  |
| 29. preserves relationships by a quieting influence and inner balance once resolved   | Georg Simmel  |

## Theoretical Models of Conflict Management

### Problem-Solving Models

Resolution, or management as more recent theorists prefer, was the emphasis of Allan C. Filley as he described three resolution styles. The categories he described included competitiveness, disruption, and problem-solving. Competitiveness occurs when incompatible goals are sought and represents an inevitable "win-lose" situation where one party is determined to win all causing the other party to lose all. Disruptive behaviors occurs when no rules are set. The atmosphere is one involving anger, fear, stress and irrational behavior. Disruptive reactions also produce "win-lose" positions. The third category, problem-solving, Filley felt represents the only type where both parties stand to gain, or at least experience sufficient amounts of satisfaction with the outcome. He emphasized problem-solving and its "win-win" results as the goal of conflict management (Filley, 1975).<sup>43</sup>

Using small groups, Les Wallace and Leslie Baxter reported on a study they completed involving thirty groups testing for reactions to various ad hoc problem-solving situations. The groups lacked prior problem-solving training. Four approaches were used. One group received problem-solving instructions, the second only used reflective thinking to solve problems, the third were given conflict management instructions and a fourth group were told to utilize both reflective thinking and conflict management instructions. Results showed no significant differences among various groups and approaches. These findings are contradictory to earlier published research using



management conflict instructions (see Hall quoted earlier under Communications in Conflict).

Wallace and Baxter postulated, however, that reasons why differences were not detected may have been related to the task, population or group process. They did notice that groups tended to avoid substantive or idea conflict because they felt it might lead them into affective conflict. The problem, then, of researching substantive conflict in small groups remained a challenge they concluded (Wallace and Baxter, 1973).<sup>44</sup>

### Cooperation

A large, very general concept, to be certain, is cooperation. In conflict management this theory appears to hold promise. Alexander Mintz stands out as a forerunner in research dealing with cooperation and conflict. In discussing non-adaptive group behavior in 1951, he indicated that cooperative behavior is vital for success and is rewarding to individuals in groups as long as everyone cooperates. As soon as an individual group member discontinues cooperation results decline. As an example he gave a theater fire. If total cooperation is the case, results are a quick and safe exit.. If, however, cooperation is disturbed, rewards and competitive behavior develops ending, in this example, perhaps in tragic results (Mintz, 1951).<sup>45</sup>

Morton Deutsch in a writing on cooperation and trust summarized the cooperation model by stating that it is based on a human's capacity to perceive the reality that exists independent of him/her as an individual and depends instead on the individual's ability to recognize that others perceive it similarly. What he also said was

that cooperation depends on the individual believing that goals are interrelated. Two critical problems cooperation continuously face are trust and bargaining. These bases are more quickly established if individuals are interested in each other's welfare (Deutsch in Bennis, 1964).<sup>46</sup>

### Game Theory

"Prisoner's Dilemma," the nickname of a two-choice game using Lewis Richardson's Mathematical Theory of War, represents the game more frequently associated with game theory. Designed in 1937 by mathematicians who initially applied the system in two arms races, it is based on theories such as the Markov Chain, Equilibrium model with adjustable parameters, Stochastic Learning and Classical Dynamics. Game theory has been tested by simulation and comparing populations. Findings using it reported that the quality of interaction within pairs of individuals who play had effects due to conflict and its intensity which also affected overall cooperation. Cooperation relates to payoffs during the game. Small sex differences were noted with men more willing to give "tit-for-tat" in conflict situations. More cooperation was noted in pairs that were willing to give "tit-for-tat" responses, and therefore men did slightly better.

Game theory has been widely tried and widely criticized due to its high level of abstraction and mathematical base, and is felt to be impractical in most real world instances. It can be useful however in clarifying conflict situations. Many feel the real world is much more complex than the very calculated Hobbesian universe of the game.

Terminology used are the major games' names--"Prisoner's Dilemma" or "PD," "zero-sum" payoff where what any one party gains the other loses. "Constant-sum" game which involves, again, one party gaining and the other losing, but with a fixed payoff added, while a "variable-sum" game (also essentially the same) has a variable payoff.

Early research in the 1950s using "PD" games found that more cooperation was prevalent when pregame communication took place. Also significant was the type of game being played and the fact that a delay in the start of communication tended to depress cooperation (Rapoport, 1957),<sup>47</sup> (Rapoport and Chammah, 1965).<sup>48</sup>

### Scientific Method

As in many other disciplines, conflict management is not without its application of the scientific method. The basic strategy (to review) involves use of: fact assessment, idea exploration, solution development, application and reassessment. Michael G. Giammatteo in 1967 revised and designed a process involving: fact assessment, idea exploration, solution development, interpersonal relationships and old problems restated to fulfillment.

Using the new approach in a workshop with small groups given a number of written documents, he studied expectations of group members in conflict and found the process effective. His paper on the process was given at the meeting of Supervisors of Student Teachers in Portland, Oregon and while simple in application represents one way to study group conflict. Samples of worksheets used can be ordered (Giammateo, 1967).<sup>49</sup>

### Static-Equilibrium Models

Models appear to have similarities in descriptions of parties involved in the conflict, behavior, space, competition and the type of conflict. A model developed by Talcott Parsons, described by Kenneth Boulding, describes a situation of two incompatible behavior units in which parties are aware of the incompatibility of potential future positions and wish to occupy a position that is incompatible with the wishes of the other party. An ordered set of positions and value ordering is involved with boundaries of possibilities spelling out particular positions one can occupy (Boulding, 1962).<sup>50</sup>

### Theory of Viability

Kenneth Boulding also described a theory where the ability of willingness of one party to destroy another exists involving space occupancy. It is based on the idea that a party is at his maximum power at home. This we see frequently in athletics where the home team is assumed in the favored position during home games. The theory is based on the idea that competitive power declines with distance from home (Boulding, 1962).<sup>51</sup>

### Mechanical and Organic Model

This approach described by Tom Burns and George MacPherson Stalker in 1962 was first explained in relationship to managing innovations. It specifically addressed itself to conflict resolution. Varying resolution techniques were discussed. Two systems--mechanical and organic were named. Use of suppression, arbitration, or open warfare in conflict resolution were most often seen in mechanical

systems, while bargaining or problem-solving fit best an organic system. No further use of the model was found since Burns and Stalker's description (Burns and Stalker, 1962).<sup>52</sup>

### Exit, Voice and Loyalty

Warren G. Bennis quoted Albert O. Hirschman's book titled, Exit, Voice and Loyalty, (Boston: Harvard University Press, 1970) as types of choices individuals face when in conflict with an organization's objectives. The "exit" choice is a type of withdrawal from the conflictful situation, while "voice" implies that communication would be effective. "Loyalty" again implies a type of withdrawal with the party compromising and electing to remain faithful to the organization, for example, inspite of continued disagreement and lack of resolution. For this last choice type Bennis gives as an example a well known American politician-educator (Bennis, 1976).<sup>53</sup>

### Other Models and Considerations

Other models have been suggested by theorists, but appear to be essentially untested. Simulation has been used widely, Stafford Beer suggests operations research, while Robert Chin felt that attitudinal change, an important consideration in general change, might also be helpful. Transactional Analysis, an outgrowth from the behavioral sciences used primarily in therapeutic settings is a paradigm beginning to be more widely accepted in analyzing communication patterns in other settings.

Other modes of conflict management are compromise, accommodation, collaboration and withdrawal. Which technique to use when seems

to depend on: (1) the stakes involved, (2) conflict intensity, (3) social pressure, (4) history of interaction, and (5) time pressure.

While a number of partial models have come forth, no one stands out as the optimum. A number lack valid applied research. It would seem then that a need remains, as Gordon Lippitt indicates, for a symbolic representation, or model, of the complex function of resolving and utilizing conflict to aid understanding toward its positive uses by: (1) analyzing reality conflict situations, (2) clarifying thinking, (3) predicting performance, and (4) evaluating alternatives available (Lippitt, 1973).<sup>54</sup>

#### Conflict Management Skill Development

Only a few years ago Dorothy Magett researched conflict management functions of central office human relations officers in selected suburban schools. Some of her findings were that the human relations officers were used to convey information primarily and that as mediators in conflict situations, they were 85 percent ineffective. She also found that only 42 percent had a tendency toward intervention at the time of conflict. Most significant of all was the fact that control appeared to be the foremost goal of most officers which was felt to be counter productive to effectively plan for change or conflict management (Magett, 1972).<sup>55</sup>

It would seem then, because of incompleteness of conflict management models, and lack of adequate field-tested studies to support theories, a definite need for model development and training in the area of conflict management skills exist.

Stephen K. Bailey addressing the American Educational Research Association at their annual meeting in 1971 agreed that educational administrators should be trained in conflict management. Since throughout the literature there exists a lack of consistent definition, Bailey suggested that conflict not be defined but typed. Categories he cited were: (1) subordinate, superordinate and lateral conflicts, (2) horizontal and vertical conflicts, (3) constructive and destructive conflicts, and (4) severity or quality of conflict. By knowing the type of conflict that exists, he felt, one is better able to select the appropriate management approach (Bailey, 1971).<sup>56</sup>

Bailey went on to describe specific administrative characteristics to be encouraged. An awareness of problems faced by all segments of his/her constituency should be urged. Administrators need to be harshly realistic about their own personality and role limitations, and use collective judgments versus individual or personal ones. He also felt that in crisis situations administrators need to realize a need to estimate their own and the enemy's resources. And last of all, Bailey felt a specific plan of resolution should be carefully designed and followed.

James Coleman would add to the list of facts administrators need to be aware of, no doubt, the fact that responsiveness and control of constituents are vital. As an outcome of his community conflict studies and escalation, he recommended using regular structural channels to listen. If such channels do not exist they should be established in order that the opposition's criticism might be heard. Coleman also suggested maintenance of good relationships with leaders of community associations and organizations and identification with

the community in general to minimize violent behavior in times of conflict. Research supports the fact that communities with high involvement will have more intense and more frequent controversies, but resolve them with ordinary democratic processes netting increased satisfaction for the majority (Coleman, 1957).<sup>57</sup>

An often neglected dimension in education administration--understanding the nature of conflict--was spoken to by Roland E. Barnes recently. Beside presenting a good conflict theory background, his writings discussed desegregation conflict and the feeling that administrators need to experience firsthand conflict and its accompanying emotions in their training. In further developing our understanding of its very complex nature, intensive social science research should be continued Barnes says. He feels administrators ought to observe carefully group behavior and begin to accept concepts that may differ from their own long-held values (Barnes, 1974).<sup>58</sup>

In response to administrative need for conflict management skill development, the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory produced a publication containing a workshop format directed toward training administrators to begin to accept conflict not as good or bad, but toward awareness and increase understanding (Northwest Regional Educational Lab, 1976).<sup>59</sup>

### Group Productivity

In both field and laboratory settings, Barry E. Collins and Harold Guetzkow analyzed group productivity with regard to effectiveness in decision-making. They were particularly interested in group process. Findings reported were that group productivity depended on:



(1) resources available to the group inherent in the task and interpersonal relationship of group members, (2) social motivation of the group with goals and rewards that were different than when members were working as individuals, and (3) social influence which was respected if contributions of those possessing the influence were supported by evidence that was logical and consistent with past experience, or evidence was within the area of the individual's ignorance, or the influential contributor was considered to be an expert (Collins and Guetzkow, 1964).<sup>60</sup>

They also described four variables affecting group productivity, and felt that: (1) the task or task environment was critical as were, (2) the impact of the presence of other people, (3) interpersonal relationships within the group, and (4) division of individual productivity and assembly effect. Specifically, obstacles originating in the task environment directly inhibited productivity.

Interpersonal obstacles on the otherhand were created by task environments and inhibited both individual and group productivity. An example of this would be different communication networks. Interpersonal obstacles created in the behavior of other group members inhibited both individual and group effects. A silent group member impaired productivity for example.

Also speaking of silent members' effect on productivity was Ewart E. Smith who had earlier examined effects of clear and unclear role expectations on group productivity. He found that initially silent group members have no effect, but then with the passing of time a lower product is noted, with productivity returning to a higher

level as the silent member's role became accepted by other group members. He studied this phenomenon by observing five-member groups where three members were classified as "naive" and two as "silent" (Smith, 1957).<sup>61</sup>

Smith also observed reduced performance caused by ambiguous roles that Collins and Guetzkow saw. Thomas Scheidel and Laura Crowell in their 1964 study of idea development in small discussion groups observed verbal behavior and task accomplishment and felt that there was a decided relationship (Scheidel and Crowell, 1964).<sup>62</sup>

It would seem then that group interaction is important to task performance. Bernard Bass spoke of communication and interaction in groups, and felt that lack of group interaction may cause inability to solve problems. Stanley Schachter, Norris Ellertson, Dorothy McBridge, and Doris Gregory however might disagree. Their report of an experimental study of cohesiveness and productivity related that group cohesiveness as such does not necessarily increase or decrease productivity of the group. Cohesiveness or attraction to group membership served to heighten the susceptibility of group influence from other members. If, however, predominant influencers are to restrict production for one reason or another, cohesiveness will lower productivity (Schachter, Ellertson, McBridge, and Gregory in Cartwright and Zander, 1960).<sup>63</sup>

The role of influencers as leaders should be considered. Fred Fielder talked of productivity and leadership style. He related an explanation of his contingency model that a group's performance related to the leadership style and the group's favorableness to that style.

One factor would be whether the style provides the leader with influence over members. He suggested that to improve group performance one needs to modify a leader's style or modify the group-task situation (Fielder, 1967).<sup>64</sup>

In discussing stress Fielder felt that under conditions of low stress relatively managing, controlling leaders were needed, while under moderate stress more permissive, considerate styles were preferred. Under high conditions of stress a task-oriented style would be the most effective. He even went so far as to relate the leader's IQ level to productivity.

An especially significant finding of Fielder's as it related to this study was that group performance was not strongly affected by range of stress and in other words, performance did not materially deteriorate under conditions of stress and was, in fact, roughly as good as without it.

In another study directed toward problem solving by small groups using various communication networks, George Heise and George A. Miller found that stress under which small groups work did have an effect on performance as did the task they were handling and the channels of communication open to members. Alex Bavelas, who also examined task oriented groups' communication patterns, found performance differed when communication was restricted, dependent on location of the recognized leadership and general satisfaction of group members (Heise and Miller, 1955),<sup>65</sup> (Bavelas, 1960).<sup>66</sup>

In still another study of creative group problem-solving L. Richard Hoffman, Ernest Harburg and Norman R. F. Maier looked for

differences and disagreement factors. They used seventy-two male college students in their study and found interesting results. They determined that those with high anxiety and high motivation did less well under stress than did low anxiety-low motivation students. Of interest is the fact that the higher level of motivation did not offset or counter balance stress factors (Hoffman, Harburg, and Maier, 1962).<sup>67</sup>

When Lorraine R. Perry investigated strategies of black community groups seeking to determine whether groups using a cooperative model to advocate for change differed in their results from groups using conflict activities. Data collection motif parallels that used in this study in that question responses were on a six-point scale. To summarize, Perry's findings indicated that: (1) both groups engaged in conflict activities equally, (2) groups advocated for radical changes and conflict strategies, but then less often use them--less often than they say they would like, (3) both groups felt cooperative models are more effective, and (4) both groups preferred to use a cooperative model to seek change (Perry, 1976).<sup>68</sup>

#### Group Process Effects

It has been demonstrated that small group processes and the issues of trust, team-building, self-disclosure and so on, which are well studied, are almost identical whether the participants are strangers, members of the same organization or representatives of different countries (Walton, 1969).<sup>69</sup>

That groups will differ in the nature and extent of internal differences lacks research according to Aubrey Fisher who studied group development phases. While consistent interaction patterns of

task behavior exist, the phase in which the group finds itself at a particular moment may differ and have an effect on productivity. Francis Trusty implied this in a discussion of his conflict research involving interviews with 100 subjects. The group development phases Fisher described are: an orientation phase, conflict phase, emergency phase and reinforcement phase (Fisher, 1970),<sup>70</sup> (Trusty, 1977).<sup>71</sup>

With reference to this study's focus, Roland E. Barnes found that conflict was particularly evident at the stage of group formulation and at the time when weighing of alternatives was occurring, or in other words, at the beginning stage of task analysis (Barnes, 1974).<sup>72</sup>

Robert F. Bales and Fred L. Strodbeck, however, imply that problems occur at any phase and throughout the group's entire being, but differ in nature. They examined twenty-two problem-solving groups where subjects were adult, English speaking, formally educated persons who regarded conflict negatively, and who were without large status differences. Group size varied from two to twenty members. Some minimal pressure existed to maintain group solidarity. During the orientation phase problems affected performance both positively and negatively. During the evaluation period however reactions tended to increase. Their conclusion was that different conditions or problems result in different sorts of phase movement for groups. It also appeared likely, they found, that status differences will modify phase movement, but this was not explored (Bales and Strodbeck, 1951).<sup>73</sup>

Deviancy may be considered a difference in group member status and can occur during any phase of development. This too is reported in the literature extensively. Generally accepted has been the fact

that groups will tolerate only a certain amount of deviancy before rejecting the member. Widely accepted as this notion is, Lewis Coser in his experience feels that evidence that groups always reject deviants is, at least, open to question (Coser, 1970).<sup>74</sup>

Durkheim and Mann, says Coser, have voiced a functional side of deviancy. They write that even crime creates a sense of solidarity among citizens within the community. Perhaps one rationale is that non-deviants pull together in opposition and comparison. The two researchers felt that the deviant's opposition strengthens the group, and that acceptance and tolerance of a deviant can also strengthen a group and that rigid and repeated rejection of deviants has serious dysfunctional consequences.

It is apparent that tolerance exists for special role incumbents such as the "star," the "stranger," and the "fool," and also group leaders who are expected to be flexible and depart from norms to further group tasks, also according to Coser. A problem raised by differences of opinion that exist is the need to distinguish between types of deviant behavior he explained.

#### Summary

In spite of Coser's reinstitution of Simmel's propositions, research regarding the functional aspects of conflict has been limited. While the true nature of conflict remains unclear, a number of descriptors have been developed. Validation of conflict's presence in human nature however is assured.

Described in current literature were six levels on which conflict is operational, and both positive and negative valences were

assigned. Also characterized were realistic or nonrealistic, substantive or affective, latent, perceived, felt and manifest types of conflict.

A number of studies reviewed in this chapter identified potential sources of conflict including: value, cultural and perceptual differences, scarce resources, inadequate communication, power, authority, control, position, diversity of personnel, and organizational structure. Unclear objectives were also stated as a possible cause as were role ambiguity, goal disagreement, usurping of traditional roles, need for interdependence, presence of high level management, interruptions and environmental obstacles, already existing change and unrest, economic events and controversial persons or groups.

Patterns occurring at the time of conflict escalation were observed. Communication became general in nature and avoidance of central issues occurred along with conflict generalizing to other areas, and polarization of parties involved.

During periods of intense conflict it was learned that communication worked best when use of common language was employed and that interaction between conflicting parties was to be encouraged. Conflict management instructions given group members facilitated the positive use of conflict in problem-solving. It was felt important, in times of considerable disagreement, that communication networks touch everyone.

Induced, or stimulated, conflict may be useful in facilitating change or organizational restructuring it was reported. Conflict, however, was not useful when consensus was required, while

conflict-increasing tactics were helpful in compulsory attendance groups. There remains a need for additional research regarding induced conflict.

Suppressed conflict was investigated by three theorists who felt negatively about lack of expression of disagreement which is sometimes brought about by group pressure or inequality of power. Theorists agreed that professional caution and ethics should be exercised in dealing with conflict--induced, suppressed or otherwise.

A chart summarizing a number of functional aspects of conflict was developed followed by discussion of a number of partial models designed to date. Included among them were: the competitive, disruptive and problem-solving model; cooperation; game theory; scientific method; static-equilibrium; theory of viability; mechanical and organic systems model; and the "exit, voice or loyalty" idea. Which to consider when depends on: (1) the stakes involved, (2) conflict intensity, (3) social pressure, (4) history of interaction, and (5) time pressure.

A need was realized for a composite model capable of: (1) analyzing conflict situations, (2) clarifying thinking, (3) predicting performance, and (4) evaluating alternatives available.

Conflict management skill development needs were discussed, as was group productivity which in the literature reviewed depended on: resources available, interpersonal relationships, social motivation of the group as a unit, social influence of contributors, the task, impact of others present, division of labor of individuals and group effect, interpersonal obstacles, communication networks, silent



members' initial impact, ambiguous roles, group interaction, cohesion (sometimes), leadership style and influence, level of anxiety and motivation in addition to change-arousing strategy.

In more deeply considering group productivity, group process research was reviewed in a limited way. Research regarding the phase in which the group is in was found to have effect on performance. Conflict was observed to be present particularly at group formulation and when alternatives were being considered. Another investigator discovered that groups experienced different problems in different phases which affected productivity both positively and negatively. A lack of conclusive research was noted which, in summary, would substantiate the need for further study of conflict's effect on productivity at various stages of group development which this exploration attempts to examine.

In Chapter III the design, target population and its demography, data collection instruments and procedures will be discussed.

## CHAPTER II FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>Gerald I. Miller and Herbert W. Simon, Perspectives of Communication in Education (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1974).

<sup>2</sup>Robert E. Park, "The Social Function of War," American Journal of Sociology XLVI (1941):551-570.

<sup>3</sup>Louis Kriesberg, The Sociology of Social Conflicts (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1973).

<sup>4</sup>Chris Argyris, Personality and Organization: The Conflict Between System and the Individual (New York: Harper, 1957), p. 66.

<sup>5</sup>Raymond A. Ehrle, "Conflict--Costs, Benefits and Potentials," Journal of Employment Counseling 8:4 (1971):162-181.

<sup>6</sup>Kurt Lewin, "Psychological Situations of Reward and Punishment," quoted in Handbook of Social Psychology, I, Theory and Methods, edited by Gardner Lindzey (London: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1954), p. 205.

<sup>7</sup>Harold Guetzkow and John Gyr, "An Analysis of Conflict in Decision-Making Groups," Human Relations 7 (1954):367-382.

<sup>8</sup>Barry E. Collins and Harold Guetzkow, A Social Psychology of Group Processes for Decision-Making (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1964).

<sup>9</sup>Ibid.

<sup>10</sup>Miller and Simons, Perspectives on Communications in Education.

<sup>11</sup>Morton Deutsch, "Conflicts: Productive and Destructive," in Fred A. Jandt, Conflict Resolution Through Communication (New York: Harper & Row, 1973), pp. 7-41.

<sup>12</sup>Samuel A. Moore, II, "Cultural Differences as a Positive Force for Change," Planning and Change 6:3-4 (Fall 1975/Winter 1976): 185-188.

<sup>13</sup>Kriesberg, The Sociology of Social Conflicts.

<sup>14</sup>Clark Kerr, "Industrial Conflict and Its Mediation," American Journal of Sociology LX (1954):230.

<sup>15</sup>Janis, 1954.

<sup>16</sup>Stephen P. Robbins, Managing Organizational Conflict (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1974).

<sup>17</sup>Richard E. Walton, et al., "Organizational Context and Interdepartmental Conflict," Administrative Science Quarterly 14:4 (1969):522-542.

<sup>18</sup>David L. Wilemon, "Managing Conflict in Temporary Management Systems," Journal of Management Studies 10:3 (1973):282-296.

<sup>19</sup>Herbert A. Sheppard, "Approaches to Conflict in American Sociology," British Journal of Sociology V (1954):324-342.

<sup>20</sup>Warren G. Bennis, Unconscious Conspiracy (New York: American Management Association, 1976), p. 38.

<sup>21</sup>Edward Zuckerman, "Patterns of Family Power, Conflict and Activity as a Function of Experimental Tasks," Dissertation Abstracts International 36/4-B (University of Pittsburg, 1975), p. 1937.

<sup>22</sup>H. Otto Dahlke, "Race and Minority Riots: A Study in the Typology of Violence," Social Forces XXX (1952):420.

<sup>23</sup>James S. Coleman, Community Conflict (New York: The Free Press, 1957).

<sup>24</sup>Nicholas A. Flannick, "Administrative Responses to Race-Related Incidents in Selected Urban Secondary Schools," Dissertation Abstracts (University of Pittsburg, 1973).

<sup>25</sup>Timothy M. Ashmore, "Communication in Small Groups Experiencing Conflict as a Function of Prior Interaction," Dissertation Abstracts 37/02A (University of Utah, 1976).

- <sup>26</sup>Robert F. Bales, Interaction Process Analysis (Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Press, 1960).
- <sup>27</sup>Bernard M. Bass, Leadership, Psychology and Organizational Behavior (New York: Harper & Row, 1960).
- <sup>28</sup>Jay Hall, "Decisions, Decisions, Decisions," Psychology Today (November 1971):51-54 and 86-89.
- <sup>29</sup>Harold J. Leavitt, "Some Effects of Certain Communication Patterns on Group Performance," Organization Theory, edited by D. S. Pugh (Baltimore: Penguin Press, 1974), pp. 72-98.
- <sup>30</sup>Robert F. Bales, "Adaptive and Integrative Changes as Sources of Strain in Social Systems," Small Groups: Studies in Social Interaction, edited by Alexander Hare, Edgar Borgatta, and Robert F. Bales (New York: Knopf & Sons, 1955), pp. 127-132.
- <sup>31</sup>Leon Festinger and Elliot Aronson, "The Arousal and Reduction of Dissonance in Social Contexts," Group Dynamics, edited by Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander (New York: Harper & Row, 1960), pp. 214-231.
- <sup>32</sup>John O. Andes, Roe L. Johns, and Ralph B. Kimbrough, Changes in Organizational Structures of Large School Systems with Space Reference to Problems of Teacher Militancy and Organizational Conflict (Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, Bureau of Research, 1971).
- <sup>33</sup>William L. Boyd, "Community Status and Conflict in Suburban School Politics" (paper presented at the American Education Research Association annual meeting, Chicago, 1972).
- <sup>34</sup>Robbins, Managing Organizational Conflict.
- <sup>35</sup>David J. Kirby and Robert L. Crain, "The Functions of Conflict: School Desegregation in 91 Cities" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, 1974).
- <sup>36</sup>Harold J. Johnson, "Decision Making, Conflict and Physiological Arousal," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 67-2 (1963): 114-124.
- <sup>37</sup>John W. Thibaut and John Coules, "The Role of Communication in the Reduction of Interpersonal Conflict," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 47 (1952):770-777.

<sup>38</sup>Norman Maier, et al., "Differences and Disagreement as Factors in Creative Group Problem-Solving," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology (1962):206-214.

<sup>39</sup>Bennis, Unconscious Conspiracy, p. 63.

<sup>40</sup>F. D. Freeman, "Theory and Strategy of Action in Race Relations," Social Forces XXX (1951):77-86.

<sup>41</sup>Solomon E. Asch, "Effects of Group Pressure Upon the Modification and Distortion of Judgments," Group Dynamics, edited by Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, pp. 189-200.

<sup>42</sup>Saul Bernstein, "Conflict, Self-Determination and Social Work," Social Values in Social Work, Monograph IX (New York: National Association of Social Work, Inc., 1967), pp. 67-83.

<sup>43</sup>Alan C. Filley, Interpersonal Conflict Resolution (Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, 1975).

<sup>44</sup>Les Wallace and Leslie Baxter, "Conflict Management in Ad Hoc Problem-Solving Groups: A Preliminary Investigation" (a paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association, Albuquerque, New Mexico, 1973).

<sup>45</sup>Alexander Mintz, "Non-Adaptive Group Behavior," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology 46 (1951):150-159.

<sup>46</sup>Morton Deutsch, "Cooperation and Trust: Some Theoretical Notes," Interpersonal Dynamics, Essays and Readings on Human Interaction (Homewood, Ill.: The Dorsey Press, 1964), p. 582.

<sup>47</sup>Anatol Rapoport, "Lewis Richardson's Mathematical Theory of War," Journal of Conflict Resolution I (1957):249-299.

<sup>48</sup>Anatol Rapoport and Albert M. Chammah, Prisoner's Dilemma--A Study in Conflict and Cooperation (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1965).

<sup>49</sup>Michael G. Giammatteo, "Process Concerns in Use of Force Field Techniques" (a paper presented at the meeting of Supervisors of Student Teachers, Portland, Oregon, 1967).

<sup>50</sup>Kenneth E. Boulding, Conflict and Defense, A General Theory (New York: Harper & Row, 1962).

<sup>51</sup>Ibid.

<sup>52</sup>Tom Burns and George MacPherson Stalker, The Management of Innovation (Chicago: Quadrangle Press, 1962).

<sup>53</sup>Bennis, The Unconscious Conspiracy, p. 52.

<sup>54</sup>Gordon L. Lippitt, Visualizing Change--Model Building and the Change Process (Fairfax, VA.: NTL Learning Resources Corp., 1973), p. 2.

<sup>55</sup>Dorothy L. Magett, "A Study of Conflict Management Functions of Central Office Human Relations Officers in Selected Suburban Schools," Dissertation Abstract (Northwestern University, 1972).

<sup>56</sup>Stephen K. Bailey, "Preparing Educational Administrators for Conflict Resolution" (an address to the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, 1971).

<sup>57</sup>Coleman, Community Conflict.

<sup>58</sup>Roland E. Barnes, "Understanding the Nature of Conflict: A Neglected Dimension in Education Administration" (a paper prepared for the Center for the Study of Desegregation and Conflict, University of Pittsburg, 1974).

<sup>59</sup>Northwest Regional Educational Lab, "Evaluation Design for Social Conflict and Negotiative Problem Solving" (a paper prepared by the National Institute of Education, Portland, Oregon, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1976).

<sup>60</sup>Collins and Guetzkow, A Social Psychology of Group Processes for Decision-Making.

<sup>61</sup>Ewart E. Smith, "The Effects of Clear and Unclear Role Expectations on Group Productivity and Defensiveness," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology 55 (1957):213-217.

<sup>62</sup>Thomas M. Scheidel and Laura Crowell, "Idea Development of Small Discussion Groups," Quarterly Journal of Speech 50 (1964):40-45.

<sup>63</sup>Stanley Schachter, Norris Ellertson, Dorothy McBride, and Doris Gregory, "An Experimental Study of Cohesiveness and Productivity," Group Dynamics, edited by Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, pp. 152-162.

<sup>64</sup>Fred Fiedler, A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967).

<sup>65</sup>George Heise and George A. Miller, "Problem Solving by Small Groups Using Various Communication Networks," Small Groups: Studies in Social Interaction, edited by Alexander Hare, Edgar Borgatta, and Robert Bales, pp. 353-367.

<sup>66</sup>Alex Bavelas, "Communication Patterns in Task-Oriented Groups," Group Dynamics, edited by Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, pp. 669-682.

<sup>67</sup>L. Richard Hoffman, Ernest Harburg, and Norman R. F. Maier, "Differences and Disagreement as Factors in Creative Group Problem-Solving," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology 64 (1962):206-214.

<sup>68</sup>Lorraine R. Perry, "Strategies of Black Community Groups," Social Work (1976):210-214.

<sup>69</sup>Walton, "Organizational Context and Interdepartmental Conflict."

<sup>70</sup>Aubrey Fisher, "Decision Emergence: Phases in Group Decision-Making," Speech Monographs 37 (1970):53-66.

<sup>71</sup>Francis M. Trusty, "An Exploration of Conflict and Conflict Management" (a paper prepared for the Danforth Foundation, St. Louis, Missouri, 1976).

<sup>72</sup>Barnes, "Understanding the Nature of Conflict: A Neglected Dimension in Educational Administration."

<sup>73</sup>Robert F. Bales and F. L. Strodtbeck, "Phases in Group Problem-Solving," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology 46 (1951):485-495.

<sup>74</sup>Lewis A. Coser, Continuities in the Study of Social Conflict (Toronto: Collier-MacMillan, 1970).

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

#### Overview

This researcher was concerned with the effect of conflict on program development group productivity. Specifically, the study was designed to identify conflict sources and intensity level effects on group development and overall group performance in an effort to examine the functional aspects of conflict. Described in this chapter are research methodology and approach, demographic data for the target population, procedures employed, a presentation of the research hypothesis, instrument rationale, data collection and analysis motifs. Also a summary is given.

#### Design

##### Research Methodology and Approach

Because of the exploratory nature of the study, along with a testable hypothesis measuring the effects of conflict on program development group productivity, systematic descriptive analysis was used. Egon Guba in discussing methodological strategies stated that,

A most important tactic in planning field studies is to lean more heavily upon logical inferences than upon statistical inference. We have repeatedly made the point that field studies cannot meet the assumptions of classical systems and design, nor



indeed, do we want them to. To rely heavily upon statistical treatment seems to be the height of folly (Guba, 1965).<sup>1</sup>

In keeping with this reasoning, narrative discussion of findings related to each of nineteen questionnaire responses was presented followed by summaries of six interviews.

Using a questionnaire, a critical level of statistical significance was set a priori at .10 since the analysis was exploratory, based on limited previous research and the instrument used had not been rigorously examined to determine its validity and reliability. To increase validity of findings Eugene Webb, Donald Campbell, Richard Schwartz, and Leo Sechrest suggested two or more independent measurement processes be employed. Consequently, interview sessions were conducted. It was noted that by linking investigations, each would yield a different outcropping of information and that findings would be more certain (Webb, Campbell, Schwartz, and Sechrest, 1966).<sup>2</sup>

Triangulation, proposition confirmation by three independent measurement processes, was completed by the addition of interviews with group members, separate and independent from primary respondents. Due to time and resource limitations only two group members were contacted by this third modality. Webb, Campbell, Schwartz, and Sechrest also felt that association membership directories, such as the one used to secure names and addresses for this study, serve as useful alternatives to member access and that the interview approach, in conjunction with other methods, is an excellent method by which to ascertain population characteristics.

The independent variable of the study was presence of conflict in program development groups, while the dependent variable is

productivity measured on two levels--group development outcomes and overall performance. Not included in the design are variables such as leadership, group membership or organizational structure. While recognizing their potential impact, it was decided in this study to primarily establish a baseline and attempt to control for them in future research.

### The Target Population

The entire population of educational program specialists, who are members of the Michigan Association of State and Federal Program Specialists, was polled. Permission was secured from the association's executive board for the mailing through a presentation by the executive secretary of the request at their February, 1977 meeting.

Requests for data were sent to 348 members whose characteristics vary in sex, age, and geographic location within Michigan. One hundred thirty-one respondents, or 37 percent, elected to participate by completing questionnaires for 315 groups. "For mailed questionnaires," Eugene Webb, Donald Campbell, Richard Schwartz, and Leo Sechrest found that, "10 percent returns are typical." Jum C. Nunnally, Jr., in speaking of sample size said that, "what is learned from applying these (statistical formulas) is that there must be a bare minimum of several hundred subjects (315 groups in this case) before any confidence can be placed in the exact size of results" (Webb, Campbell, Schwartz, and Sechrest, 1966),<sup>3</sup> (Nunnally, 1970).<sup>4</sup>

The majority of the respondents represents K-12 school districts, are educated at at least the bachelor's degree level, and are within their employment setting formally or informally referred

to as program specialists. Their official titles and responsibilities varied from that of program evaluator, special projects director, superintendent to president of a community college.

#### Procedures

A pilot study for the purpose of establishing content validity of the research instrument, and to obtain variance and mean differences to be able to predict the nature of the study's incoming data was undertaken. On February 16, 1977 pilot questionnaires were mailed to twenty-three randomly selected program specialists who represented 6 percent of the target population. Thirteen, or 57 percent, returned questionnaires representing thirty-two program development groups. As a result of comments made and an analysis of frequencies tabulated, a number of questions were reworded and one was eliminated. A moderate level of conflict was reported.

On March 16, 1977 questionnaires accompanied by a cover letter defining the study's authorization and purpose with directions for completion were sent to program specialists. On April 13, 1977 follow-up requests were mailed (see Appendices A and B). Questionnaires were professionally printed back-to-back on legal-sized sheets with each side available for reporting one group's characteristics. Two such forms were sent to each member. A return-addressed, stamped envelop was enclosed for convenience. Questionnaires were of two attention-seeking colors. A photographically reduced copy of the instrument is displayed as Appendix C.

On April 23, May 3 and 4, 1977 individual interviews were conducted with program specialists in their respective school

d

d

g

m

w

c

c

i

o

p

tv

Tv

si

fu

gr

ex

as

spe

Sym

vit;

districts. Eight interviews were completed of one to three hours' duration during which respondents described informally their reported groups' experiences. On May 23, 1977 contact was made with two group members to further verify findings.

Though factual data was desired, format was semi-structured with enough open-endedness allowed by the interviewer to minimize constraint of the respondent's reaction, allow flexibility, depth, clarification and probing as Fred Kerlinger suggested possible with interview schedules. A few specific questions related to perception of conflict's effects and group formation process (Kerlinger, 1965).<sup>5</sup>

Interviewees were three assistant superintendents, four special projects directors, and one director of research and evaluation, and two teachers. Four of the eight interviewees were women and four men. Two interviews, while very informative generally, were not included since one did not truly represent groups polled and another did not fully align with the researcher's purpose in the study.

### Major Research Hypothesis

It was undertaken to show statistically conflict's effect on group productivity by differences in performance outcomes in groups experiencing minimal, moderate, or intense conflict.

Null hypothesis: no difference will be found in productivity as measured by the number of functional outcomes reported by program specialists for minimal, moderate, or intense-conflict groups.

Symbolically stated:  $H_0: M_{\min} = M_{\text{mod}} = M_{\text{int}}$ .

Alternative hypothesis: a difference will be found in productivity. Symbolically stated:  $H_1: M_{\min} \neq M_{\text{mod}} \neq M_{\text{int}}$ .

Legend:  $M_{\min}$  - minimal conflict mean;  $M_{\text{mod}}$  = moderate conflict mean; and  $M_{\text{int}}$  = intense conflict mean.

### Instrumentation

Format of the questionnaire developed followed that most frequently used for instruments measuring affective domains. However, a six-point scale, versus a traditional five-point scale, was specifically selected to minimize a tendency on the part of respondents to answer in the center area. According to Gunar Myrdal, social science research methodology has found that scales can be used to tabulate beliefs to help minimize bias. Scales would also make them more quantitative and reportable (Myrdal, 1969).<sup>6</sup>

Questions 4, 8, 11, 14, and 17, conflict source questions, were interspersed among others to de-emphasize any potential threat or bias they might create. This was found to be necessary in the pilot study. Questions 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7 attempted to measure group development outcomes, while questions 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, and 19 examined overall group productivity. A discussion of the underlying theoretical base for specific line item questions on the instrument follows:

#### Rationale for Inclusion of Specific Questionnaire Items

To what extent did this group . . .

#### Question 1: Define and Clarify Its Objectives or Purposes?

Arthur Kornhauser, Robert Dubin, and Arthur Ross in their book on industrial conflict felt conflict functions in clarifying objectives, as did David Wilemon who found that the less specific objectives are understood, the greater the potential for conflict to develop (quoted earlier) (Kornhauser, et al., 1954),<sup>7</sup> (Wilemon, 1973).<sup>8</sup>

Question 2: Establish Regular Routines? (Such as Selecting the Same Leader, Meeting Time).

Group norms, such as "regular routines" implies, were mentioned by Otto Kahn-Freund in his article on intergroup conflict and settlement as still another function of conflict which seemed valid to investigate.

Question 3: Reduce Initial Tension Where Present and Allow More Relaxed Conversation and Social Interaction Among Members?

Robert Dubin addressed himself to the idea that conflict relationships constitute a social interaction process having important consequences and added that without conflict accommodative relationships would result in subordination rather than agreement. He also felt a central proposition was that intergroup conflict served as a fundamental institutionalized social process which determines the direction of social change, and in effect, defines social welfare. Clark Kerr felt that conflict reduces tension and permits maintenance of social interaction under stress. Conflict also may serve as a safety valve keeping more violent behaviors from occurring. Thomas Scheidel and Laura Crowell, too, observed verbal behavior directly related to task accomplishment (Dubin, 1957),<sup>10</sup> (Kerr, 1954),<sup>11</sup> and (Scheidel, Crowell, 1964).<sup>12</sup>

Question 4: Experience Conflict Over Scarce Resources? (Such as Personnel, Supplies, Time, Space or Other Tangible Items).

Many theorists like Jessie Bernard felt smallness in the size of the "pip," or resource, frequently stimulated disagreement (Bernard, 1957).<sup>13</sup> Herbert Sheppard felt that conflict relations always involve attempts to gain control of scarce resources and position, and to influence behavior in certain directions; hence, a conflict relationship always involves the attempt to acquire, or exercise power or the actual acquisition or exercise of power," he said (Sheppard, 1954).<sup>14</sup>

Question 5: Begin to Work Together as a Unit Rather Than as a Number of Individuals?

Again, many researchers learned that group cohesion, a vital and even universal aspect of group development, was necessary to productivity. Of those who spoke specifically, Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, and Lewis Coser stand out. Coser said that "far from being necessarily dysfunctional, a certain degree of conflict is an essential element in group formation and the persistence of group life." He felt that group unity depend on the issue and that when individuals join a number of groups their conflicts have a tendency to criss-cross which has a stabilizing overall effect. In another related Simmel proposition, Coser says, that a fight tends to pull group members together and that a group defines itself by struggling with other groups. Such "struggle groups" may actually attract enemies in order to maintain and increase group cohesion. Victory then lowers group energy which had guaranteed group unity and the goal changes



to not results-oriented, but toward preservation of the group structure itself; in other words, "one unites to fight" (Cartwright and Zander, 1960),<sup>15</sup> (Coser, 1956).<sup>16</sup>

Question 6: Experience Changing Relationships Among Its Members?

This question's inclusion was based on Karl Marx's feeling that conflict leads to ever-changing relationships. He described well the notion where "bad guys" become "good guys" when he said: "Feudal production had two antagonistic elements, which were equally designed by the names of good side and bad side of feudalism, with regard being had to the fact that it is always the evil side which finishes by overcoming the good side. It is the bad side that produces the movement which makes history by constituting the struggle" (Marx, 1910).<sup>17</sup>

Discussions with two program specialists interviewed further substantiated the idea that relationship changes, positive and negative, occurred as conflict aftermath. This may lead one to wonder what makes the difference whether the final relationship becomes a positive or negative one--values held as the basis of the conflict perhaps, style of resolution, communication and interaction, or something that occurs in group development.

Question 7: Come to Agreement on Major Topics?

In order to measure group development progress this question was constructed feeling that if a group were able to come to agreement, they were ready to move to another phase and begin to deal with the task. This question is classified as a group development outcome question.

Question 8: Experience Conflict Over Leadership, Position, Status or Control?

An assortment of theorists related to this conflict source as seen in Chapter II and partially in question 5 above. Coser also indicated that conflict establishes and maintains the balance of power (and position) and that by conflict comparative strengths are revealed (Coser, 1956).<sup>18</sup>

Question 9: Complete Its Original Objectives or Purposes?

An overall productivity measurement attempting to determine whether the group accomplished what it set out to accomplish is cited here.

Question 10: Help to Modify Any Lack of Interest, Inertia or Outdated Procedures Within the District?

Conflict within and between bureaucratic structures provides the means for avoiding the ossification and ritualism which threatens their form of organization. Conflict, through apparently dysfunctional for highly organized systems, may actually have important latent functional consequences

said Coser. He continued,

By attacking and overcoming the resistance to innovation and change that seem to be an "occupational psychosis" always threatening the bureaucratic office holder, it can help to insure that the systems are not stifled by deadening routine of habituation and that in the planning activity itself creativity and invention can be applied (Coser, 1957).<sup>19</sup>

Question 11: Experience Distractions Such as Interruptions, Broken Equipment, Illnesses or Other Behavior/Environmental Obstacles?

Edward Zuckerman would support inclusion of this item in that his research assumed a relationship between conflict and the number of attempted interruptions and obstacles present (Zuckerman, 1975).<sup>20</sup>

Question 12: Stimulate Any Creativity or Innovation Within the District?

This question attempts to measure overall productivity as an outcome usual to program development groups, (also see Coser's final words above under question 10).

Question 13: Become Responsible for the Development of Any New Or Different Program, Curriculum, Approach or Procedure?

Conflict and differences always exist in an organization Likert stated, and though capable of immobilizing by bitter, unresolved differences, he felt conflict was essential to progress and new and different developments (Likert, 1974).<sup>21</sup>

Question 14: Experience Conflict Regarding Open or Underlying Value Differences?

Previously cited at length in Chapter II, many theorists would tend to agree that value, cultural and/or perceptual differences can initiate conflict (Deutsch in Jandt, 1973),<sup>22</sup> (Bennis, 1966),<sup>23</sup> and (Coleman, 1957).<sup>24</sup>

Question 15: Help Make Possible Additional Funding for the School District? (Such as a Grant)

"Conflict not only generates new norms, new institutions . . . but it may be said to be stimulating directly in the economic and

technological realms" according to, again, Coser. Fund raising is frequently a goal of program development groups when they prepare grant applications for example, and therefore this question represents a realistic general outcome measurement of performance (Coser, 1956).<sup>25</sup>

Question 16: Give Direction and Incentive to Other Groups in the District?

Stephen Robbins believed that, "the absence of conflict in an organization (school district in this application) almost inevitably indicates stagnation, and that at times it may be necessary to stimulate conflict to revitalize the system." By so stating it is implied that conflict is capable of providing that stimulation to other individuals or groups within a school district (Robbins, 1974).<sup>26</sup>

Question 17: Finding That Change or Unrest Was Occurring Within the School District? (Such as a New Superintendent, Unsettled Contract or Revised Curriculum)

One of six factors analyzed by H. Otto Dahlke in a race riot study revealed that riots (conflicts) are highly probable when the period is one of change, unrest or mobility (Dahlke, 1952).<sup>27</sup>

Question 18: Affect any District-Wide Change?

In 1974 Arch Riggall explored functional effects of conflict involving public administration and found that conflict may: (1) promote organizational order and define policy positions, (2) serve to enrich informational inputs and policy options in the decision process, (3) facilitate democratic participation in and access to the decision making forum, (4) escalate policy decision making above

special and parochial interest to forums keyed to broader public interest, (5) advance the search for policy rationality, and (6) provide a means of censoring attitudes and practices of the bureaucracy which are contrary to public interest (Riggall, 1974).<sup>28</sup>

Question 19: Effect Any Community-Wide Change?

Gunnar Myrdal in discussing William Graham Sumner's model of studying communities, said: "What is more important to our society are the changes, the conflicts and the absence of static equilibrium." Since a number of theorists felt that conflict stimulates change and alters societal dynamics this last question was included to assess community level effects (Myrdal, 1944).<sup>29</sup>

Additional normative questionnaire items established: (1) the number of times the reported groups met, (2) group purpose, and (3) the approximate date of the last meeting. Joseph McGrath and Irwin Altman felt knowing the time dimension involved was "absolutely crucial for understanding small group phenomenon" (McGrath and Altman, 1966).<sup>30</sup>

Data Collection and Processing

Arrival of questionnaires was recorded and kept confidential, although it became necessary to identify specific respondents to avoid inconveniencing those who had responded initially and to minimize expense of forwarding follow-up questionnaires. After the May 1, 1977 cut-off date for data collection passed, qualitative information was coded numerically and all responses were entered by hand on individual data scoring sheets. Three hundred fifteen (315) such sheets were

then processed by the OpScan 100M optical scanner with punched data input cards produced. Other data cards were keypunched manually. Data processing and analysis was done on the Control Data 6500 computer at Michigan State University with assistance from the Office of Research Consultation.

### Statistical Analysis

Data analysis was accomplished through the use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) program. Multivariate and Univariate analyses of variance were the statistical methods employed to measure conflict effects on productivity across three categories of intensity levels. Where Multivariate significance was obtained, post hoc Scheffé comparisons were done at the 95 percent level of confidence. The Scheffé technique was selected to assist in isolating: (1) the location of difference; (2) the magnitude of differences found; and (3) for efficiency in dealing with the large number of comparisons examined. Scheffé was also felt desirable because of its ability to minimize error rate. Frequencies for each question were also calculated and Pearson-Product Moment correlation coefficients done to determine relationships between conflict sources.

### Summary

Research methodology utilized for conducting this study on conflict effects on program development group productivity has been presented in this chapter. Both the design of the study and major research hypothesis were included, as well as the theoretical base underlying development of the instrument, data collection and analysis procedures.

Q

S

B

Jc

Jc

### CHAPTER III FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>Egon Guba, "Methodological Strategies for Educational Change" (paper presented at a conference on strategies for educational change sponsored by Ohio State University and the U.S. Office of Education, Columbus, Ohio, November 9, 1965), p. 4.

<sup>2</sup>Eugene J. Webb, Donald T. Campbell, Richard D. Schwartz, and Leo Sechrest, Unobtrusive Measures: Nonreactive Research in the Social Sciences (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966), p. 174.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>Jum C. Nunnally, Jr., Introduction to Measurement (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970), p. 501.

<sup>5</sup>Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research, 2nd edition (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1973), pp. 127-129.

<sup>6</sup>Gunnar Myrdal, Objectivity in Social Research (New York: Pantheon Press, 1969).

<sup>7</sup>Arthur Kornhauser, Robert Dubin, and Arthur Ross, Industrial Conflict (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954), p. 16.

<sup>8</sup>David L. Wilemon, "Managing Conflict in Temporary Management Systems," Journal of Management Studies 10:3 (October 1973):282-296.

<sup>9</sup>Otto Kahn-Freund, "Intergroup Conflicts and Their Settlement," British Journal of Sociology V (1954):201.

<sup>10</sup>Robert Dubin, "Industrial Conflict and Social Welfare," Journal of Conflict Resolution I (1957):179-183.

<sup>11</sup>Clark Kerr, "Industrial Conflict and Its Mediation," American Journal of Sociology LX (1954):230.



<sup>12</sup>Thomas M. Scheidel and Laura Crowell, "Idea Development in Small Discussion Groups," Quarterly Journal of Speech 50 (1964):40-45.

<sup>13</sup>Jessie Bernard, "Parties and Issues to Conflict," Journal of Conflict Resolution I (1957):111.

<sup>14</sup>Herbert A. Sheppard, "Approaches to Conflict in American Sociology," British Journal of Sociology V (1954):324-342.

<sup>15</sup>Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, Group Dynamics: Research and Theory, 2nd edition (New York: Harper & Row, 1960).

<sup>16</sup>Lewis A. Coser, The Functions of Social Conflict (New York: The Free Press, 1956).

<sup>17</sup>Karl Marx, The Poverty of Philosophy (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Co., 1910), p. 132.

<sup>18</sup>Lewis A. Coser, "Social Conflict and the Theory of Social Change." British Journal of Sociology VIII (1957):197-207.

<sup>19</sup>Coser, The Functions of Social Conflict.

<sup>20</sup>Edward Zuckerman, "Patterns of Family Power, Conflict and Activity as a Function of Experimental Tasks," Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 36/4-B (University of Pittsburgh, 1976), p. 1937.

<sup>21</sup>Rensis Likert, "The Principles of Supportive Relations," in Organization Theory, edited by D. S. Pugh (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1974), pp. 279-304.

<sup>22</sup>Morton Deutsch, "Conflicts: Productive and Destructive," in Conflict Resolution Through Communication by Fred A. Jandt (New York: Harper & Row, 1973).

<sup>23</sup>Warren G. Bennis, Changing Organizations: Essays on the Development and Evaluation of Human Organization (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966).

<sup>24</sup>James S. Coleman, Community Conflict (New York: The Free Press, 1957).

<sup>25</sup>Coser, The Functions of Social Conflict.

<sup>26</sup>Stephen P. Robbins, Managing Organizational Conflict (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974).

<sup>27</sup>H. Otto Dahlke, "Race and Minority Riots: A Study in the Typology of Violence," Social Forces XXX (1952):420.

<sup>28</sup>Arch John Riggall, "The Function of Conflict in Public Administration: An Exploration Based on Case Studies," Dissertation Abstracts International 35/8-A (University of Texas at Austin, 1974).

<sup>29</sup>Gunnar Myrdal, An American Dilemma (New York: Harper & Row, 1944), II, p. 1032.

<sup>30</sup>Joseph McGrath and Irwin Altman, Small Group Research: A Synthesis and Critique of the Field (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1966), p. 73.

## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS

A statistical analysis of these data, to retain or not retain the major hypothesis presented in Chapter III relating to conflict effects on program development group productivity, is set forth in this chapter along with five sub-hypotheses each representing a conflict source. In addition, correlation coefficients for conflict sources are stated as well as analyses of responses to questionnaire items. Summaries of interviews conducted with questionnaire respondents and individuals who were members of reported groups are also discussed.

#### Analysis of Data

The following five sub-hypotheses represent sources of conflict analyzed separately, while the major hypothesis tests overall effects on productivity. Analyses involved determining cell means, standard deviations and frequencies for minimal, moderate and intense (or complete) levels of conflict for productivity output for each of fourteen (14) productivity-measuring questions. Frequencies were computed for five (5) conflict-measuring questions, and three (3) normative data questions. Six Multivariate (MANOVA) Tests of

Significance were used to test hypotheses at the .05 level. Six Univariate (ANOVA) Tests were also computed.

Though a level of significance was established a priori at .10 it became apparent that more rigorous control was possible and multivariate test findings were reported at the .05 level. Post hoc Scheffé comparisons were completed where significant F ratios were obtained to locate and confirm specific differences, and the degree of difference observed. Pearson-Product Moment correlation coefficients were calculated to assess relationships, if any, between conflict sources; these coefficients are tabled.

#### Sub-Hypothesis 1

Conflict 1: Conflict Over Scarce Resources (Such as Personnel, Time, Space or Other Tangible Items)--Question 4 on the Questionnaire

Sub-Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference in productivity between groups experiencing minimal, moderate or intense scarce resource conflict. Or, symbolically stated:  $H_{0,1}: M_{\min} = M_{\text{mod}} = M_{\text{int}}$ , with the alternative sub-hypothesis being:  $H_{1,1}: M_{\min} \neq M_{\text{mod}} \neq M_{\text{int}}$  where "min" equals the mean of minimal presence of conflict, "mod" equals the mean of moderate presence of conflict and "int" equals the mean of intense, or complete, presence of conflict.

An overall significant F of 2.18228 with a probability level of .00051 and 2,282 degrees of freedom caused the researcher to not retain the null sub-hypothesis 1 and state that a difference in mean productivity existed for Conflict 1 (see Table 1).

Specific differences, as can be seen on Table 1, appear to be located at questions: 3, 5, 6 and 7. These differences are discussed under those questions' narratives.

### Sub-Hypothesis 2

#### Conflict 2: Conflict Over Leadership, Position, Status, or Control?-- Question 8 on the Questionnaire

Sub-Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference in productivity between groups experiencing minimal, moderate or intense leadership or control conflict. Or, symbolically stated:  $H_{0,2}: M_{\min} = M_{\text{mod}} = M_{\text{int}}$ , with the alternative sub-hypothesis being:  $H_{1,2}: M_{\min} \neq M_{\text{mod}} \neq M_{\text{int}}$  where "min" equals the mean of minimal presence of conflict, "mod" equals the mean of moderate presence of conflict and "int" equals the mean of intense, or complete, presence of conflict.

For Conflict 2, as observed on Table 2, an overall significant F level of 2.49652 with a probability level of .00004 with 2,280 degrees of freedom was obtained which caused the researcher to not retain the null sub-hypothesis 2, and state that a difference in mean productivity existed. Specific differences are apparent at questions: 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 15 and are discussed under those questions' narrative analyses.

Conf  
Obst

proc

beh

$H_0$ ,

$H_1$ ,

pre

con

of

1.2.

free

reta

Conf  
Ques

prod

valu

$M$   
mod

$M$   
mod

flict

prese

### Sub-Hypothesis 3

#### Conflict 3: Conflict Over Distractions or Behavioral/Environmental Obstacles?--Question 11 on the Questionnaire

Sub-Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference in productivity between groups experiencing minimal, moderate or intense behavioral/environmental obstacle conflict. Or, symbolically stated:

$H_{0,3}: M_{\min} = M_{\text{mod}} = M_{\text{int}}$ , with the alternative hypothesis being:

$H_{1,3}: M_{\min} \neq M_{\text{mod}} \neq M_{\text{int}}$  where "min" equals the mean of minimal presence of conflict, "mod" equals the mean of moderate presence of conflict and "int" equals the mean of intense, or complete, presence of conflict.

For Conflict 3, as observed on Table 3, an overall F of 1.2340 with a probability value of .19156 with 2,280 degrees of freedom was obtained. The null sub-hypothesis 3 was therefore retained.

### Sub-Hypothesis 4

#### Conflict 4: Conflict Regarding Open or Underlying Value Differences?--Question 14 on the Questionnaire

Sub-Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference in productivity between groups experiencing minimal, moderate or intense value difference conflict. Or, symbolically stated:  $H_{0,4}: M_{\min} = M_{\text{mod}} = M_{\text{int}}$ , with the alternative hypothesis being:  $H_{1,4}: M_{\min} \neq M_{\text{mod}} \neq M_{\text{int}}$  where "min" equals the mean of minimal presence of conflict, "mod" moderate presence and "int" intense, or complete, presence.

6  
M  
w  
m

1  
de  
5.

bet  
Or,

Symb



For Conflict 4, as shown in Table 4, an overall F of 2.94159 with a probability of .0001 with 2,281 degrees of freedom resulted in not retaining sub-hypothesis 4. Questions 2, 3, 5 and 7 are questions where differences occurred which will be discussed in another section.

#### Sub-Hypothesis 5

##### Conflict 5: Conflict Occurring at a Time When Change or Unrest Was Already Present--Question 17 on the Questionnaire

Sub-Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference in productivity between groups experiencing minimal, moderate or intense change or unrest conflict. Or, symbolically stated:  $H_{0,5}: M_{\min} = M_{\text{mod}} = M_{\text{int}}$ , with the alternative hypothesis being:  $H_{1,5}: M_{\min} \neq M_{\text{mod}} \neq M_{\text{int}}$  where "min" equals the mean of minimal presence of conflict, "mod" moderate and "int" intense, or complete, presence.

For Conflict 5, the last source of conflict, an overall F level of 1.15943 was obtained with a probability of .26379 with 2,268 degrees of freedom which required retention of the null sub-hypothesis 5. See Table 5.

#### Major Hypothesis

Null Hypothesis: There is no difference in productivity between groups experiencing minimal, moderate or intense conflict. Or, symbolically stated:  $H_0: M_{\min} = M_{\text{mod}} = M_{\text{int}}$ .

Alternative Hypothesis: There is a difference in productivity. Symbolically stated:  $H_1: M_{\min} \neq M_{\text{mod}} \neq M_{\text{int}}$  where  $M_{\min}$  equals the

h

c

l

f

g

H

c

r

i

(H

re

va

ti

mean of minimal presence of conflict,  $M_{\text{mod}}$  equals the mean of moderate presence of conflict and  $M_{\text{int}}$  equals the mean of intense, or complete, presence of conflict.

Referring to Table 6, an overall F ratio of 3.14854 was obtained with a probability level of .00001 with 2,283 degrees of freedom causing the researcher to not retain the major null hypothesis. A difference in productivity does appear to exist. Differences noted centered about questions: 3, 5, 6, 7, 10, 15 and 16.

### Correlation Coefficients

In order to determine whether significant relationships between conflict sources existed, Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficients were calculated (see Table 7).

Abraham Franzblau stated that, ". . . there are no sharp lines of demarcation . . ." (for deciding when a correlation coefficient is high or low). However, Franzblau sets forth a basic guideline in his Primer of Statistics for Non-Statisticians (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1958), p. 81. He indicates that reliable coefficients of correlation ranging from about .40 to .60 may be regarded as indicating a moderate degree of correlation, while those in the .20 to .30 range indicate a relationship, but of a low degree (Franzblau, 1958).

Applying Franzblau's criteria, it was found that five moderate relationships existed between conflict sources. Correlation coefficient values within the moderate realm ranged from .4394 to .5284. Relationships noted were:

Of

a

fo

no

de

var

men

not

gro

sou

rep

min

1. Scarce resource conflict: Leadership/control conflict with  
r = .4699
2. Scarce resource conflict: Value difference conflict with  
r = .4673
3. Scarce resource conflict: Change/unrest conflict with r =  
.4366
4. Leadership/control conflict: Distractions and Behavioral/  
Environmental Obstacles with r = .4394
5. Leadership.control conflict: Value differences conflict being  
the highest coefficient obtained with r = .5284.

Other relationships yielded coefficients in the .30 range indicating a low, but existent, relationship between conflict sources.

#### Analysis of Questionnaire Responses

Initially presented on the questionnaire sent to three hundred forty-eight (348) program specialists throughout Michigan were three normative data questions that sought information regarding group development characteristics.

Purpose.--It was determined that groups met for a very large variety of reasons. The majority, however, were to develop and implement additional or new educational programs or services that were not already in existence within the school district. A number of groups were advisory councils, mentioned earlier as frequently funding-source mandated structures, comprised of lay persons and/or community representatives. Groups concerned with instituting programs for minority or special needs students were also prevalent.

group

altho

of se

a str

time

knowl

tivit

month

withi

nine

month

Twent

larly

Quest

Objec

Chapt

great

quest

level.

contro

which

Number of Meetings.--The average number of sessions held by groups (mean) was 9.938 with the median being 6.387 and mode 4.00, although one group met 85 times!

Date of the Group's Last Meeting.--By knowing both the number of sessions held and how recently the group met, group legitimacy as a structure and persistence of purpose were assessed feeling that time represents a significant factor in group formation, vital to be knowledgeable of as the group moves through phases prior to productivity attempts.

Two hundred thirteen (213) groups met within the period three months prior to receipt of the questionnaire, thirty-three (33) met within the previous six months, eleven (11) met within the previous nine months, and twenty-five (25) met within the previous 12 or more months. Not all responding groups completed normative questions. Twenty-five (25) elected to not respond to these questions irregularly and eight (8) replies were out of range of the statistic used.

Question 1: To What Extent Did This Group Define and Clarify Its Objectives or Purposes?

Support for David Wilemon's theory and others cited in Chapter II that the less specific objectives are understood, the greater the potential for conflict to develop, seemed apparent from question one's findings. In the presence of minimal and intense levels of conflict initiating over leadership, position, status or control, a significant mean productivity difference of .58 was found which was confirmed by post hoc Scheffé comparison. It would therefore

appea

confl

See T

Quest  
(Such

prese

value

devel

confl

dysfun

produc

at 4.6

Questi  
Allow

of sca

differ

increa

conflic

was sig

were pr

were: .

overall



appear that productivity is lowered by intense leadership/control conflict when objectives are clear to a moderate extent (4.732). See Table 8.

Question 2: To What Extent Did This Group Establish Regular Routines?  
(Such as Selecting the Same Leader, Meeting Time)

A significant mean difference of .71 was observed in the presence of minimal and intense conflict regarding open or underlying value differences confirmed by post hoc Scheffé comparison. Routine development was noted at a lower level when intense value difference conflict was evident. Value difference conflict appeared therefore dysfunctional to the establishment of group routines. The overall productivity mean for question 2 was in the higher range of moderate at 4.655. See Table 9. No other significant findings were noted.

Question 3: To What Extent Did This Group Reduce Initial Tension and Allow Relaxed Conversation and Social Interaction Among Members?

Four differences were detected involving question 3. Presence of scarce resources, leadership/control conflict as well as value differences all had dysfunctional effects in reducing tensions and increasing social and verbal interaction among members as did overall conflict. In other words, tension reduction and relaxed interaction was significantly higher when only minimal levels of these conflicts were present. See Tables 10 and 27. Group differences reported were: .69, .95, 1.01 and .57 for the three conflict sources cited and overall conflict. It would seem that conflict arising over value

differences had greatest dysfunctional impact in reducing tension and increasing relaxed interaction measured by 4.365 as a mean.

Question 4: To What Extent Did This Group Experience Conflict Over Scarce Resources?--Conflict 1

This conflict type showed a moderate relationship to three other conflict sources as measured by correlation coefficients. They were: value difference conflict, leadership/control conflict and change and unrest oriented disagreements. See Tables 7 and 28. Forty-seven percent (47%) of the responses (135 groups) reported minimal conflict, while a total of 53 percent, or absolute frequency of 152 groups, reported moderate or intense levels. The overall mean was recorded as "somewhat" present, yet four effects were noted when scarce resources conflict existed, one of which was functional to group outcomes. Sixty-one groups, or 21.3 percent of the groups reporting on scarce resource conflict, reported intense presence.

Question 5: To What Extent Did This Group Begin to Work Together as a Unit Rather Than as a Number of Individuals?

With regard to cohesiveness developing during group formation, dysfunctional effects were observed as reported by lowered productivity mean in the face of conflicts over: scarce resources, leadership/control, value differences and overall conflict. Differences noted respectively were: .75, .94, .84 and .65 for the overall measure. It would appear that struggles for leadership and control have greatest impact on the development of group cohesiveness. The

extent to which groups achieved cohesion was moderate (4.276). See Table 12 and Table 27.

Question 6: To What Extent Did This Group Experience Changing Relationships Among Its Members?

Functional, or constructive effects, were noted in the development of changing relationships among members in the presence of scarce resource conflict, and also when conflict was evidenced generally. These functional differences are difficult to explain since it is unknown whether relationship changes were positive or negative in nature. It can only be stated that member relationships were altered when conflict was present. Mean differences (see Tables 13 and 27) were: .64 and .60 for the overall effect. Groups experienced changing relationships on a "somewhat" level (3.490).

Question 7: To What Extent Did This Group Come to Agreement on Major Topics?

Group agreement appeared to be negatively affected by scarce resource struggles, leadership and control conflict, value differences and overall conflict. Mean differences of .66, .87, .80 and .76 were obtained. Group agreement registered between moderate and considerable levels of productivity. See Tables 14 and 27.

Question 8: To What Extent Did This Group Experience Conflict Over Leadership, Position, Status or Control?--Conflict 2

Question 8, a conflict source, was related most highly to value difference conflict. A coefficient of .5284 was found as mentioned previously. Over 66 percent of responses (190 groups)

reported minimal levels, while only 33 percent or 95 groups reported moderate or intense levels. While a low overall mean was found (2.295), leadership/control conflict seemed to have considerable impact on productivity when present. It was also the most frequently affecting conflict source. Six effects were detected, one functional and five dysfunctional. See Tables 15 and 28.

Question 9: To What Extent Did This Group Complete Its Original Objectives or Purposes?

As this question moves from measuring group development, it attempts to assess overall group accomplishment--in other words, did the group complete its assigned tasks? It is from here on, in the questionnaire, that conflict effects become less frequent. In the presence of conflict 2, that involving disagreements over leadership and control, a dysfunctional nature effect was noted by a mean difference of .56. No other differences were detected. Groups tended to complete their original objectives to a moderate-to-considerable degree. See Table 16.

Question 10: To What Extent Did This Group Help to Modify Any Lack of Interest, Inertia or Outdated Procedures Within the District?

Functional to altering district inertia, apathy, and/or obsolete procedures was overall conflict. While no specific group differences stood out, conflict in general did appear to be useful in stirring up and modifying lack of interest, inertia and outdated procedures (perhaps even personnel!) when moderate in intensity. A difference of .59 was noted between minimal and moderate levels.

See Table 17 for overall 3.674 productivity (a somewhat to moderate level), but refer to Table 27 for functional difference between minimal and moderate levels of conflict present.

Question 11: To What Extent Did This Group Experience Distractions or Other Behavioral/Environmental Obstacles?--Conflict 3

While present, low relationships between distractions and obstacles conflict and four others existed. See Table 7 for coefficients and Table 28 for intensity level frequencies. Conflict involving distractions and obstacles existed minimally as witnessed by a mean of 2.267. Effects were also minimal. These findings are somewhat in contradiction to previous research cited in Chapter II. See Table 18 for response frequencies.

Question 12: To What Extent Did This Group Stimulate Any Creativity or Innovation Within the District?

A measure of overall productivity, question 12, attempted to assess conflict effects on school district creativity, but failed to obtain group differences in any of the four conflict sources or overall conflict. A modest mean of stimulation created was observed at 3.673 with a standard deviation of 1.322 indicating that program development groups are only able to somewhat stimulate district-wide creativity. See Table 19.

Question 13: To What Extent Did This Group Become Responsible for Development of New Programs, Curriculum, Approaches or Procedures?

While a relatively high productivity mean of 4.032 in the "considerable" range was secured, no significant effects resulted.

It would appear that conflict neither helps nor hinders this highly successful program development group task. See Table 20.

Question 14: To What Extent Did This Group Experience Conflict Regarding Open or Underlying Value Differences?--Conflict 4

As mentioned, a moderate coefficient was reported regarding value difference conflict as it related to leadership/control conflict. While a moderate mean of 3.077 was evidenced, value difference conflict represented the second most frequent conflict source seen. Four dysfunctional effects on productivity were noted which are discussed under specific productivity questions. Fifty-eight (58) groups, or 20.3 percent of the groups reporting, found presence of intense value difference conflict. See Tables 21 and 28.

Question 15: To What Extent Did This Group Help Make Possible Additional Funding?

Definite functional effects in producing additional funding resulted when conflict centering about leadership or control was present. Also observed was a functional overall conflict effect. These findings were surprising and are without prior research base. Mean productivity differences noted were: .82 and .65. A relatively low mean of 2.612 was found for productivity of funding indicating that while only a minimal amount of additional funding was secured, it appeared to be higher when intense conflict was operational. See Tables 22 and 27.

Question 16: To What Extent Did This Group Give Direction and Incentive to Other Groups in the District?

Another functional effect was observed in question 16 where direction and incentive were stimulated to a somewhat-to-moderate degree with intense conflict. Overall conflict yielded a mean difference of .73 between minimal and intense levels present. No specific conflict source could be identified. See Tables 23 and 27.

Question 17: To What Extent Did This Group Find Change or Unrest Occurring Within the School District?--Conflict 5

While this conflict source had theory previously in support of its effect on continuing conflict in communities, no effects on group productivity were detected. Change and unrest was observed present on a "somewhat" level with 54 percent of the groups reporting its existence in moderate or intense amounts. Change and unrest as a source of conflict related to other types of conflict by a low correlation coefficient. See Tables 7, 24 and 28.

Question 18: To What Extent Did This Group Affect Any District-Wide Change? and Question 19: To What Extent Did This Group Affect Any Community-Wide Change?

Neither question revealed significant effects. However, conflict was present 30.3 percent of the time as district-wide change was assessed, yet only 15.7 percent of the time when community-wide changes were analyzed. Perhaps this is due to a somewhat lowered level of program development group responsibility to these tasks. District-wide change was observed only to a "somewhat" extent produced, and community-wide change to a minimal extent. See Tables 25 and 26.

### Summaries of Interviews

In an effort to validate respondents reporting on questionnaires, visitations to eight school districts were completed. Informal interview sessions both confirmed findings and allowed opportunity to discuss in greater depth effects of conflict and personal related experiences with program development group productivity. Due to the confidential nature of some of the sharing that occurred, no attempt was made to identify respondents or school districts. Subjects included were six respondents and two group members. Key points of the discussions follow.

#### Subject 1--Questionnaire Respondent

Confirmation of questionnaire data regarding presence of considerable conflict present in two program development groups was obtained early in this discussion from the respondent who continued to describe personal attitudes regarding conflict, leadership styles and personal experience with functional use of conflict. The respondent indicated that a favored group approach during early formation is to, as a group leader, "start with my worst shot first." This, the interviewee felt stirred reaction, challenged prejudgments, and opened verbal interaction immediately. It also served later as a positive reinforcer when events and situations netted in improved or lesser than the initially threatened "worst shots" the respondent felt.

Subject 1 also felt that group conflict is seen especially while group cohesion is developing and can be quite intense. Cohesion



and the group development phase in general, the respondent thought, takes about three meeting sessions to work through. The respondent personally believes conflict to be a facilitator in initiating change and induces it or purposefully stimulates conflict with some groups.

#### Subject 2--Questionnaire Respondent

This subject also had experienced considerable conflict in two program development groups which was confirmed in discussion. Conflict levels did not appear to be dealt with directly however or become resolved, but suppressed instead seemingly as the acceptable way to deal with differences. There appeared to be a definite effort to minimize or avoid personal involvement when differences occurred. "Most of our differences are value differences, not selfish differences" was stated.

Deviant group members (often lay persons on advisories) in the district were accepted without open confrontation and often, in fact, had substantial impact on major decisions made in spite of other group members' underlying disagreement. It appeared then that while conflict was present in this district, it tended to remain suppressed or unresolved and seemed to lack legitimacy with regard to open discussion of differences.

#### Subject 3--Questionnaire Respondent

Four groups experienced considerable conflict as confirmed by this respondent during the interview. The subject felt that inducing conflict (a definite functional aspect) is very real, necessary and

perhaps the only way sometimes to bring about vital large-scale change. Willingness to attempt to induce conflict may be related to an individual's risk-taking behavior. When conflict is induced, it should only be attempted after other change strategies have failed, is well planned with an accurate factual base, and with an understanding that the strategy may not produce the desired results.

Unresolved conflict, or conflict whose source remains undefined or unclear was personally very disturbing, it was reported. When conflict intensity rises so do physiological and emotional reactions, the respondent related. Also observed was halted productivity in the face of intense conflict and disbanding of the group with an entirely new group organized minus dissenting or conflict-causing members.

In still another group, unclear objectives resulted in lack of productivity which occurred when members were told they had total and absolute free rein to brainstorm, dream and develop an "education utopia." It appeared that some basic initial objective or guideline was necessary. In this particular group, while little was produced, permanent strong social relationships developed that have continued in spite of the group's disbanding.

#### Subject 4--Questionnaire Respondent

Reporting on the opposite end of the continuum was a respondent who described four groups that experienced minimal conflict. While confirmation was obtained of groups reported, the respondent also shared another experience involving intense conflict. This

caused the researcher to wonder how many other respondents were somewhat reluctant to share data regarding seemingly negative or intense-conflict level group experiences on the questionnaire.

Value differences, leadership/control conflict and state mandated objectives that seemed unclear all were present causing frustration. The leadership role appeared to shift periodically as frustration mounted; as a new leader took over their values followed. A number of very strong, very diverse cultural values and differences existed which made this particular group unique and which may have contributed to the high level of disagreement seen. Conflict remained unresolved and a state consultant's assistance had been requested for resolution technique suggestions. The idea was discussed regarding the potentiality of building on very general similar interests existing within the group to perhaps assist basic cohesion development. The group was comprised of a number of lay persons as an advisory council.

Other lay person advisories within the same district experienced similar discord earlier, but of a lesser intensity and have, over a period of several years experienced extensive productivity and minimal levels of conflict once roles and objectives became clarified and accepted.

#### Subject 5--Questionnaire Respondent

While the respondent reported, and in reality was experiencing, four groups with minimal levels of conflict and high productivity relatively speaking on face-to-face discussion, it was learned that

conflict in the district may in fact be simply suppressed. This was one of several district that had a year or so ago experienced acute district-wide staff-administration-community conflict. While an almost entirely new staff was currently aboard, conflict aftermath effects were still sensed underlying activities, according to the respondent. No formal communication channels were operational which limited expression of what was really occurring, it was stated, and yet informal communication revealed an awareness of suppressed conflict building with a lack of formal structures available to deal with it.

Subject 6--Questionnaire Respondent

A racial theme (value differences) was present in one group with intense conflict discussed with subject 6. Conflict intensity reached a high level without productivity occurring over a period of one year. The next year the group reconvened with one less highly verbal, deviant member. It would seem a pattern may exist that when conflict becomes too intense and resolution is neither attempted or possible, the group tends to disband and reorganize without dissenting members.

This respondent also shared personal prior experience in another district where it became necessary for an individual to testify legally against superior administrators over value differences which resulted in a high level employee's resignation and group productivity in the form of court order desegregated program provisions. This example represented probably the broadest example of

district-wide change effects of conflict involving educational program development that was uncovered. This respondent however felt conflict dysfunctional to groups and school districts generally.

Subject 7--Group Member

This subject was a group member included in findings' validation to complete the triangulation research approach described earlier. Beside confirming respondent's questionnaire and discussion responses, the interviewee confirmed Simmel's "groups unite to fight" concept clearly when group experiences were described. It appeared that school administrators disagreed and rejected a hardworking group's and product efforts. When this occurred, a negative cohesion developed that was maintained with no further overall end product produced that was satisfactory until one year later when the group was reorganized with different group members involved.

It was felt that group size altered productivity and that a smaller group does better as well as when clear initial objectives are present. The reported group oddly enough did not experience one specific leader, but the lack did not seem important to members. Changing relationships experienced were generally positive in nature with only one deviant present who held value differences which were never accepted by other group members. No lack of resources seemed to exist, however an environmental obstacle in the form of time schedules that were pressuring was present. This obstacle was dealt with by discussion involving all group members however. When one member became lax and did not perform as expected, others

experienced inner conflict and disagreement, but elected to suppress concerns and avoid confronting the individual. So, again it is seen that group cognitive concerns can be dealt with, but individuals appear reluctant to confront other individuals regarding their personal behaviors.

Subject 8--Group Member

This interviewee was also a group member who supported findings contributed by an initial respondent and said that objectives lacked clarity and that a struggle for leadership and control may have existed, especially for the individual group member who admitted a strong feeling and need for the leadership role which did not materialize. This left the member feeling intrinsically unsatisfied with outcomes although the group did accomplish its tasks completely.

It was felt an initial outline, resource or direction was important and once established the group relaxed and seemed better able to direct efforts toward the task. This group too experienced reduced productivity at a point when initial group recommendations were rejected and they were required to begin once again.

The subject felt that a few group members tend to produce more than a large group and that very close relationships result from group experiences and the trials they experience together. Group polarization existed for a period in one group when a few members neglected to hold up their end of the responsibilities.

A definite environmental obstacle that especially effected productivity was intense summer heat during which the group worked. Another interesting occurrence was when an inaccuracy developed within the group that led to a value difference which led to a negative changing relationship which, it was felt, also reduced overall productivity from its initial very high potential level.

### Overview

In this chapter the author dealt with statistical analysis of the data to retain or not retain the major hypothesis and five sub-hypotheses relating to conflict effects on program development group productivity. The major hypothesis was not retained, nor were sub-hypotheses 1, 2 and 4. Sub-hypotheses 3 and 5 were retained.

Relationships between five conflict sources analyzed were moderate.

Next presented were narrative analyses of responses to questionnaire items which questioned Michigan program specialists regarding their groups' characteristics and experiences with conflict and productivity. Groups varied in purpose with a good many directed toward establishing programs for minority or special needs students using lay person advisory councils. Groups polled tended to meet approximately ten times and most had met within the previous three months prior to receipt of the questionnaire.

Twenty-two effects of conflict on productivity were reported--seven functional in nature and fifteen dysfunctional. Approximately

6.7 to 23.1 percent of the groups reported presence of intense conflict, 21.3 to 42.3 percent reported presence of moderate conflict and 37.4 to 67.7 percent reported presence of minimal levels.

Next, summaries of interviews conducted with respondents and group members were discussed whose comments tended to support questionnaire findings that dysfunctional conflict effects were most apparent during initial stages of group formation while functional effects occurred involving overall productivity. Suppression, deviant members, group cohesion, induced or stimulated conflict, group size, unclear objectives and value differences were important factors to respondents. Conflict aftermath and one extreme case of especially intense value difference conflict were discussed.



## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Included in this chapter is a review of the design and analysis, report of findings and discussion of the study's results. Implications and recommendations for future research are also summarized.

#### Summary of the Study

##### Purpose

The researcher's major purpose in this study was to analyze functional aspects of conflict in program development groups to facilitate an increased understanding of conflict sources, intensity levels and effects on social structures such as small groups. It was hoped the results would be of use to educational program specialists working with small planning groups by helping them to expand awareness of conflict's presence and functionality, particularly as it impacts group productivity.

##### Design of the Study

On March 16, 1977, an instrument developed by the researcher was mailed to three hundred forty-eight (348) program specialists who were members of the Michigan Association of State and Federal Program

Specialists. The collection of data included three hundred fifteen (315) groups as described by one hundred thirty-one (131) respondents (37%) who replied to the questionnaire.

Eight interviews conducted informally in April and May of 1977 involved six questionnaire respondents and two individuals who had been members of groups reported in an effort to validate findings by a triangulated data collection approach.

The instrument supplied data for testing a major hypothesis and five sub-hypotheses. Additional information in the form of narrated discussions was reported for each item on the questionnaire. Interview summaries were also included.

### Analysis

The major hypothesis and five sub-hypotheses employed primarily (MANOVA) Multivariate, but also (ANOVA) Univariate Tests of Significance at the .05 level. Other statistics used were post hoc Scheffé comparisons to detect location and size of productivity mean differences found. Pearson-Product Moment Correlations, calculations of cells means, standard deviations and frequencies for questionnaire items were also computed.

### Findings

#### Major Hypothesis

Differences in productivity between groups experiencing minimal, moderate or intense conflict were supported by data analyzed. The major hypothesis therefore was not retained.

Four constructive, or functional, effects of general conflict on productivity were observed affecting:

1. relationship changes among members;
2. the group's ability to modify lack of interest, inertia or outdated procedures;
3. the group's ability to develop new programs and
4. the group's ability to give incentive and direction to other groups.

It is interesting to note that functional effects, detected by post hoc Scheffé complex comparisons, regarding general conflict were observed after initial group formation. Three dysfunctional effects were also seen altering the group's ability to:

1. reduce initial tension and allow relaxed social interaction among members;
2. develop group cohesion and
3. come to agreement on major topics.

These three dysfunctional effects occurred during group development when perhaps members were getting acquainted, clarifying objectives, establishing routines and evaluating others' strengths and weaknesses. As groups began to move past the formation stage toward accomplishing overall goals, conflict seemed to take on positive, or functional, valences. Fifty-seven percent (4 of 7) of the effects noted were facilitative to group productivity.

### Sub-Hypothesis 1

Restated: There is no significant difference in productivity between groups experiencing minimal, moderate or intense scarce resource conflict.

Results from the data did not permit retention of sub-hypothesis 1 since specific differences were found that negatively affected group ability to:

1. reduce tension and allow relaxed social interaction;
2. develop group cohesion and
3. agree on major topics.

These dysfunctional productivity mean differences were all interestingly present during the group's formation phase, while one functional difference appeared altering group ability to:

1. experience changing relationships among members.

To some extent this measure was an evaluation of individual members' involvements with others. It would seem that individuals altered their associations with other members and productivity increased in the face of limited resources conflict. However, the data do not specify whether the relationship alteration was positive or negative.

### Sub-Hypothesis 2

Restated: There is no significant difference in productivity between groups experiencing minimal, moderate or intense leadership, position, status or control conflict.

Data supported nonretention of sub-hypothesis 2 and indicated that differences were present. Those reducing productivity did so by altering the group's ability to:

1. define and clarify objectives and purposes;
2. reduce tension and allow relaxed social interaction;
3. develop group cohesion and
4. agree on major topics.

These four effects of six differences located, were observed occurring during group formation. Another dysfunctional effect related to the group's ability to complete initially established objectives which was an overall productivity measure.

A functional effect involved the group's capacity to make possible additional funding, a critical group task, which was increased as a result of leadership conflict.

### Sub-Hypothesis 3

Restated: There is no significant difference in productivity between groups experiencing minimal, moderate or intense behavioral/ environmental obstacle conflict.

While the overall F ratio for this conflict source supported retention of sub-hypothesis 3, two substantial functional group differences were detected by Univariate testing. The overall Multivariate test however, which was the primary test statistic employed, was not significant. Of only nominal interest then are Univariate-detected constructive differences:

1. the group's experiencing changing relationships and
2. the group's ability to create additional funding.

Both of these constructive outcomes on overall productivity goals were facilitated by the presence of intense behavioral/ environmental obstacle conflict. They may, however, have been due to chance and future research examining the items is suggested to determine whether significant univariates observed were due to chance or possibly some exogenous variable.

#### Sub-Hypothesis 4

Restated: There is no significant difference in productivity between groups experiencing minimal, moderate or intense value difference conflict.

Involving this source, dysfunctional differences located by Scheffé comparisons negatively altered the group's capacity to:

1. establish regular routines;
2. reduce initial tension and allow relaxed social interreaction;
3. develop cohesion and
4. come to agreement on major topics.

All four occurred during group development and are not measures of overall productivity. Conflict was found to be functional however when minimal in intensity and of assistance in establishing group routines such as selecting the same leader, meeting time and place.

#### Sub-Hypothesis 5

Restated: There is no difference in productivity between groups experiencing minimal, moderate or intense conflict related to change or unrest that was occurring within the district. No

specific group differences were observed in the data examined and therefore sub-hypothesis 5 was retained. Of particular interest is the fact that though 23.1 percent of the groups experienced intense change and unrest within their districts, the highest conflict source frequency observed, no significant positive or negative effects developed.

### Conclusions

Findings indicate that functional aspects of conflict in program development groups definitely exist. Examination of data indicated that conflict was functional to productivity 32 percent of the time and dysfunctional 68 percent of the time. A greater number of dysfunctional effects occurred during the period when groups were experiencing their developmental or formation phase. More significant functional effects were seen after group formation had been accomplished; more functional effects related to increased overall group task accomplishment. See Table 29.

While change and unrest, as a source of conflict, were reported present in a great number of school districts, they did not appear to alter outcomes either positively or negatively. Whether distractions and behavioral/environmental obstacles existed also did not disturb group accomplishments one way or another as tested by the major MANOVA statistic.

Relationships between the five conflict sources analyzed were generally moderate. All 315 groups reported experiencing conflict of at least a moderate intensity. Intensity levels varied from source

to source. Seven functional (MANOVA and Scheffé-detected) effects were observed and fifteen dysfunctional to group productivity. Two additional (ANOVA and Scheffé-detected) functional effects were also observed.

In summary, it can be concluded from the data analyzed that conflict appears to be consistently present in program development groups with functional effects related more frequently to the group's overall productivity, and dysfunctional attributes seen more frequently during the group formation period.

It may be that the group development phase is particularly difficult for individual members. Disagreement content may also differ during this phase and be based on more personal-level differences which might restrict productivity. Once individual-focused and/or somewhat mechanical types of differences are resolved, the group may be better able to move on to a more substantive conflict management plane where efforts are more group and task focused. Further research investigating disagreement content and personal-level differences would be both interesting and of value.

### Interviews

Interviews conducted supported basic questionnaire responses. They were especially beneficial in contributing to depth of understanding and detail regarding specific group characteristics and members' experience.

A few consistencies and patterns emerged. In general, lack of clear objectives was felt to alter group accomplishments negatively,



and most individuals interviewed felt an initial outline, roadmap, or directive leadership style facilitated in minimizing initial group frustration and potential for conflict. These activities would also tend to reduce the attention directed toward individual members initially.

Interviewees repeatedly described situations where intense conflict escalated to a point where group efforts became immobilized which resulted in the group disbanding only to reorganize without the dissenting member(s) at a later date.

Lay person memberships appeared to create conflict of particular concern to program specialists who felt such disagreement difficult to solve. Conflict in groups with community representation seemed most frequently centered about value differences or unclear initial group objectives and/or role expectations.

Several individuals interviewed were of the opinion that conflict is capable of constructive functions, particularly as a change strategy, and covertly induce it to initiate group effort and/or to stimulate desired, but previously blocked, change. Future research regarding induced conflict parameters would be useful directed particularly toward when to induce how much toward whom for maximum productivity outcomes.

### Recommendations

The study provided evidence that conflict plays a definitive functional role in program development group productivity. An awareness of its presence, intensity levels, sources and impact

would seem vital if group leaders are to deal with, or resolve, dysfunctional conflict, or consider inducing or stimulating conflict with functional potentialities. The idea of conflict's functionality needs to be expanded by increased sensitivity and understanding among educational practitioners prior to diagnostic and management skill development. How best to develop that understanding must be addressed.

Disagreement content, personal-level differences versus task-related differences, induced conflict and conflict aftermath as well would all be useful to research further by field studies. Workshop models available to program specialists and educators need to be initiated and management models evaluated to determine those most effective in educational settings.

Future research attention might also be directed toward developing conflict management training programs on a number of levels--administrative and instructional staff levels--but also perhaps on student levels with curriculum designed to assist young people in learning professional and personal skills in dealing with functional and dysfunctional conflict--so basic a concept in human nature.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### A. Books

- Argyris, Chris. Personality and Organization: The Conflict Between Systems and the Individual. New York: Harper & Row, 1957.
- Asch, Solomon E. "Effects of Group Pressure Upon the Modification and Distortion of Judgments." In Group Dynamics: Research and Theory, pp. 189-200. Edited by Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander. New York: Harper & Row, 1960.
- Bales, Robert F. "Adaptive and Integrative Changes as Sources of Strain in Social Systems." In Small Groups: Studies in Social Interaction, pp. 127-132. Edited by Alexander Hare, Edgar Borgatta and Robert F. Bales. New York: Knopf, 1955.
- Bales, Robert F. Interaction Process Analysis. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Press, 1960.
- Bass, Bernard M. Leadership, Psychology, and Organizational Behavior. New York: Harper & Row, 1960.
- Bavelas, Alex. "Communication Patterns in Task-Oriented Groups." In Group Dynamics: Research and Theory, pp. 669-682. Edited by Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander. New York: Harper & Row, 1960.
- Bennis, Warren G. Changing Organizations; Essays on the Development and Evolution of Human Organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- Bennis, Warren G. et al. Interpersonal Dynamics, Essays and Reading on Human Interaction. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1964.
- Bennis, Warren G. The Unconscious Conspiracy. New York: American Management Association, 1976.
- Bernard, Jessie et al. The Nature of Conflict. Paris: United Nations in collaboration with International Sociological Association, 1957.

- Boulding, Kenneth E. Conflict and Defense, A General Theory. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.
- Burns, Thomas, and Stalker, George M. The Management of Innovation. Chicago: Quadrangle Press, 1962.
- Coleman, James S. Community Conflict. New York: The Free Press, 1957.
- Collins, Barry E., and Guetzkow, Harold. A Social Psychology of Group Processes for Decision-Making. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1964.
- Coser, Lewis A. Continuities in the Study of Social Conflict. Toronto: Collier-MacMillan, 1970.
- Coser, Lewis A. The Functions of Social Conflict. New York: The Free Press, 1956.
- Dahrendorf, Ralf. Essays in the Theory of Conflict. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1968.
- Dahrendorf, Ralf. Social Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Societies. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1968.
- deReuck, Anthony. Conflict in Society. Boston: London and Churchill, 1966.
- Dewey, John. Human Nature and Conduct. New York: The Modern Library, 1930.
- DuBois, Philip H. An Introduction to Psychological Statistics. New York: Harper & Row, 1956.
- Festinger, Leon, and Aronson, Elliot. "The Arousal and Reduction of Dissonance in Social Contexts." In Group Dynamics: Research and Theory. Edited by Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander. New York: Harper and Row, 1960, pp. 214-236.
- Fiedler, Fred. A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Filley, Alan C. Interpersonal Conflict Resolution. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, 1975.
- Franzblau, Abraham. A Primer of Statistics for Non-Statisticians. New York: Harcourt, Brace, World, Inc., 1958.
- French, John R. P., Jr., and Raven, Bertram H. "The Bases of Social Power." In Group Dynamics: Research and Theory. Edited by Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander. New York: Harper & Row, 1960.

- Gluckman, Max. Custom and Conflict in Africa. New York: The Free Press, 1956.
- Heise, George, and Miller, George A. "Problem Solving by Small Groups Using Various Communication Nets." In Small Groups: Studies in Social Interaction, pp. 353-367. Edited by Alexander Hare, Edgar Borgatta and Robert F. Bales. New York: Knopf, 1955.
- Jandt, Fred A. Conflict Resolution through Communication. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.
- Kahn, Robert, and Boulding, Elise (eds.). Power and Conflict in Organizations. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1964.
- Kelly, Harold H., and Thibault, John W. "Experimental Studies of Group Problem Solving and Process." In Handbook of Social Psychology. Edited by Gardner Lindzey. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Press, 1954.
- Kerlinger, Fred H. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1973.
- Kornhauser, Anthony A.; Dubin, Robert; and Ross, Arthur Max. Industrial Conflict. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954.
- Kriesberg, Louis. The Sociology of Social Conflicts. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1973.
- Lewin, Kurt. "Psychological Situations of Reward and Punishment." In Handbook of Social Psychology, p. 205. Edited by Gardner Lindzey. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Press, 1954.
- Lewin, Kurt. Resolving Social Conflicts. New York: Harper & Row, 1948.
- Leavitt, Harold J. "Some Effects of Certain Communication Patterns on Group Performance." In Organizational Theory, pp. 72-98. Edited by D. S. Pugh. Baltimore: Penguin, 1974.
- Likert, Rensis. "The Principles of Supportive Relationships." In Organizational Theory, p. 302. Edited by D. S. Pugh. Baltimore: Penguin, 1974.
- Lippitt, Gordon L. Visualizing Change--Model Building and the Change Process. Fairfax, Virginia: National Training Laboratories Learning Resources Corp., Inc., 1973.
- McGrath, Joseph, and Altman, Irwin. Small Group Research: A Synthesis and Critique of the Field. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966, p. 73.

- Marx, Karl. The Poverty of Philosophy. Chicago: Chas. H. Kerr & Co., 1910, p. 132.
- Miller, Gerald I., and Simons, Herbert W. Perspectives on Communication in Social Change. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1974.
- Miller, Richard I. Perspectives in Educational Change. New York: Appleton-Century, Crofts, 1967.
- Myrdal, Gunnar. An American Dilemma. New York: Harper & Row, 1944, II, p. 1032.
- Myrdal, Gunnar. Objectivity in Social Research. New York: Pantheon Books, 1969.
- Nunnally, Jum C., Jr. Introduction to Measurement. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1970.
- Parsons, Talcott. The Structure of Social Action. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1949.
- Rapoport, Anatol. Fights, Games and Debates. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 1967.
- Rapoport, Anatol, and Chammah, Albert M. with the collaboration of Orwant, Carol J. Prisoner's Dilemma--A Study in Conflict and Cooperation. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 1965.
- Robbins, Stephen P. Managing Organizational Conflict. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1974.
- Schachter, Stanley et al. "An Experimental Study of Cohesiveness and Productivity." In Group Dynamics: Research and Theory, pp. 152-162. Edited by Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander. New York: Harper & Row, 1960.
- Simmel, George. Conflict. Kurt H. Wolff, translator. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955.
- Webb, Eugene J. et al. Unobstrusive Measures: Non-Reactive Research in the Social Sciences. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1966.
- Weber, Max. The Methodology of the Social Sciences. Edward A. Shils and Henry A. Finch, translators. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1949.

### B. Journals and Periodicals

- Ashmore, Timothy M. "Communication in Small Groups Experiencing Conflict as a Function of Prior Interaction." Dissertation Abstracts 37/02A (1976):688.
- Bales, Robert F., and Strodtbeck, Fred L. "Phases in Group Problem Solving." Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology 46 (1951): 485-495.
- Bernard, Jessie. "Parties and Issues of Conflict." Journal of Conflict Resolution 1 (1957):111.
- Blake, Robert R., and Mouton, Jane Srygley. "The Fifth Achievement." Journal of Applied Behavioral Science 6 (1970):413-426.
- Bunker, Douglas. "Individual Applications of Laboratory Training." Journal of Applied Behavioral Science 1 (April-May-June 1965): 131-148.
- Coser, Lewis A. "Social Conflict and the Theory of Social Change." The British Journal of Sociology 8 (1957):197-207.
- Dahlke, H. Otto. "Race and Minority Riots: A Study in the Typology of Violence." Social Forces XXX (1952):420.
- Dalton, Melville. "Conflicts Between Staff and Line Managerial Officers." American Sociology Research XX (1950):342-351.
- Deutsch, Morton. "Conflicts: Productive and Destructive." Journal of Social Issues 25 (No. 1):7-41.
- Deutsch, Morton. "Toward an Understanding of Conflict." International Journal of Group Tensions 1 (1971):42-54.
- Dubin, Robert. "Industrial Conflict and Social Welfare." Journal of Conflict Resolution 1 (1957):179-183.
- Ehrle, Raymond A. "Conflict-Costs, Benefits and Potentials." Journal of Employment Counseling 8 (December 1971):162-181.
- Freeman, F. D. "Theory and Strategy of Action in Race Relations." Social Forces XXX (1951):86.
- Guetzkow, Harold, and Gyr, John. "An Analysis of Conflict in Decision-Making Groups." Human Relations 7 (1954):367-382.
- Hall, Jay. "Decisions, Decisions, Decisions." Psychology Today 11 (1971):51-54 and 86-89.



- Hoffman, L. Richard; Harburg, Ernest; and Maier, Norman R. F. "Differences and Disagreement as Factors in Creative Group Problem Solving." Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology 64 (1962): 206-214.
- Janis, Irving. "Problems of Theory in the Analysis of Stress Behavior." Journal of Social Issues 10 (1954):12-25.
- Kahn-Freund, Otto. "Intergroup Conflicts and Their Settlement." The British Journal of Sociology V (1954):201.
- Kerr, Clark. "Industrial Conflict and Its Mediation." American Journal of Sociology LX (1954):230.
- Mack, Raymond W., and Snyder, Richard C. "The Analysis of Social Conflict--Toward an Overview and Synthesis." Journal of Conflict Resolution 1 (1957):212-248.
- Maibaum, Matthew. "The Characteristics, Functions and Symptomatology of Intergroup Conflict: A Participant-Observational Field Study in the Social Psychology of College-Age Youth Groups." Dissertation Abstracts, Los Angeles: Calif. Sch. of Professional Psychology, 1975.
- Maier, Norman et al. "Differences and Disagreement as Factors in Creative Group Problem-Solving." Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology (1962):206-214.
- Mintz, Alexander. "Non-Adaptive Group Behavior." Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology 46 (1951):150-159.
- Moore, Samuel A. "Cultural Differences as a Positive Force for Change." Planning and Change 6 (Fall 1975/Winter 1976):185.
- Park, Robert E. "The Social Function of War." American Journal of Sociology XLVI (1941):551-570.
- Perry, Lorraine R. "Strategies of Black Community Groups." Social Work V (1976):210-214.
- Rapoport, Anatol. "Lewis Richardson's Mathematical Theory of War." The Journal of Conflict Resolution I (1957):249-299.
- Riggall, Arch John. "The Function of Conflict in Public Administration: An Exploration Based on Case Studies." Dissertation Abstracts 35/8A (1974):5506-A.
- Scheidel, Thomas M., and Crowell, Laura. "Idea Development in Small Discussion Groups." Quarterly Journal of Speech 50 (1964): 40-45.

- Sheppard, Herbert A. "Approaches to Conflict in American Sociology." The British Journal of Sociology V (1954):324-342.
- Smith, Ewart E. "The Effects of Clear and Unclear Role Expectations on Group Productivity and Defensiveness." Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology 55 (1957):213-217.
- Thibault, John W., and Coules, John. "The Role of Communication in the Reduction of Interpersonal Conflict." Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology 47 (1952):770-777.
- Walton, Richard E. et al. "Organizational Context and Interdepartmental Conflict." Administrative Science Quarterly 14 (December 1969):522-542.
- Wilemon, David L. "Managing Conflict in Temporary Management Systems." Journal of Management Studies 10 (October 1973):282-296.

### C. Published Reports

- Andes, John O.; Johns, Roe L.; and Kimbrough, Ralph B. Changes in Organizational Structures of Large School Systems with Special Reference to Problems of Teacher Militancy and Organizational Conflict. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Bureau of Research, March, 1971.
- Barnes, Roland E. Understanding the Nature of Conflict. Center for the Study of Desegregation and Conflict, University of Pittsburgh, January, 1974.
- Bernstein, Saul. "Conflict, Self-Determination, and Social Work." Monograph IX in a series sponsored by the Regional Institute Program of National Association of Social Workers, Inc., New York, 1967, pp. 67-83.
- Chesler, Mark et al. The Educational Change Team: An Effort to Develop a National Facility to Generate and Implement Information and Resources. National Institute of Mental Health, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Research, July, 1972.
- Institute of Industrial Relations. "Management of Conflict: Implications for Community Relations and for the World of Work." Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual Meeting. Los Angeles, Calif., 1974.
- Northwest Regional Education Laboratory. Evaluation Design for Social Conflict and Negotiative Problem Solving. National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, March, 1976.

Piele, Philip K. Conflict Management in Education. Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1971.

Schofield, Dee. "Conflict Management in Education." NAESP School Leadership Digest Series 10 (1975), National Association of Elementary School Principals, Washington, D.C.

Trusty, Francis M. An Exploration of Conflict and Conflict Management. Danford Foundation, St. Louis Missouri, May, 1976.

Zuckerman, Edward. "Patterns of Family Power, Conflict and Activity as a Function of Experimental Tasks." Dissertation Abstracts 36/4-B (1937).

#### D. Unpublished Reports

Bailey, Stephen K. "Preparing Educational Administrators for Conflict Resolution." Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New York, February, 1971.

Boyd, William L. "Community Status and Conflict in Suburban School Politics." Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, April, 1972.

Flannick, Nicholas A. "Administrative Responses to Race-Related Incidents in Selected Urban Secondary Schools." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1973.

Giammatteo, Michael C. "Process Concerns in Use of Force Field Techniques." Paper presented to meeting of Supervisors of Student Teachers held in Portland, Oregon, 1967.

Guba, Egon. "Methodological Strategies for Educational Change." Paper presented to the Conference on Strategies for Educational Change, Ohio State University and U.S. Office of Education, November, 1969.

Kirby, David J., and Crain, Robert L. "The Functions of Conflict: School Desegregation in Ninety-One Cities." Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, April, 1974.

Krafft, Larry J. "The Influence of Human Relations Laboratory Training Upon the Perceived Behavioral Changes of Secondary School Seminar Instructors." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Michigan State University under the direction of John H. Suehr, 1967.

- Magett, Dorothy Littlejohn. "A Study of Conflict Management Functions of Central Office Human Relations Officers in Selected Suburban Schools." Unpublished Dissertation, Northwestern University, 1972.
- Schmuck, Richard A. "Development of Management Teamwork: National Overview." Paper presented to the Educational Managers Annual Meeting, Wemme, Oregon, July, 1974.
- Vogt, Molly T. "Conflict Management as an Integral Part of Planning in the University." Unpublished Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1975.
- Wallace, Les, and Baxter, Leslie. "Conflict Management in 'Ad Hoc' Problem-Solving Groups: A Preliminary Investigation." Paper presented to the Western Speech Communication Association Annual Meeting, Albuquerque, New Mexico, November, 1973.

#### E. Interviews

- Trusty, Francis M. Department of Education Administration, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee. Interview, March 16, 1977.

#### F. General References

- Aranguren, Jose L. Human Communication. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.
- Gamson, William A. "Rancorous Conflict in Community Politics." American Sociology Review 31 (February 1966):71-81.
- Ignatovich, Frederick R. "Management of Organizational Conflict Resulting from Adoption of New Planning-Evaluation Strategies." Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New Orleans, March, 1973.
- Johnson, Harold J. "Decision Making, Conflict, and Physiological Arousal." Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology 67 (1963): 114-124.
- Oberschall, Anthony. Social Conflict and Social Movements. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1973.
- Perrow, Charles. Complex Organizations. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman, 1972, pp. 1-224.
- Smith, Gerda Hansen. "The Social System of a Freshman Class in a Modern School: A Study of the Functions of Social Conflict." Unpublished Dissertation, Rice University, 1974.

## APPENDICES

## **APPENDIX A**

### **INITIAL LETTER TO PROGRAM SPECIALISTS**

## APPENDIX A

### INITIAL LETTER TO PROGRAM SPECIALISTS

March 16, 1977

Dear Program Specialist:

In our most recent Michigan Association of State & Federal Program Specialists newsletter, you may have read of the research I am undertaking at Michigan State University regarding program development group characteristics. I am a school administrator, currently on leave from the Bay City Public Schools, completing doctoral studies in education administration with particular interest in program development.

Research regarding groups such as you and I are frequently involved with in education is almost totally lacking, or at best only implicit in application to our particular settings. A particular interest of mine, and a few social theorists, is the functional, or constructive, aspects of varying amounts of conflict in small planning groups. As you well know, frequently it is only through differences that opinions are heard, ideas come forth and changes are born.

The attached questionnaire hopes to analyze group characteristics in terms of group productivity and presence of differing amounts and types of conflict. It is hoped this study will springboard future interest in the importance of program development groups in education and the need for additional research to broaden our awareness and understanding as to precisely how such groups function best.

If you would be kind enough to complete the enclosed forms, one side for each of four groups with whom you have worked, your contribution will stand among other program specialists' throughout Michigan. Should you be interested in receipt of an abstract of the completed study for potential relevance to your setting, please indicate your name and address on any of the forms. Otherwise, responses are to be kept anonymous and completely confidential. Thank you for your time and interest; they are deeply respected.

Cordially,

Lori Mahon (Ms.)  
3074 Lupine Lane  
Bay City, Michigan 48706  
enc.

**APPENDIX B**

**FOLLOW-UP LETTER**



## APPENDIX B

### FOLLOW-UP LETTER

April 13, 1977

Dear Program Specialist:

On March 16 I sent you a questionnaire designed to inquire into your perceptions regarding varying amounts of conflict present in small educational program planning groups. If you are one of the more than 80 who returned the questionnaire, I wish to express my sincere thanks. However, as is usually the case in research of this type, a second mailing is necessary. The enclosed materials are for those of you who, for one reason or another, did not respond to the first questionnaire.

While my concern for your responses is obviously self-serving, the findings should begin to answer questions concerning how groups in education involved with developing or revising existing programs function, and begin to give us some guideline regarding the effects, if any, of conflict in such groups.

While you need not sign your name, if you wish to receive the results of the study I would be happy to send them to you if you will supply me with your name and mailing address on any of the forms.

The first questionnaire may have reached you at an inconvenient time when you were in the midst of activities preparatory to the spring vacation. I hope that this second mailing will arrive at a more opportune time, for if I am going to be able to complete the study I must have a sizeable return.

Thank you for your assistance. I shall look forward to hearing from you soon. A stamped, return-addressed envelope is enclosed for your reply.

Cordially,

Lori Mahon  
3074 Lupine Lane  
Bay City, Michigan 48706  
enclosures

## APPENDIX C

### QUESTIONNAIRE

# APPENDIX C

## An Analysis of Program Development Groups

GROUP NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_ The group's general purpose was \_\_\_\_\_

The approximate number of meetings held were \_\_\_\_\_. The approximate date of the group's last meeting was \_\_\_\_\_

Directions: Please Check One of the Below for Each Question

To What Extent Did This Group . . .

- |  |                                 |                                |                                    |
|--|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. define and clarify its objectives or purposes?  | ___ NOT AT ALL<br>___ MINIMALLY | ___ SOMEWHAT<br>___ MODERATELY | ___ CONSIDERABLY<br>___ COMPLETELY |
| 2. establish regular routines? (such as selecting the same leader, meeting time)   | ___ NOT AT ALL<br>___ MINIMALLY | ___ SOMEWHAT<br>___ MODERATELY | ___ CONSIDERABLY<br>___ COMPLETELY |
| 3. reduce initial tension where present and allow more relaxed conversation and social interaction among members?                                | ___ NOT AT ALL<br>___ MINIMALLY | ___ SOMEWHAT<br>___ MODERATELY | ___ CONSIDERABLY<br>___ COMPLETELY |
| 4. experience conflict over scarce resources? (such as personnel, supplies, time, space or other tangible items)                                 | ___ NOT AT ALL<br>___ MINIMALLY | ___ SOMEWHAT<br>___ MODERATELY | ___ CONSIDERABLY<br>___ COMPLETELY |
| 5. begin to work together as a unit rather than as a number of individuals?  | ___ NOT AT ALL<br>___ MINIMALLY | ___ SOMEWHAT<br>___ MODERATELY | ___ CONSIDERABLY<br>___ COMPLETELY |
| 6. experience changing relationships among its members?  | ___ NOT AT ALL<br>___ MINIMALLY | ___ SOMEWHAT<br>___ MODERATELY | ___ CONSIDERABLY<br>___ COMPLETELY |
| 7. come to agreement on major topics?  | ___ NOT AT ALL<br>___ MINIMALLY | ___ SOMEWHAT<br>___ MODERATELY | ___ CONSIDERABLY<br>___ COMPLETELY |
| 8. experience conflict over leadership, position, status or control?   | ___ NOT AT ALL<br>___ MINIMALLY | ___ SOMEWHAT<br>___ MODERATELY | ___ CONSIDERABLY<br>___ COMPLETELY |
| 9. complete its original objectives or purposes?   | ___ NOT AT ALL<br>___ MINIMALLY | ___ SOMEWHAT<br>___ MODERATELY | ___ CONSIDERABLY<br>___ COMPLETELY |
| 10. help to modify any lack of interest, inertia or outdated procedures within the district?   | ___ NOT AT ALL<br>___ MINIMALLY | ___ SOMEWHAT<br>___ MODERATELY | ___ CONSIDERABLY<br>___ COMPLETELY |
| 11. experience distractions such as interruptions, broken equipment, illnesses or other behavioral/ environmental obstacles?                     | ___ NOT AT ALL<br>___ MINIMALLY | ___ SOMEWHAT<br>___ MODERATELY | ___ CONSIDERABLY<br>___ COMPLETELY |
| 12. stimulate any creativity or innovation within the district?  | ___ NOT AT ALL<br>___ MINIMALLY | ___ SOMEWHAT<br>___ MODERATELY | ___ CONSIDERABLY<br>___ COMPLETELY |
| 13. become responsible for the development of any new or different program, curriculum, approach or procedure?                                   | ___ NOT AT ALL<br>___ MINIMALLY | ___ SOMEWHAT<br>___ MODERATELY | ___ CONSIDERABLY<br>___ COMPLETELY |
| 14. experience conflict regarding open or underlying value differences?  | ___ NOT AT ALL<br>___ MINIMALLY | ___ SOMEWHAT<br>___ MODERATELY | ___ CONSIDERABLY<br>___ COMPLETELY |
| 15. help make possible additional funding for the school district? (such as a grant)   | ___ NOT AT ALL<br>___ MINIMALLY | ___ SOMEWHAT<br>___ MODERATELY | ___ CONSIDERABLY<br>___ COMPLETELY |
| 16. give direction and incentive to other groups in the district?  | ___ NOT AT ALL<br>___ MINIMALLY | ___ SOMEWHAT<br>___ MODERATELY | ___ CONSIDERABLY<br>___ COMPLETELY |
| 17. find that change or unrest was occurring within the school district? (such as a new superintendent, unsettled contracts, revised curriculum) | ___ NOT AT ALL<br>___ MINIMALLY | ___ SOMEWHAT<br>___ MODERATELY | ___ CONSIDERABLY<br>___ COMPLETELY |
| 18. affect any district-wide change?   | ___ NOT AT ALL<br>___ MINIMALLY | ___ SOMEWHAT<br>___ MODERATELY | ___ CONSIDERABLY<br>___ COMPLETELY |
| 19. affect any community-wide change?  | ___ NOT AT ALL<br>___ MINIMALLY | ___ SOMEWHAT<br>___ MODERATELY | ___ CONSIDERABLY<br>___ COMPLETELY |

## **APPENDIX D**

### **TABLES**

Table 1  
Conflict 1--Scarce Resources

ANOVA Results

Effect on Fourteen Productivity Variates

Variate	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Value
Q 1	5.12994	2.56497	1.76731	.17268
2	2.57730	1.28865	.62041	.53845
3	19.94023	9.97011	7.17539	.00091*
5	23.32186	11.66093	8.46623	.00027*
6	17.39877	8.69938	5.11271	.00659*
7	18.41198	9.20599	5.44664	.00478*
9	10.44178	5.22089	2.70244	.06878
10	7.58234	3.79117	1.79769	.16757
12	6.15095	3.07548	1.60929	.20186
13	2.74444	1.37222	.58017	.56047
15	8.01402	4.00701	1.17818	.30935
16	2.67923	1.33962	.66479	.51518
18	3.18270	1.59135	.68766	.50359
19	4.94250	2.47125	1.14551	.31954
MANOVA results: 2,280 degrees of freedom			2.18228	.00051*

Table 2  
 Conflict 2--Leadership/Control  
 ANOVA Results  
 Effect on Fourteen Productivity Variates

Variate	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	P Value
Q 1	12.27765	6.13883	4.27177	.01488*
2	12.81900	6.40950	3.12943	.04528
3	30.57469	15.28734	11.23663	.00002*
5	29.43665	14.71833	10.75414	.00003*
6	5.30625	2.65313	1.53053	.21823
7	30.43272	15.21636	9.06510	.00015*
9	21.72766	10.86383	5.75077	.00357*
10	.38138	.19069	.08876	.91509
12	5.58806	2.79403	1.49244	.22661
13	1.68571	.84285	.35420	.70205
15	20.91933	10.45967	3.14382	.04464*
16	3.16664	1.58332	.78136	.45878
18	.57229	.28615	.12193	.88526
19	8.12440	4.06220	1.87829	.15477
MANOVA results: 2,280 d.f.			2.49652	.0004*

Table 3  
 Conflict 3--Distractions/Obstacles  
 ANOVA Results  
 Effect on Fourteen Productivity Variates

Variate	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Value
Q 1	.69781	.34891	.23714	.78904
2	1.91962	.95981	.47182	.62436
3	2.96230	1.48115	1.01444	.36393
5	5.78218	2.89109	2.01176	.13568
6	18.95095	9.47547	5.62471	.00403*
7	7.01889	3.50944	1.99213	.13833
9	1.86607	.93304	.47426	.62285
10	2.54607	1.27304	.60738	.54549
12	1.06683	.53342	.28315	.75362
13	2.92612	1.46306	.61517	.54128
15	20.83192	10.41596	3.13758	.04492*
16	.42608	.21304	.10727	.89832
18	6.28404	3.14202	1.37820	.25374
19	.05313	.02657	.01221	.98786
MANOVA results: 2,280 d.f.			1.23401	.19156

Table 4  
Conflict 4--Value Differences

## ANOVA Results

Effect on Fourteen Productivity Variates

Variate	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	P Value
Q 1	1.85086	.92543	.65219	.52169
2	14.70746	7.35373	3.70467	.02582*
3	39.10766	19.55383	15.17610	.00001*
5	25.85464	12.92732	9.45327	.00011*
6	6.45688	3.22844	1.84942	.15924
7	24.38070	12.19035	7.37542	.00076*
9	8.61187	4.30593	2.26517	.10571
10	4.37755	2.18878	1.03680	.35594
12	.96451	.48226	.26155	.77004
13	6.50219	3.25110	1.41002	.24586
15	12.55614	6.27807	1.86836	.15629
16	4.49901	2.24951	1.16259	.31417
18	2.19878	1.09934	.48075	.61883
19	3.42983	1.71492	.79677	.45180
MANOVA results: 2,281 d.f.			2.94159	.00001*



Table 5  
 Conflict 5--Change and Unrest  
 ANOVA Results  
 Effect on Fourteen Productivity Variates

Variate	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	P Value
Q 1	1.96802	.98401	.65747	.51899
2	1.68245	.84123	.40719	.66593
3	.80882	.40441	.27035	.76332
5	6.95019	3.47510	2.30430	.09319
6	5.33918	2.66959	1.52127	.22032
7	6.69563	3.34781	1.96908	.14160
9	2.54483	1.27241	.68588	.50453
10	.80492	.40246	.19757	.82085
12	.92278	.46139	.25645	.77398
13	5.93799	2.96899	1.38664	.25170
15	3.35042	1.67521	.51111	.60041
16	5.41552	2.70776	1.37422	.25481
18	1.47505	.73752	.33331	.71685
19	3.15834	1.57917	.75850	.46937
MANOVA results: 2,268 d.f.			1.15943	.26379

Table 6  
Conflict's Overall Effect on Productivity

ANOVA Results

Variate	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	P Value
Q 1	2.60022	1.30011	.88716	.41297
2	4.25026	2.12513	1.02946	.35853
3	17.20035	8.60018	6.12674	.00248*
5	27.84742	13.92371	10.22196	.00005*
6	19.96828	9.98414	5.91730	.00304*
7	28.66985	14.33492	8.58614	.00024*
9	10.06612	5.03306	2.60203	.07590
10	16.71501	8.35751	4.02479	.01890*
12	2.53719	1.26860	.66126	.51700
13	1.85801	.92900	.39298	.67541
15	20.57300	10.28650	3.06848	.04804*
16	25.22651	12.61325	6.51319	.00172*
18	10.40622	5.20311	2.27253	.10493
19	2.17149	1.08574	.50027	.60690
MANOVA results: 2,283 d.f.			3.14854	.00001*

Table 7

## Conflict Sources Relationships

## Pearson Correlation Coefficients

Variable	Conflict Sources				
	1 Resources	2 Control	3 Obstacles	4 Values	5 Change
1. Scarce Resources	-	.4699	.3450	.4673	.4366
2. Leadership/Control	.4699	-	.4394	.5284	.3692
3. Obstacles/Distractions	.3450	.4394	-	.3894	.3382
4. Value Differences	.4673	.5284	.3894	-	.3533
5. Change/Unrest	.4366	.3692	.3382	.3533	-
Overall: Mean	2.882	2.295	2.267	3.077	3.044
SD	1.548	1.450	1.258	1.410	1.585
Mode	1.000	1.000	2.000	3.000	2.000
Median	2.698	1.858	2.000	3.029	2.760

Table 8

Question 1: To What Extent Did This Group Define and Clarify Its Objectives or Purposes?  
Productivity Mean, Standard Deviation and Frequency of Responses  
by Conflict Sources and Overall

Intensity Level <sup>a</sup>	Statistic	Conflict Sources				Percent Frequency
		1 Resources	2 Control	3 Obstacles	4 Values	5 Change
Minimal	Mean	4.84	4.84*	4.74	4.82	4.75
	SD	1.18	1.15	1.23	1.13	1.21
Moderate	Mean	4.66	4.56	4.63	4.69	4.56
	SD	1.26	1.26	1.14	1.19	1.24
Intense	Mean	4.51	4.26*	4.68	4.61	4.90
	SD	1.18	1.33	1.29	1.29	1.23
Overall:	Mean					
	SD					
	Mode					
	Median					
*Significant Group Difference:			.58			
						4.732
						1.180
						5.000
						4.976

<sup>a</sup>Legend: 1.00-2.99 = minimal  
3.00-4.99 = moderate  
5.00-5.99 = intense or complete

Table 9

Question 2: To What Extent Did This Group Establish Regular Routines?  
Productivity Mean, Standard Deviation and Frequency of Responses  
by Conflict Sources and Overall

Intensity Level	Statistic	Conflict Sources					Percent Frequency
		1 Resources	2 Control	3 Obstacles	4 Values	5 Change	
Minimal	Mean	4.59	4.78	4.69	4.59*	4.54	16.5
	SD	1.49	1.39	1.42	1.41	1.40	
Moderate	Mean	4.77	4.41	4.51	4.88	4.69	21.3
	SD	1.27	1.48	1.38	1.23	1.44	
Intense	Mean	4.52	4.21	4.53	4.28*	4.71	67.2
	SD	1.57	1.61	1.65	1.74	1.50	
Overall:	Mean						4.655
	SD						1.410
	Mode						6.000
	Median						5.016
*Significant Group Difference:							.71

<sup>a</sup>Legend: 1.00-2.99 = minimal  
3.00-4.99 = moderate  
5.00-5.99 = intense or complete

Table 10

Question 3: To What Extent Did This Group Reduce Initial Tension and Allow  
Relaxed Social Interaction?

Productivity Mean, Standard Deviation and Frequency of Responses  
by Conflict Sources and Overall

Intensity Level	Statistic	Conflict Sources				Percent Frequency
		1 Resources	2 Control	3 Obstacles	4 Values	5 Change
Minimal	Mean	4.59*	4.59*	4.43	4.78*	4.41
	SD	1.06	1.06	1.18	1.03	1.16
Moderate	Mean	4.33	4.13	4.19	4.32	4.31
	SD	1.25	1.22	1.23	1.11	1.27
Intense	Mean	3.90*	3.62*	4.37	3.77	4.29
	SD	1.31	1.55	1.38	1.35	1.28
Overall:	Mean					
	SD					
	Mode					
	Median					
*Significant Group Difference:		.69	.95		1.01	
						4.365
						1.202
						5.000
						4.622

<sup>a</sup>Legend: 1.00-2.99 = minimal  
3.00-4.99 = moderate  
5.00-5.99 = intense or complete

Table 11

## Conflict 1

Question 4: To What Extent Did This Group Experience  
Conflict Over Scarce Resources?

## Mean and Frequency of Responses

Intensity Level <sup>a</sup>	Absolute Frequency	Percent Frequency
Minimal	135	47.0
Moderate	91	31.7
Intense	61	21.3
Total Responses	187	
Overall:	Mean	2.882
	SD	1.548
	Mode	1.000
	Median	2.698

<sup>a</sup>Legend: 1.00-2.99 = minimal  
3.00-4.99 = moderate  
5.00-5.99 = intense or complete

Table 12

Question 5: To What Extent Did This Group Begin to Work as a Unit Versus a Number of Individuals?

Productivity Mean, Standard Deviation and Frequency of Responses by Conflict Sources and Overall

Intensity Level <sup>a</sup>	Statistic	Conflict Sources					Percent Frequency
		1 Resources	2 Control	3 Obstacles	4 Values	5 Change	
Minimal	Mean	4.50*	4.47*	4.35	4.58*	4.42	8.4
	SD	1.13	1.10	1.18	1.18	1.10	
Moderate	Mean	4.27	4.03	4.03	4.26	4.07	39.2
	SD	1.13	1.22	1.13	1.10	1.23	
Intense	Mean	3.75*	3.53*	4.16	3.74*	4.14	52.4
	SD	1.32	1.48	1.57	1.29	1.34	
Overall:	Mean						4.276
	SD						1.176
	Mode						5.000
	Median						4.559
*Significant Group Difference:		.75	.94		.84		

<sup>a</sup>Legend: 1.00-2.99 = minimal  
 3.00-4.99 = moderate  
 5.99-5.99 = intense or complete



Table 13

Question 6: To What Extent Did This Group Experience Changing Relationships Among Its Members?  
 Productivity Mean, Standard Deviation and Frequency of Responses  
 by Conflict Sources and Overall

Intensity Level <sup>a</sup>	Statistic	Conflict Sources					Percent Frequency
		1 Resources	2 Control	3 Obstacles	4 Values	5 Change	
Minimal	Mean SD	3.28* 1.39	3.39 1.30	3.31 1.34	3.38 1.36	3.34 1.28	24.0
Moderate	Mean SD	3.52 1.19	3.70 1.32	3.79 1.16	3.53 1.25	3.51 1.30	48.9
Intense	Mean SD	3.92* 1.32	3.62 1.41	4.05 1.31	3.74 1.40	3.70 1.44	27.1
Overall:	Mean SD Mode Median						3.490 1.323 3.000 3.449
*Significant Group Difference: .64							

<sup>a</sup>Legend: 1.00-2.99 = minimal  
 3.00-4.99 = moderate  
 5.00-5.99 = intense or complete

Table 14

Question 7: To What Extent Did This Group Come to Agreement on Major Topics?

Productivity Mean, Standard Deviation and Frequency of Responses  
by Conflict Sources and Overall

Intensity Level <sup>a</sup>	Statistic	Conflict Sources					Percent Frequency
		1 Resources	2 Control	3 Obstacles	4 Values	5 Change	
Minimal	Mean	4.68*	4.69*	4.57	4.71*	4.59	6.4
	SD	1.29	1.29	1.28	1.33	1.31	
Moderate	Mean	4.48	4.13	4.29	4.53	4.36	27.5
	SD	1.18	1.26	1.37	1.21	1.27	
Intense	Mean	4.02*	3.82*	4.21	3.91*	4.20	66.1
	SD	1.48	1.40	1.58	1.34	1.32	
Overall:	Mean						4.579
	SD						1.120
	Mode						5.000
	Median						4.819
*Significant Group Difference:		.66	.87		.80		

<sup>a</sup>Legend: 1.00-2.99 = minimal  
3.00-4.99 = moderate  
5.00-5.99 = intense or complete

Table 15

## Conflict 2

Question 8: To What Extent Did This Group Experience Conflict  
Over Leadership, Position, Status or Control?

## Mean and Frequency of Responses

Intensity Level <sup>a</sup>	Absolute Frequency	Percent Frequency
Minimal	190	66.7
Moderate	61	21.3
Intense	34	12.0
Total Responses	285	
Overall:	Mean	2.295
	SD	1.450
	Mode	1.000
	Median	1.858

<sup>a</sup>Legend: 1.00-2.99 = minimal  
3.00-4.99 = moderate  
5.00-5.99 = intense or complete

Table 16

## Question 9: To What Extent Did This Group Complete Its Original Objectives?

Productivity Mean, Standard Deviation and Frequency of Responses  
by Conflict Sources and Overall

Intensity Level <sup>a</sup>	Statistic	Conflict Sources					Percent Frequency
		1 Resources	2 Control	3 Obstacles	4 Values	5 Change	
Minimal	Mean SD	4.64 1.42	4.71* 1.33	4.56 1.42	4.69 1.37	4.61 1.24	9.9
Moderate	Mean SD	4.54 1.26	4.11 1.39	4.38 1.34	4.53 1.28	4.41 1.41	25.3
Intense	Mean SD	4.15 1.50	4.15* 1.60	4.47 1.43	4.21 1.58	4.40 1.50	64.8
Overall:	Mean SD Mode Median						4.563 1.326 5.000 4.878
*Significant Group Difference:			.56				

<sup>a</sup>Legend: 1.00-2.99 = minimal  
3.00-4.99 = moderate  
5.00-5.99 = intense or complete

Table 17

Question 10: To What Extent Did This Group Help To Modify Any Lack of Interest,  
Inertia or Outdated Procedures?

Productivity Mean, Standard Deviation and Frequency of Responses  
by Conflict Sources and Overall

Intensity Level <sup>a</sup>	Statistic	Conflict Sources				Percent Frequency
		1 Resources	2 Control	3 Obstacles	4 Values	5 Change
Minimal	Mean SD	3.40 1.56	3.58 1.48	3.51 1.50	3.41 1.57	3.53 1.46
						21.5
Moderate	Mean SD	3.78 1.38	3.49 1.32	3.72 1.22	3.68 1.33	3.64 1.36
						43.8
Intense	Mean SD	3.57 1.33	3.53 1.64	3.63 1.71	3.65 1.47	3.51 1.46
						34.7 34.7
Overall:	Mean SD Mode Median					3.674 1.335 5.000 3.856

<sup>a</sup>Legend: 1.00-2.99 = minimal  
3.00-4.99 = moderate  
5.00-5.99 = intense or complete

Table 18

## Conflict 3

Question 11: To What Extent Did This Group Experience Distractions  
or Other Behavioral/Environmental Obstacles?

## Mean and Frequency of Responses

Intensity Level <sup>a</sup>	Absolute Frequency	Percent Frequency
Minimal	193	67.7
Moderate	73	25.6
Intense	19	6.7
Total Responses	285	
Overall:	Mean	2.267
	SD	1.258
	Mode	2.000
	Median	2.000

<sup>a</sup>Legend: 1.00-2.99 = minimal  
3.00-4.99 = moderate  
5.00-5.99 = intense or complete

Table 19  
Question 12: To What Extent Did This Group Stimulate Creativity or Innovation  
Within the District?

Productivity Mean, Standard Deviation and Frequency of Responses  
by Conflict Sources and Overall

Intensity Level <sup>a</sup>	Statistic	Conflict Sources				Percent Frequency
		1 Resources	2 Control	3 Obstacles	4 Values	5 Change
Minimal	Mean	3.67	3.73	3.58	3.62	3.72
	SD	1.32	1.30	1.37	1.38	1.27
Moderate	Mean	3.73	3.39	3.68	3.71	3.60
	SD	1.46	1.50	1.28	1.27	1.29
Intense	Mean	3.34	3.53	3.79	3.56	3.60
	SD	1.39	1.50	1.69	1.48	1.54
Overall:	Mean					
	SD					
	Mode					
	Median					
						21.1
						44.4
						34.5
						3.673
						1.322
						5.000
						3.833

<sup>a</sup>Legend: 1.00-2.99 = minimal  
3.00-4.99 = moderate  
5.00-5.99 = intense or complete

Table 20

Question 13: To What Extent Did This Group Develop Any New or Different Program,  
Curriculum, or Procedure?

Productivity Mean, Standard Deviation and Frequency of Responses  
by Conflict Sources and Overall

Intensity Level <sup>a</sup>	Statistic	Conflict Sources				Percent Frequency
		1 Resources	2 Control	3 Obstacles	4 Values	5 Change
Minimal	Mean	4.00	3.99	3.88	3.71	3.97
	SD	1.56	1.50	1.53	1.57	1.45
Moderate	Mean	3.79	3.89	4.00	4.03	3.80
	SD	1.57	1.56	1.62	1.48	1.45
Intense	Mean	4.00	3.76	4.26	4.14	4.21
	SD	1.44	1.74	1.42	1.51	1.52
Overall:	Mean					
	SD					
	Mode					
	Median					

4.032  
1.415  
5.000  
4.514

<sup>a</sup>Legend: 1.00-2.99 = minimal  
3.00-4.99 = moderate  
5.00-5.99 = intense or complete



Table 21

## Conflict 4

Question 14: To What Extent Did This Group Experience Conflict  
Regarding Open or Underlying Value Differences?

## Mean and Frequency of Responses

Intensity Level <sup>a</sup>	Absolute Frequency	Percent Frequency
Minimal	117	37.4
Moderate	121	42.3
Intense	58	20.3
Total Responses	196	
Overall:	Mean	3.077
	SD	1.410
	Mode	3.000
	Median	3.029

Table 22

Question 15: To What Extent Did This Group Make Possible Additional Funding for the School District?  
 Productivity Mean, Standard Deviation and Frequency of Responses  
 by Conflict Sources and Overall

Intensity Level <sup>a</sup>	Statistic	Conflict Sources					Percent Frequency
		1 Resources	2 Control	3 Obstacles	4 Values	5 Change	
Minimal	Mean	2.38	2.30*	2.40	2.27	2.44	59.3
	SD	1.93	1.77	1.82	1.84	1.75	
Moderate	Mean	2.73	2.62	2.38	2.48	2.66	
	SD	1.81	1.83	1.76	1.80	1.86	
Intense	Mean	2.33	3.12*	3.47	2.84	2.40	24.9
	SD	1.71	2.07	2.09	1.90	1.85	
Overall:	Mean						2.612
	SD						1.800
	Mode						1.000
	Median						1.862

\*Significant Group Difference .82

<sup>a</sup>Legend: 1.00-2.99 = minimal  
 3.00-4.99 = moderate  
 5.00-5.99 = intense or complete

Table 23

Question 16: To What Extent Did This Group Give Direction and Incentive to Other Groups in the District?

Productivity Mean, Standard Deviation and Frequency of Responses by Conflict Sources and Overall

Intensity Level <sup>a</sup>	Statistic	Conflict Sources				Percent Frequency
		1 Resources	2 Control	3 Obstacles	4 Values	5 Change
Minimal	Mean	3.50	3.60	3.51	3.41	3.39
	SD	1.47	1.41	1.41	1.51	1.44
						24.0
Moderate	Mean	3.67	3.44	3.57	3.69	3.72
	SD	1.39	1.46	1.41	1.26	1.29
						40.8
Intense	Mean	3.41	3.29	3.63	3.53	3.54
	SD	1.36	1.49	1.38	1.42	1.48
						35.2
Overall:	Mean					
	SD					3.567
	Mode					1.368
	Median					5.000
						3.587

<sup>a</sup>Legend: 1.00-2.99 = minimal  
 3.00-4.99 = moderate  
 5.00-5.99 = intense or complete

Table 24

## Conflict 5

Question 17: To What Extent Did This Group Find Change or  
Unrest Occurring Within the District?

## Mean and Frequency of Responses

Intensity Level <sup>a</sup>	Absolute Frequency	Percent Frequency
Minimal	124	45.4
Moderate	86	31.5
Intense	63	23.1
Total Responses	173	
Overall:	Mean	3.004
	SD	1.585
	Mode	2.000
	Median	2.760

Table 25

Question 18: To What Extent Did This Group Affect Any District-Wide Change?  
 Productivity Mean, Standard Deviation and Frequency of Responses  
 by Conflict Sources and Overall

Intensity Level <sup>a</sup>	Statistic	Conflict Sources					Percent Frequency
		1 Resources	2 Control	3 Obstacles	4 Values	5 Change	
Minimal	Mean SD	3.37 1.56	3.41 1.50	3.35 1.51	3.30 1.56	3.35 1.42	29.5
Moderate	Mean SD	3.52 1.56	3.31 1.61	3.44 1.46	3.48 1.35	3.48 1.43	40.2
Intense	Mean SD	3.23 1.36	3.44 1.56	3.98 1.72	3.49 1.72	3.52 1.67	30.3
Overall:	Mean SD Mode Median						3.470 1.442 5.000 3.526

<sup>a</sup>Legend: 1.00-2.99 = minimal  
 3.00-4.99 = moderate  
 5.00-5.99 = intense or complete

Table 26

Question 19: To What Extent Did This Group Affect Any Community-Wide Change?  
Productivity Mean, Standard Deviation and Frequency of Responses  
by Conflict Sources and Overall

Intensity Level <sup>a</sup>	Statistic	Conflict Sources					Percent Frequency
		1 Resources	2 Control	3 Obstacles	4 Values	5 Change	
Minimal	Mean	2.78	2.86	2.74	2.84	2.80	48.9
	SD	1.63	1.56	1.52	1.60	1.50	
Moderate	Mean	2.87	2.57	2.74	2.78	2.74	35.4
	SD	1.34	1.27	1.34	1.39	1.39	
Intense	Mean	2.51	2.41	2.68	2.54	2.52	15.7
	SD	1.26	1.28	1.53	1.36	1.40	
Overall:	Mean						2.818
	SD						1.414
	Mode						2.000
	Median						2.564

<sup>a</sup>Legend: 1.00-2.99 = minimal  
3.00-4.99 = moderate  
5.00-5.99 = intense or complete

Table 27

## Total Conflict

## Overall Group Productivity Mean and Standard Deviation

Variate	Statistic	Minimal	Moderate	Intense	Significant Group Differences*
Q 1	Mean	4.78	4.77	4.58	
	SD	1.24	1.24	1.16	
2	Mean	4.54	4.82	4.57	
	SD	1.53	1.24	1.49	
3	Mean	4.62*	4.46	4.05*	.57
	SD	1.04	1.19	1.31	
5	Mean	4.49*	4.49	3.84*	.65
	SD	1.14	1.12	1.23	
6	Mean	3.12*	3.63	3.72*	.60
	SD	1.32	1.30	1.27	
7	Mean	4.84*	4.51	4.08*	.76
	SD	1.31	1.17	1.37	
9	Mean	4.60	4.70	4.26	
	SD	1.47	1.26	1.42	
10	Mean	3.25*	3.84*	3.63	.59
	SD	1.66	1.30	1.33	
12	Mean	3.49	3.72	3.65	
	SD	1.44	1.27	1.43	
13	Mean	3.82	3.99	4.00	
	SD	1.64	1.46	1.50	
15	Mean	2.11*	2.76*	2.57	.65
	SD	1.86	1.81	1.82	
16	Mean	3.21*	3.94*	3.48	.73
	SD	1.54	1.24	1.36	
18	Mean	3.14	3.61	3.45	
	SD	1.59	1.44	1.50	
19	Mean	2.74	2.86	2.65	
	SD	1.65	1.52	1.24	

Table 28

Conflict Intensity Levels  
Absolute Frequencies and Percentages

Conflict Source	Number of Groups Experiencing:					
	Minimal		Moderate		Intense	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
1. Scarce Resources	135	47.0%	91	31.7%	61	21.3%
2. Leadership/Control	190	66.7%	61	21.3%	34	12.0%
3. Distraction/Obstacles	193	67.7%	73	25.6%	19	6.7%
4. Value Differences	117	37.4%	121	42.3%	58	20.3%
5. Change/Unrest	124	45.4%	86	31.5%	63	23.1%



Table 29

## Directionality of Mean Differences Detected

By Post Hoc Scheffé Comparisons

Productivity Measure	C o n f l i c t   S o u r c e s				
	1	2	3	4	5
	Resources	Leadership	Obstacles	Values	Change
					General
<u>I. Group Development</u>					
Clarifying objectives		-			
Establishing routines					
Tension/Interaction		-			(- when intense) (+ when minimal)
Group Cohesion	-	-		-	-
Changing relationships	-	-		-	-
Topic agreement	+		++		+
<u>II. Overall Productivity</u>					
Complete objectives	-				
Alter inertia					+
Stimulate innovations					
Develop new programs					+
Additional funding	+		++		
Incentive to others					
District-wide change					+
Community-wide change					

\*ANOVA finding, MANOVA was insignificant.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293103720730