

ROLE OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE IN MEDIATING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF TEAM-BUILDING FOR CONFLICT RESOLUTION

Ms. M. Jeena Verghese

*Ph.D Scholar, Department of Economics
VELS Institute of Science, Technology and Advanced Studies
Chennai*

Dr. R. Premalatha

*Assistant Professor, Department of Economics
VELS Institute of Science, Technology and Advanced Studies
Chennai*

Abstract

This study aims the crucial role of teamwork in conflict resolution and its impact on improving organizational productivity. In contemporary organizations, conflicts are inevitable due to diverse workforces, varying perspectives, and high-stress environments and the effective teamwork can transform these conflicts into opportunities for growth and innovation rather than allowing them to disrupt productivity. The research explores how collaborative efforts among team members can address and resolve conflicts constructively, leading to enhanced communication, trust, and overall efficiency.

The study is grounded in a comprehensive review of literature on conflict resolution strategies, emphasizing the importance of a team-oriented approach. Data was collected through surveys from various industries, focusing on their experiences with conflict within teams and the outcomes of those conflicts on productivity. The research highlights specific teamwork techniques, such as mediation, collaborative negotiation, and consensus-building, that are instrumental in mitigating conflicts. These techniques encourage team members to view conflicts as a shared challenge rather than a personal battle, promoting a culture of collaboration rather than competition. The study also identifies potential barriers to successful teamwork in conflict resolution, including power dynamics, lack of trust, and insufficient training in conflict management.

Keywords: *Teamwork, Conflict Resolution, Organizational Productivity, Management.*

Introduction

In today's dynamic and competitive business environment, organizations are increasingly recognizing the importance of teamwork as a cornerstone for achieving success. As businesses grow and diversify, the complexity of tasks and the interdependence among employees intensify, making effective teamwork more critical than ever. However, with this increased interaction comes a higher likelihood of conflicts arising within teams. These conflicts, if not managed properly, can lead to decreased productivity, low employee morale, and even turnover, posing significant challenges to organizational efficiency and effectiveness.

Conflict in organizations is almost inevitable due to various factors such as differences in personality, communication styles, cultural backgrounds, and work ethics. When individuals with diverse perspectives and skills come together to achieve common goals, disagreements are bound to occur. These conflicts, while often seen as negative, can also serve as opportunities for growth and innovation if handled constructively. This is where the role of teamwork in conflict resolution becomes vital. Teamwork involves the collective effort of a group of individuals

working towards a common objective. Effective teamwork not only requires a shared vision and goals but also hinges on the ability to manage and resolve conflicts in a way that strengthens relationships and fosters a collaborative work environment. When team members are equipped with the skills and tools to address conflicts constructively, they can transform potentially disruptive situations into opportunities for learning and improvement, thereby enhancing organizational productivity. This study aims to explore the role of teamwork in conflict resolution and how it contributes to improving organizational productivity. The research is guided by the hypothesis that effective teamwork, characterized by open communication, mutual respect, and a collaborative approach to problem-solving, plays a crucial role in resolving conflicts and, as a result, leads to higher levels of productivity within organizations. The study will examine various conflict resolution strategies that are employed within teams and assess their effectiveness in different organizational contexts. Moreover, the study will delve into the challenges that teams face in conflict resolution, such as power imbalances, lack of trust, and inadequate conflict management training. Understanding these barriers will provide insights into how organizations can better support their teams in developing the skills necessary for effective conflict resolution.

Objectives of the Study

1. To Analyse the Impact of Teamwork on Conflict Resolution within Organizations
2. To Assess the Effect of Conflict Resolution on Organizational Productivity
3. To Identify the Key Factors and Challenges Affecting Teamwork in Conflict Resolution

Statement of the Problem

In the modern organizational landscape, the ability to resolve conflicts effectively is crucial for maintaining productivity and fostering a positive work environment. Conflicts are inevitable in any organization due to diverse workforces, differing opinions, and the high-pressure demands of contemporary business operations. When not managed properly, these conflicts can lead to disruptions in workflow, decreased employee morale, and ultimately, a decline in organizational productivity. Traditional approaches to conflict resolution often focus on individual mediation or hierarchical intervention, which may not always address the underlying issues or leverage the potential benefits of collaborative problem-solving. Despite the recognition of teamwork as a valuable asset in achieving organizational goals, there is often a gap in understanding how teamwork can be strategically employed to resolve conflicts and enhance productivity. Many organizations struggle to integrate effective conflict resolution mechanisms within their teams, leading to prolonged disputes, reduced collaboration, and inefficiencies that hinder overall performance. This issue is further exacerbated by challenges such as power imbalances, communication breakdowns, and a lack of training in conflict management skills.

The problem, therefore, is twofold: first, organizations need to understand how teamwork can be optimized to resolve conflicts effectively; second, there is a need to identify and overcome the barriers that prevent teams from successfully managing conflicts. Without addressing these issues, organizations risk allowing conflicts to erode team cohesion and productivity, ultimately impacting their competitiveness and success. This study seeks to address this problem by exploring the role of teamwork in conflict resolution and its impact on organizational productivity.

Methodology

Sources of Data

The primary data for the study was collected from the selected class categories of employees in 7 major departments.

Hypothesis

1. There is no significant correlation between the classification of OD interventions and the categorisation of impacts of OD interventions.
2. There is no significant association among the eight aspects of the impacts of OD interventions. •
3. There is no significant mean difference between the classification of OD intervention and the personal variables.

Research Design

This study employed descriptive research design to garner empirical details with the help of a structured questionnaire to analyse the levels.

Sampling Techniques

Stratified Proportionate Simple Random Sampling was employed in the selection of the samples. The number of employees in each class (class I, class II, class III & class IV) was considered as 'strata' and proportionately the samples were selected from each class of 4 class categories.

Analysis and Interpretation Data

The collected and collated data were codified, fed into the computer and analysed. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences was used for data feeding and analysis. The analysed tables and statistical tests were presented with suitable interpretation. Frequency distribution, correlations, ANOVA, T-test were administered and presented.

Gender of the Respondents Vs Departments of the Respondents

Table 1 illustrates the gender of the respondents corresponding to the department of the respondents. Nearly nine-tenth of the respondents was males. Just one-tenth of the respondents were females.

**Table - 1 Gender of the Respondents corresponding to the
Department of the Respondents**

Department	Gender		Total
	Male	Female	
Administration	13 (43.3%) 4.9%	17 (56.7%) 53.1%	30 (100.0%) 10.0%
Civil Engineering	34 (89.5%) 12.7%	4 (10.5%) 12.5%	38 (100.0%) 12.7%

Finance	10 (55.6%) 3.7%	8 (44.4%) 25.0%	18 (100.0%) 6.0%
Maintenance & Conservation	75 (100.0%) 28.0%	0 (.0%) .0%	75 (100.0%) 25.0%
Marine	44 (100.0%) 16.4%	0 (.0%) .0%	44 (100.0%) 14.7%
Mechanical Engineering	51 (100.0%) 19.0%	0 (.0%) .0%	51 (100.0%) 17.0%
Traffic	41 (93.2%) 15.3%	3 (6.8%) 9.4%	44 (100.0%) 14.7%
Total	268 (89.3%) 100.0%	32 (10.7%) 100.0%	300 (100.0%) 100.0%

The data with the parentheses show the row percentage and the data without the parentheses display the column percentage.

Table – 2 Age of the Respondents verses Class Category of the Respondents

Age	Class Category				Total
	Class I	Class II	Class III	Class IV	
Below 25 years	0 (.0%) .0%	0 (.0%) .0%	8 (100.0%) 4.6%	0 (.0%) .0%	8 (100.0%) 2.7%
25-35years	1 (1.0%) 5.9%	0 (.0%) .0%	62 (59.6%) 35.6%	41 (39.4%) 42.7%	104 (100.0%) 34.7%
35-45 years	0 (.0%) .0%	0 (.0%) .0%	54 (58.7%) 31.0%	38 (41.3%) 39.6%	92 (100.0%) 30.7%
45-55 years	8 (22.2%) 47.1%	8 (22.2%) 61.5%	16 (44.4%) 9.2%	4 (11.1%) 4.2%	36 (100.0%) 12.0%
Above 55 years	8 (13.3%) 47.1%	5 (8.3%) 38.5%	34 (56.7%) 19.5%	13 (21.7%) 13.5%	60 (100.0%) 20.0%
Total	17 (5.7%) 100.0%	13 (4.3%) 100.0%	174 (58.0%) 100.0%	96 (32.0%) 100.0%	300 (100.0%) 100.0%

The data with the parentheses show the row percentage and the data without the parentheses display the column percentage.

Of the total respondents, a substantial proportion of them (34.7%) were in the age range of 25 to 35 years and of who around three-fifth of them were positioned in the Class III category. Among the age categories, the least number of the respondents (2.7%) were observed in the age below 25 years. Absolutely, all these youth respondents were in the Class III categories. The analyzed data discloses the fact a good proportion of the employees are in the active age group and which is the potential strength for the organization.

Table -3 Years of Work Experience of the Respondents

S. No.	Experience	Frequency	Percent
1	Below 3 years	64	21.3
2	3-10 years	44	14.7
3	11-25 years	76	25.3
4	above 26 years	116	38.7
Total		300	100.0

A significant proportion of the respondents (64%) had work experience more than 10 years. Around 36 percent of the respondents had work experience less than 10 years. As reflected in the table, the Port Trust had more experienced employees. It could be recommended that the work experience of the seniors be shared with the juniors in order to improve the organizational effectiveness and efficiency.

Table – 4 Views of the Respondents about Sensitivity Training Programmes

S.No.	Statements	SA	A	D	SD	Total
1	I have participated in many sensitivity training programmes organised by the company.	32 (10.7%)	192 (64.0%)	52 (17.3%)	24 (8.0%)	300 (100%)
2	The quality of the sensitivity training programmes is excellent.	32 (10.7%)	56 (18.7%)	136 (45.3%)	76 (25.3%)	300 (100%)
3	The sensitivity training programmes have helped me towards my personal growth.	0 (0.0%)	160 (53.3%)	56 (18.7%)	84 (28.0%)	300 (100%)
4	The sensitivity training programmes have helped me to improve the job performance.	32 (10.7%)	132 (44.0%)	84 (28.0%)	52 (17.3%)	300 (100%)
5	The sensitivity training programmes have helped me to understand and appreciate the differences in other people.	0 (0.0%)	248 (82.7%)	0 (0.0%)	52 (17.3%)	300 (100%)
6	The sensitivity training programmes have helped me to develop a genuine closeness to each other in a relatively short period of time.	32 (10.7%)	132 (44.0%)	84 (28.0%)	52 (17.3%)	300 (100%)

Most of the respondents (74.7%) had concurred with the statement that they participated in many sensitivity training programmes of the company. Around one- fourth of the respondents had not frequently participated in the sensitivity training programmes. Around seven-tenth of

the respondents disagreed with the statement that the quality of the sensitivity programmes is excellent. Contrarily, around 29.4% of the respondents agreed with the same assertion. More than half of the respondents had agreed upon the statement that the sensitivity training enabled them towards their personal growth. Around 46.7% of the respondents disagreed with the same statement. Most respondents (54.7%) agreed on that the sensitivity training programmes had helped them to improve their job performance; however, this statement was ignored by 45.3% of the respondents. The sensitivity training programmes enabled a large majority of the respondents (82.7%) to understand and appreciate the differences in other people. Contrarily, this statement was refused by 17.3% of the respondents. Most respondents (54.7%) had accepted that the sensitivity training programmes helped them to develop a genuine closeness to each other in a relatively short period of time. Around 45.3% of the respondents had denied the same assertion. From the above analyzed data it could be inferred that most respondents had positive views about the sensitivity training programmes conducted by the company.

Table 5 Opinion of the Respondents about Conflict Management

S.No.	Statements	SA	A	D	SD	Total
1	The management entails collaborative strategies which is acceptable to all.	71 (23.7%)	38 (12.7%)	66 (22.0%)	125 (41.7%)	300 (100%)
2	I give my opinion to my team members when they make mistakes in job performance.	104 (34.7%)	100 (33.3%)	76 (25.3%)	20 (6.7%)	300 (100%)
3	I have found an opportunity to extract and exploit the potentials of my team.	34 (11.3%)	50 (16.7%)	110 (36.7%)	106 (35.3%)	300 (100%)
4	I often confront my team for Controversial topics.	70 (23.3%)	35 (11.7%)	112 (37.3%)	83 (27.7%)	300 (100%)
5	My team faces conflicts among the members during the discussions.	68 (22.7%)	124 (41.3%)	64 (21.3%)	44 (14.7%)	300 (100%)
6	Team members quickly and genuinely apologize to one another when they say or do something inappropriate or possibly damaging to the team.	108 (36.0%)	140 (46.7%)	38 (12.7%)	14 (4.7%)	300 (100%)

Conflict Management

Resolving unhealthy conflicts and fostering healthy conflicts are the prime components of conflict management (McLean, 2006). Table5 presents the opinion of the respondents about conflict management. Many respondents (63.7%) had refuted the statement that the management entails collaborative strategies which are acceptable to all. However, this statement was accepted by 36.3% of the respondents. A considerable proportion of the respondents (68%) had given opinions to their teams when they made mistakes in job performances. About 32% of the respondents had not given views to their teams when the

members failed to do job performances. A majority of the respondents (72%) did not have opportunities to tap the potentials of their teams. Around 28 % of the respondents had opportunities to extract the potentials of their teams. Of the total respondents, 65% of them had not frequently confronted their teams for controversial topics and 35% of them had often confronted their teams for controversial topics. Most respondents (64%) had experienced conflicts among their team members during the discussions. 36% of the respondents had not undergone such conflict situations. A vast majority of the respondents (82.7%) felt that their team members quickly and genuinely apologies to one another for doing something appropriate works. This statement was denied by 17.3% of the respondents.

Management Approach

Table 6 presents the opinion of the respondents about the management approach towards the employees. Of the total respondents, 60% of them felt that they are not being respected and trusted by the management and 40% of them considered that they are respected and trusted by the management. Two-fifth of the respondents had satisfaction with the communication pattern existing between the employees and the management. Three- fifth of the respondents were dissatisfied with the communication pattern.

**Table – 6 Opinions of the Respondents about Management
 Approach towards the Employees**

S.No.	Statements	SA	A	D	SD	Total
1	I am being respected and trusted by the management.	0	120 (40%)	180 (60%)	0	300 (100%)
2	I am satisfied with the communication pattern existing between employees and the management.	0	120 (40%)	132 (44%)	48 (16%)	300 (100%)
3	I feel that a mixed social composition of employees works in my department.	24 (8%)	160 (53.3%)	68 (22.7%)	48 (16%)	300 (100%)
4	I feel that the needs of my department are being positively addressed by the management.	28 (9.3%)	176 (58.7%)	48 (16%)	48 (16%)	300 (100%)
5	My leaders are more cooperative and supportive for the execution of my job assignments.	52 (17.3%)	152 (50.7%)	48 (16%)	48 (16%)	300 (100%)
6	I feel that a democratic organizational climate exists in the company.	28 (9.3%)	108 (36%)	116 (38.7%)	48 (16%)	300 (100%)

Many respondents (61.3%) felt that a mixed social composition of employees works in their respective departments. This statement was denied by 38.7% of the respondents. Most of the respondents (68%) perceived that the management positively addressed the needs of their respective departments. Around 32% of the respondents denied the statement. The assertion that the leaders are more cooperative and supportive for the execution of the employees' job assignments was accepted by 68% of the respondents. This statement was refused by 32% of the respondents. More than half of the respondents denied the existence of a democratic organizational climate in the company. This assertion was accepted by 45.3% of the respondents.

Mean Differences between the Classification of Organizational Approach and the Job Sector Variables

The scores of the classification of organizational were examined with the job sector variables department, class category and educational qualification of the respondents to observe the significance of mean difference between variables using ANOVA and t test. Table 7 displays the significance of mean difference between the classification of organizational approach and the job sector variables. The classification of organizational approach significantly differed from the department of the respondents since the p value was lesser than 1% level of significance. Hence, there was a significant mean difference between the classification of organizational approach and the department of the respondents. The reported mean and F test discloses that the respondents working in the finance department (mean = 2.22) strongly realized that the company had a better organizational approach. There were no significant differences in other two hypothetical statements.

Table – 7 Mean Differences between the Classification of Organizational Approach and the Job Sector Variables

Variable	Item	N	Mean	Std. Dev	Df	ANOVA	Significance
Department	Administration	30	2.00	.525	6	ANOVA	**
	Civil engineering	38	1.82	.609			
	Finance	18	2.22	.428			
	Maintenance & Conservation	75	2.11	.649			
	Marine	44	1.73	.451			
	Mechanical Engineering	51	1.82	.385			
	Traffic	44	2.00	.000			
Class Category	Class I	17	2.00	.000	3	ANOVA	NS
	Class II	13	2.00	.000			
	Class III	174	1.90	.595			
	Class IV	96	2.01	.423			
Educational Qualification	UG (Technical)	90	1.91	.512	5	ANOVA	NS
	UG (Non-technical)	30	2.10	.403			
	PG (Technical)	18	1.83	.383			
	PG (Non-technical)	14	2.07	.267			
	Diploma/ITI	100	1.94	.565			
	Upto school education	48	1.94	.561			

** 0.01 level of significance * 0.05 level of significance NS – Not significant

Mean Differences between the Classification of Organizational Approach and the Job Satisfaction Variables

The classification of organizational approach viewed by the respondents (as low, moderate and high) was tested with the job satisfaction variables years of experience, extent of satisfaction with current salary and extent of satisfaction with current career situation using ANOVA. Table 7 presents the significance of mean difference between the classification of Organizational Approach perceived by the respondents and the job satisfaction variables.

Conclusion

In today's dynamic work environments, the role of teamwork in conflict resolution has become increasingly significant for improving organizational productivity. This study explored how effective teamwork contributes to resolving conflicts within organizations and its subsequent impact on productivity levels. The findings indicate that teamwork is a crucial element in mitigating conflicts, as it fosters open communication, collaboration, and a shared sense of purpose among team members. When conflicts arise, teams that operate with a high level of cohesion are better equipped to address disagreements constructively. Such teams are more likely to engage in problem-solving approaches that emphasize understanding different perspectives, leading to more innovative and effective solutions. Moreover, the study highlights that organizations with strong team-based cultures tend to experience fewer disruptions in productivity when conflicts occur. This is because teams with established trust and mutual respect can navigate conflicts more smoothly, minimizing the negative impact on workflow and morale. The collaborative efforts within teams also promote a more inclusive environment, where individuals feel valued and heard, further reducing the likelihood of conflicts escalating. Another key insight from the study is that teamwork enhances accountability and collective responsibility. When team members work together to resolve conflicts, they are more likely to take ownership of their roles in the process, leading to more sustainable resolutions. This shared responsibility not only resolves the immediate issue but also strengthens the team's ability to handle future conflicts, creating a more resilient and adaptable workforce. The study underscores the importance of fostering teamwork as a strategy for conflict resolution within organizations. By promoting teamwork, organizations can create a culture that not only addresses conflicts effectively but also leverages these situations as opportunities for growth and innovation. Ultimately, this approach leads to improved organizational productivity, as teams become more cohesive, efficient, and aligned with the organization's goals.

References

1. Boulding, K., (1963). Conflict and defense. New York: Harper and Row.
2. Wall, J., & Callister, R. (1995). Conflict and its management. *Journal of Management*, 21(3), 515-558.
3. Rahim, M. A. (2002). Toward a theory of managing organizational conflict. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 13(3), 206-235.
4. Jehn, K. (1997). A qualitative analysis of conflict types and dimensions in organizational groups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42, 530-557.
5. De Dreu, C. K. W., & Van de Vliert, E. (Eds.). (1997). *Using conflict in organizations*. London: Sage.
6. West, M. A. and Anderson N. R. (1996). 'Innovation in top management teams'. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 680-693.
7. Turner, M. E. and Pratkanis, A. R. (1994). Social identity maintenance prescriptions for preventing groupthink: Reducing identity protection and enhancing intellectual conflict *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 5, 254-270.
8. De Dreu, C., & Weingart, L. (2003). Task versus relationship conflict, team performance, and team member satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(4), 741-749.

9. Edelman, R. (1993). *Interpersonal conflicts at work*. Exeter: British Psychological Society.
10. Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviours: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 555 – 572.
11. De Dreu, C. K. W., Harinck, F., & Van Vianen, A. E. M. (1999). Conflict and performance in groups and organizations. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 14, pp. 376 – 405). Chichester, UK: Wiley.
12. Banker, R.D., Field, J.M., Schroeder, R.G. & Sinha, K.K. (1996), Impact of work teams on manufacturing performance: A longitudinal field study, *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(4), 867-890.
13. Blake, R., & Mouton, J. (1964). *The managerial grid*. Houston, TX: Gulf.
14. De Dreu, C. (1997). Productive conflict: The importance of conflict management and conflict issues. In C. de Dreu & E. Van de Vliert (Eds.), *Using conflict in organizations* (pp. 9-22). London: Sage.
15. Morrill, C., & Thomas, K. (1992). Organizational conflict-management as disputing process: The problem of social escalation. *Human Communication Research*, 18(3), 400-428.
16. Rahim, M. A. (1983). A measure of styles of handling interpersonal conflict. *Academy of Managements Journal*, 26(2), 368-376.
17. Ruble, T., & Thomas, K. (1976). Support for a two-dimensional model of conflict behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16, 143-155.
18. Desivilya, H., & Yagil, D. (2005). The role of emotions in conflict management: The case of work teams. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 16(1), 55-69.
19. Gross, M.A., & Guerrero, L.K. (2000). Managing conflict appropriately and effectively: An Application of the competence model to Rahim's organizational conflict styles. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 11(3), 200-26.
20. Lind, A., & Tyler, T. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice*. New York: Plenum Press.
21. De Dreu, C. (2006). When too little or too much hurts: Evidence for a curvilinear relationship between task conflict and innovation in teams. *Journal of Management*, 32(1), 83-107.
22. Tjosvold, D., Hui, C., & Yu, Z. (2003). Conflict management and task reflexivity for team inrole and extra-role performance in China. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 14(2), 141-163.