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 **HAWTHRONE EXPERIMENT**

In 1927, a group of researchers led by Elton Mayo and Fritz Roethlisberger of the Harvard Business School were invited to join in the studies at the Hawthorne Works of Western Electric Company, Chicago. The experiment lasted up to 1932. The Hawthorne Experiments brought out that the productivity of the employees is not the function of only physical conditions of work and money wages paid to them. Productivity of employees depends heavily upon the satisfaction of the employees in their work situation. Mayo’s idea was that logical factors were far less important than emotional factors in determining productivity efficiency. Furthermore, of all the human factors influencing employee behaviour, the most powerful were those emanating from the worker’s participation in social groups. Thus, Mayo concluded that work arrangements in addition to meeting the objective requirements of production must at the same time satisfy the employee’s subjective requirement of social satisfaction at his work place. The Hawthorne experiment consists of four parts. These parts are briefly described below:-

1. Illumination Experiment.
2. Relay Assembly Test Room Experiment.
3. Interviewing Programme.
4. Bank Wiring Test Room Experiment.

1. **Illumination Experiment:**

This experiment was conducted to establish relationship between output and illumination. When the intensity of light was increased, the output also increased. The output showed an upward trend even when the illumination was gradually brought down to the normal level. Therefore, it was concluded that there is no consistent relationship between output of workers and illumination in the factory. There must be some other factor which affected productivity.

2. **Relay Assembly Test Room Experiment:**

This phase aimed at knowing not only the impact of illumination on production but also other factors like length of the working day, rest hours, and other physical conditions. In this experiment, a small homogeneous work-group of six girls was constituted. These girls were friendly to each other and were asked to work in a very informal atmosphere under the supervision of a researcher. Productivity and morale increased considerably during the period of the experiment. Productivity went on increasing and stabilized at a high level even when all the improvements were taken away and the pre-test conditions were reintroduced. The researchers concluded that socio-psychological factors such as feeling of being important, recognition, attention, participation, cohesive work-group, and non-directive supervision held the key for higher productivity.

3. **Mass Interview Programme:**

The objective of this programme was to make a systematic study of the employees’ attitudes which would reveal the meaning which their “working situation” has for them. The researchers interviewed a large number of workers with regard to their opinions on work, working conditions and supervision. Initially, a direct approach was used whereby interviews asked questions considered important by managers and researchers. The researchers observed that the replies of the workmen were guarded. Therefore, this approach was replaced by an indirect technique, where the interviewer simply listened to what the workmen had to say. The findings confirmed the importance of social factors at work in the total work environment.

4. **Bank Wiring Test Room Experiment:**

This experiment was conducted by Roethlisberger and Dickson with a view to develop a new method of observation and obtaining more exact information about social groups within a company and also finding out the causes which restrict output. The experiment was conducted to study a group of workers under conditions which were as close as possible to normal. This group comprised of 14 workers. After the experiment, the production records of this group were compared with their earlier production records. It was observed that the group evolved its own production norms for each individual worker, which was made lower than those set by the management. Because of this, workers would produce only that much, thereby defeating the incentive system. Those workers who tried to produce more than the group norms were isolated, harassed or punished by the group. The findings of the study are:-

* Each individual was restricting output.
* The group had its own “unofficial” standards of performance.
* Individual output remained fairly constant over a period of time.
* Informal groups play an important role in the working of an organization.

**Contributions of the Hawthorne Experiment:**

Elton Mayo and his associates conducted their studies in the Hawthorne plant of the western electrical company, U.S.A., between 1927 and 1930. According to them, behavioural science methods have many areas of application in management. The important features of the Hawthorne Experiment are:-

1. A business organization is basically a social system. It is not just a techno-economic system.
2. The employer can be motivated by psychological and social wants because his behaviour is also influenced by feelings, emotions and attitudes. Thus economic incentives are not the only method to motivate people.
3. Management must learn to develop co-operative attitudes and not rely merely on command.
4. Participation becomes an important instrument in human relations movement. In order to achieve participation, effective two-way communication network is essential.
5. Productivity is linked with employee satisfaction in any business organization. Therefore management must take greater interest in employee satisfaction.
6. Group psychology plays an important role in any business organization. We must therefore rely more on informal group effort.
7. The neo-classical theory emphasizes that man is a living machine and he is far more important than the inanimate machine. Hence, the key to higher productivity lies in employee morale. High morale results in higher output.

**DETAILED EXPLANATION**

General Electric, the major manufacturer of light bulbs, had preliminary evidence that better lighting of the work place improved worker productivity, but wanted to validate these findings to sell more light bulbs, especially to businesses. GE funded the National Research Council (NRC) of the National Academy of Sciences to conduct an impartial study. AT&T's Western Electric Hawthorne plant located in Cicero, Illinois, was chosen as the laboratory. Beginning with this early test, the “Hawthorne Experiments” were a series of studies into worker productivity performed at the Cicero plant beginning in 1924 and ceasing in 1932.

**Illumination Studies, 1924 -1927**

The earliest experiment (1924) was conducted by the NRC with engineers from MIT. The study would end in 1927 with the NRC abandoning the project. The group examined the relationship between light intensity and worker efficiency. The hypothesis was that greater illumination would yield higher productivity.  Two work groups of female employees were selected for “control” and “experimental” groups. By comparing the changes on worker productivity by manipulating lighting in the experimental group with the production of the control group, the researchers could validate and measure the impact of lighting.  The study, however, failed to find any simple relationship as poor lighting and improved lighting seemed in increase productivity. Indeed, in the final stage, when the group pretended to increase lighting the worker group reported higher satisfaction.

The preliminary findings were that behaviour is not merely physiological but also psychological. This was a break with the Scientific Management School that saw work productivity as “mechanical”, and led to the decision to learn more about worker behaviour. George Pennock, Western Electric’s superintendent of inspection suggested that the reason for increased worker productivity was simply that the researchers interacted with the female employees; and, this was first time anyone had shown an interest in the workers. Basically, the workers were trying to please the researchers by continuing to increase their output and report satisfaction in the study, no matter what the intervention was. Later, the phenomenon of a researcher corrupting an experiment simply by his presence would be termed the “Hawthorne effect”.

**Relay Assembly Test Room Experiments, 1927-1929**

The NRC started an experiment to probe the unexpected findings of the Illumination study but would depart in 1927, at which time Western Electric continued the project drawing on support from Harvard researchers. An experimental group was established of five young women from the Relay Assembly room of the plant. The experiments involved the manipulation of a number of factors, to include pay incentives, length of workday and workweek, and use of rest periods, to measure impact on productivity and fatigue. Again, the relationship between pay, incentives, rest, and working hours seemed to have little effect on productivity, even when the original, more demanding conditions were re-implemented.

**Mica-Splitting Test group, 1928 – 1930**

Disturbed by the inconclusive evidence that rewards and incentives improved worker performance, a second experiment was conducted to look only at this relationship using workers in the Mica-Splitting Room. In his experiment the workers’ piece wages were held constant while work conditions were varied.  Productivity increased by about 15%. The researchers concluded that productivity was affected by non-pay considerations. Members of the research team began to develop the theory that social dynamics were the basis of worker performance.

**Plant-wide Interview program, 1928-1931**

As early findings indicated that concern for workers and willingness to listen impacted productivity, Western Electric implemented a plant-wide survey of employees to record their concerns and grievances. From 1928 to 1930, 21,000 employees were interviewed. This data would support the research of the Harvard team for years and lead them to conclude that work improved when supervisors began to pay attention to employees, that work takes place in a social context in which work and non-work considerations are important, norms and groups matter to workers.

**Bank Wiring Observation group, 1931-1932**

The final Hawthorne experiment was conducted studying 14 male workers assigned to the Bank Wiring factory. The objective was to study the dynamics of the group when incentive pay was introduced. The finding was that nothing happened! The work group had established a work “norm” – a shared expectation about how much work should be performed in a day and stuck to it, regardless of pay.  The conclusion: informal groups operate in the work environment to manage behaviour.

 **Importance of the Hawthorne Plant Studies**

Despite modern criticism that the research was flawed and that incentives played a larger role in improving worker productivity than the Hawthorne plant researchers concluded. These studies changed the landscape of management from Taylor’s engineering approach to a social sciences approach. Worker productivity would, henceforth, be interpreted predominately in the United States in terms of social group dynamics, motivation, leadership, and “human relations”.  The practice of management could not be the aloof technician of Taylor’s Scientific Management, designing the job, selecting and training the “right” worker, and rewarding for performance. The manager was an immediate part of the social system in which work is performed, responsible for leading, motivating, communicating, and designing the social milieu in which work takes place.

The studies also developed the scholars that would continue to influence the American way of thinking about management at Harvard Business School and elsewhere. Included among these researchers were:

**Elton Mayo** came to Harvard from Wharton where as a psychologist he had researched the impact of social and home life on worker performance. At the Harvard University School of Business his reputation led him to consult with the FBI and the movie industry. Mayo’s reporting of the Hawthorne experiments became the most influential in that he laid out a programmatic interpretation, which would be called the “Human Relations” approach that dominated management thinking until the 1950’s. Mayo’s views lead to the construction of manager as a leader supported by knowledge and skills to build social cooperation.

**Fritz Roethlisberger** and **W.J. Dickson** were the first to publish comprehensive findings of the Hawthorne experiments in 1937 and authored Management and the Worker in 1939, a comprehensive statement of the research and findings.  Roethlisberger, educated as an engineer, started the Harvard Industrial Research Department, were a lead researcher in the Hawthorne project and a leader in the Human Relations movement. Dickson was Chief of Employee Relations Research Department at the Hawthorne plant and an instrumental contributor to the project.

**W. Lloyd Warner**, an anthropologist who designed the group experiments, pioneered the field of social anthropology at Chicago and Michigan.  His work includes classics in the American class system and race.

**L.J. Henderson** a chemist and physiologist in charge of the Fatigue Laboratory at the Harvard Business School provided a theoretical foundation to the research. He would contribute to the development of “systems theory”, influencing management theorists Chester Barnard and George Homans. He became the first president of the History of Science Society.

This group of scholars permanently influenced the study of management and the development of Organizational Behaviour as a discipline.

**GROUP DYNAMICS**

**GROUP INTRODUCTION**

 The study of group behaviour is very important in organizational behaviour, Because managing group in organizations is more difficult than managing individuals.By understanding groups and the dynamics of group behaviour, the manager will be able to utilize groups to the mutual advantage of the group members and the organizations. Understanding group cohesiveness, the factors influencing group cohesiveness and also process of group decision making are very much essential for the manager in managing human behaviour at work. The present unit defines groups, reviews various reasons for group formation, group dynamics, group cohesiveness and types of groups in organisation.

It is the study of groups, and also a general term for group processes. Relevant to the fields of [psychology](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Psychology), [sociology](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sociology), and [communication studies](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Communication_studies), a [group](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Group_%28sociology%29) is two or more individuals who are connected to each other by social relationships.[[1]](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Group_dynamics#cite_note-0) Because they interact and influence each other, groups develop a number of dynamic processes that separate them from a random collection of individuals. These processes include norms, roles, relations, development, need to belong, social influence, and effects on behaviour.

In [organizational development](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Organizational_development) (OD), or group dynamics, the phrase "group process" refers to the understanding of the behaviour of people in groups, such as task groups, that are trying to solve a problem or make a decision. An individual with expertise in 'group process, such as a trained [facilitator](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Facilitator), can assist a group in accomplishing its objective by diagnosing how well the group is functioning as a problem-solving or decision-making entity and intervening to alter the group's operating behaviour.

Because people gather in groups for reasons other than task accomplishment, group process occurs in other types of groups such as personal growth groups (e.g. encounter groups, study groups, prayer groups). In such cases, an individual with expertise in group process can be helpful in the role of facilitator.

**According to the professional group workers:**

Is the [social status](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_status) of people within the group (i.e., senior or junior)? The group leader (or facilitator) will usually have a strong influence on the group due to his or her role of shaping the group's outcomes. This influence will also be affected by the leader's sex, race, relative age, income, appearance, and personality, as well as organizational structures and many other factors.

**DEFINITIONS OF GROUP**

 According to stephen R.Robbins, “Group as two or more individuals, interacting and interdependent, who have come together to achieve particular objectives.”

 According to Marvin, “A group is two or more persons who are interacting with one another in such a manner that each person influences and influenced by each other person.”

**DEFINITION OF GROUP DYNAMICS**

 “Group dynamics is a social process by which people interact face to face in small group”

**CHARACTERISTICS OF GROUPS**

1.STRONG DESIRE OF ASSOCIATION.

2.COHESIVENESS.

3.LEADERSHIP QUALITY.

4.AWARENESS OF MEMBERS.

5.INDIVIDUALS PROPERTIES.

**GROUP COHESIVENESS**

 Cohesiveness is a degree to which group members are attracted to each other and are motivated to stay in the same group. Cohesiveness defines the degree of cloeness that the members feel with the groups. It is understood as the extent of liking each member has towards others in the group and how far every one wants to remain as a member of the group.

**"Group cohesiveness"** is the force bringing group members closer together. Cohesiveness has two dimensions: [emotional](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emotional) (or personal) and task-related. The emotional aspect of cohesiveness, which was studied more often, is derived from the connection that members feel to other group members and to their group as a whole. That is, how much do members like to spend time with other group members? Do they look forward to the next group meeting? Task-cohesiveness refers to the degree to which group members share group goals and work together to meet these goals. That is, is there a feeling that the group works smoothly as one unit or do different people pull in different directions?

**Factors Influencing Group Cohesiveness**

The forces that push group members together can be positive (group-based rewards) or negative (things lost upon leaving the group). The main factors that influence group cohesiveness are: members’ similarity, group size, entry difficulty, group success and external competition and threats. Often, these factors work through enhancing the identification of the individual with the group she/he belongs to as well as their beliefs of how the group can fulfil their personal needs.

**Members’ Similarity**

The more group members are similar to each other on various characteristics the easier it would be to reach cohesiveness. Following Social Identity Theory, we know that people feel closer to those whom they perceive as similar to themselves in terms of external characteristics (age, ethnicity) or internal ones (values, attitudes). In addition, similar background makes it more likely that members share similar views on various issues, including group objectives, how to communicate and the type of desired leadership. In general, higher agreement among members on group rules and norms results in greater trust and less dysfunctional conflict. This, in turn, strengthens both emotional and task cohesiveness.

**Group Size**

Since it is easier for fewer people to agree on goals and to co-ordinate their work smaller groups are more cohesive than larger groups. Task cohesiveness may suffer, though, if the group lacks enough members to perform its tasks well enough.

**Entry Difficulty**

Difficult entry criteria or procedures to a group tend to present it in more exclusive light. The more elite the group is perceived to be, the more prestigious it is to be a member in that group and consequently, the more motivated members are to belong and stay in it. This is why alumni of prestigious universities tend to keep in touch for many years after they graduate.

**Group Success**

Group success, like exclusive entry, increases the value of group membership to its members and influences members to identify more strongly with the team and to want to be actively associated with it.

**External Competition and Threats**

When members perceive active competition with another group, they become more aware of members’ similarity within their group as well as seeing their group as a means to overcome the external threat or competition they are facing. Both these factors increase group cohesiveness; leaders throughout human history have been aware of this and focused the attention of their followers on conflicts with external enemies when internal cohesion was threatened. Similar effects can be brought about by facing an ‘objective’ external threat or challenge (such as natural disaster).

**Factors determine group cohesiveness**

**1.Status of the group.**

**2.Size of the group.**

**3.Inter Dependency.**

**4.Time spent together.**

**5.Leadership style.**

**6.External thetas.**

**7.Autonomy.**

**8.Communication.**

**9.Management behaviour.**

**10.Location of the group.**

**11.Previous successes.**

**12.Nature of the group.**

**ORGANIZATIONAL CONFLICT**

 Conflict exists in all organizations and it can take many forms, It may mean disagreement, hostility, contradiction or incompatibility between individuals and groups in the organzation.

**TYPES AND SOURCES OF ORGANIZATIONAL CONFLICT**

1. **Intra-Personal conflict.**

**1.Goal conflict.**

**a) Approach-approach conflict.**

**b)Approach-avoidance conflict.**

**c)Avoidance-avoidance conflict.**

**2.Role conflict.**

**a)person-role conflict.**

**b)Inter-role conflict.**

**c)Intra-sender role conflict.**

**d)Inter-sender role conflict.**

1. **Inter-personal conflict.**

**1.personality differences .**

**2.Perceptions.**

**3.Clash of values and interests.**

**4.Power and status differences.**

**5.Scarcity if resources.**

1. **Inter-group conflict.**

**1.Incompatible goals.**

**2.Task interdependence.**

**3.Resources sharing.**

**4.Joint decision-making.**

**5.Organizational ambiguities.**

**6.Introduction of changes.**

**SOCIOMETRY**

**INTRODUCTION**

 Sociometry is a technique to analyze small groups in order to establish the patterns of interactions among their members. It includes all measures of social functioning suchas attitude scales, content analysis, sociograms etc., but basically it is a method to identify certain intra-group relationship.

**BRANCHES OF SOCIOMETRY**

 The sociometry has two main branches: research sociometry, and appiled sociometry. Research sociometry is action research with groups exploring the socio-emotional networks of relationships usingspecified criteria e.g Who in this group do you want to sit beside you at work? Who in the group do you go to for advice on a work problem? Sometimes called network explorations, research sociometry is concerned with relational patterns in small and large populations, such as organizations abd neighborhood. APPLIED sociometrists utilise a range of methods to assist people and groups review, expand and develop their existing psycho-social networks of relationships.

**SOCIOMETRY INTERVENTIONS RESULT**

* They confirm the inner structure of this group
* Group members feel more united within themselves, and warm up to progressive roles/behaviour
* The group re-defines itself; group member’s relationships are strengthened enabling them to be more productive.

**Conflict**

 In psychology, a struggle resulting from incompatible or opposing needs, drives, wishes, or demands. Interpersonal conflict represents such a struggle between two or more people, while internal conflict is a mental struggle. A child experiencing internal conflict, for example, may be dependent on his mother but fear her because she is rejecting and punitive. Conflicts that are not readily resolved may cause the person to suffer helplessness and [anxiety](http://encyclopedia2.thefreedictionary.com/anxiety).

**DEFINITION**

Friction or opposition resulting from actual or perceived differences or incompatibilities Conflict may have negative as well as positive [characteristics](http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/characteristic.html).

**Types of Conflict**

By evaluating a conflict according to the five categories below -- relationship, data, interest, structural and value -- we can begin to determine the causes of a conflict and design resolution strategies that will have a higher probability of success.

**Relationship Conflicts**

Relationship conflicts occur because of the presence of strong negative emotions, misperceptions or stereotypes, poor communication or miscommunication, or repetitive negative behaviours. Relationship problems often fuel disputes and lead to an unnecessary escalating spiral of destructive conflict. Supporting the safe and balanced expression of perspectives and emotions for acknowledgment (not agreement) is one effective approach to managing relational conflict.

**Data Conflicts**

Data conflicts occur when people lack information necessary to make wise decisions, are misinformed, disagree on which data is relevant, interpret information differently, or have competing assessment procedures. Some data conflicts may be unnecessary since they are caused by poor communication between the people in conflict. Other data conflicts may be genuine incompatibilities associated with data collection, interpretation or communication. Most data conflicts will have "data solutions."

**Interest Conflicts**

Interest conflicts are caused by competition over perceived incompatible needs. Conflicts of interest result when one or more of the parties believe that in order to satisfy his or her needs, the needs and interests of an opponent must be sacrificed. Interest-based conflict will commonly be expressed in positional terms. A variety of interests and intentions underlie and motivate positions in negotiation and must be addressed for maximized resolution. Interest-based conflicts may occur over substantive issues (such as money, physical resources, time, etc.); procedural issues (the way the dispute is to be resolved); and psychological issues (perceptions of trust, fairness, desire for participation, respect, etc.). For an interest-based dispute to be resolved, parties must be assisted to define and express their individual interests so that all of these interests may be jointly addressed. Interest-based conflict is best resolved through the maximizing integration of the parties' respective interests, positive intentions and desired experiential outcomes.

**Structural Conflicts**

Structural conflicts are caused by forces external to the people in dispute. Limited physical resources or authority, geographic constraints (distance or proximity), time (too little or too much), organizational changes, and so forth can make structural conflict seem like a crisis. It can be helpful to assist parties in conflict to appreciate the external forces and constraints bearing upon them. Structural conflicts will often have structural solutions. Parties' appreciation that a conflict has an external source can have the effect of them coming to jointly address the imposed difficulties.

**Value Conflicts**

Value conflicts are caused by perceived or actual incompatible belief systems. Values are beliefs that people use to give meaning to their lives. Values explain what is "good" or "bad,""right" or "wrong," "just" or "unjust." Differing values need not cause conflict. People can live together in harmony with different value systems. Value disputes arise only when people attempt to force one set of values on others or lay claim to exclusive value systems that do not allow for divergent beliefs. It is of no use to try to change value and belief systems during relatively short and strategic mediation interventions. It can, however, be helpful to support each participant's expression of their values and beliefs for acknowledgment by the other party.

**The Five Most Common Types of Conflict in the Workplace**

1. **Interdependence Conflicts**. A person's job depends on someone else's co-operation, output or input. For example a sales-person is constantly late inputting the monthly sales figures which causes the accountant to be late with her reports.
2. **Differences in Style.**[People's style for completing a job can differ.](http://www.leadership-and-motivation-training.com/disc.html) For example, one person may just want to get the work done quickly (task oriented), while another is more concerned about having it done a particular way e.g. artistic or by including other people in the project.
3. **Differences in Background/Gender.** Conflicts can arise between people because of differences in [educational backgrounds, personal experiences, ethnic heritage, gender and political preferences](http://www.align-lead-inspire.com/public/72.cfm).
4. **Differences in Leadership**. [Leaders have different styles.](http://www.leadership-and-motivation-training.com/articles-on-leadership.html) Employees who change from one supervisor to another can become confused, for example one leader may be more open and inclusive whilst another may be more directives.
5. **Personality Clashes.** These types of conflict in the workplace are often fuelled by emotion and perceptions about somebody else's motives and character. For example a team leader jumps on someone for being late because she perceives the team member as being lazy and inconsiderate. The team member sees the team leader as out to get him.

**CONFLICT RESOLUTION**

**One way to peacefully resolve conflict is for each side**

* to come together voluntarily
* to work cooperatively on the issues
* under the guidance of a trained facilitator

**Conflict resolution should be a voluntary process that**

* reflects the school's values if applied throughout the school
* is also modelled and followed by teachers, administrators, and staff
* will fail if perceived as a process for students only

**The following process should be under the guidance of a trained facilitator.
Bring your conflicted parties together in a private location, and:**

* Gather information:  identify key issues without making accusations
* Focus on what the issues are, not who did what
* Avoid accusations, finding fault, calling names

**A Conflict Resolution Process**

Based on these approaches, a starting point for dealing with conflict is to identify the overriding conflict style employed by yourself, your team or your organization.

Over time, people's conflict management styles tend to mesh, and a "right" way to solve conflict emerges. It's good to recognize when this style can be used effectively, however make sure that people understand that different styles may suit different situations.

Look at the circumstances, and think about the style that may be appropriate.

Then use the process below to resolve the conflict:

**Step One: Set the Scene**

If appropriate to the situation, agree the rules of the [IBR Approach](http://www.mindtools.com/pages/article/newLDR_81.htm#irb) (or at least consider using the approach yourself.) Make sure that people understand that the conflict may be a mutual problem, which may be best resolved through discussion and negotiation rather than through raw aggression.

If you are involved in the conflict, emphasize the fact that you are presenting your perception of the problem. Use [active listening](http://www.mindtools.com/CommSkll/ActiveListening.htm) skills to ensure you hear and understand other's positions and perceptions.

* Restate.
* Paraphrase.
* Summarize.

And make sure that when you talk, you're using an adult, [assertive](http://www.mindtools.com/stress/pp/Assertiveness.htm) approach rather than a submissive or aggressive style.

**Step Two: Gather Information**

Here you are trying to get to the underlying interests, needs, and concerns. Ask for the other person's viewpoint and confirm that you respect his or her opinion and need his or her cooperation to solve the problem.

Try to understand his or her motivations and goals, and see how your actions may be affecting these.

Also, try to understand the conflict in objective terms: Is it affecting work performance? Damaging the delivery to the client? Disrupting team work? Hampering decision-making? Or so on. Be sure to focus on work issues and leave personalities out of the discussion.

* Listen with empathy and see the conflict from the other person's point of view.
* Identify issues clearly and concisely.
* Use "I" statements.
* Remain flexible.
* Clarify feelings.

**Step Three: Agree the Problem**

This sounds like an obvious step, but often different underlying needs, interests and goals can cause people to perceive problems very differently. You'll need to agree the problems that you are trying to solve before you'll find a mutually acceptable solution.

Sometimes different people will see different but interlocking problems – if you can't reach a common perception of the problem, then at the very least, you need to understand what the other person sees as the problem.

**Step Four: Brainstorm Possible Solutions**

If everyone is going to feel satisfied with the resolution, it will help if everyone has had fair input in generating solutions. Brainstorm possible solutions, and be open to all ideas, including ones you never considered before.

**Step Five: Negotiate a Solution**

By this stage, the conflict may be resolved: Both sides may better understand the position of the other, and a mutually satisfactory solution may be clear to all.

However you may also have uncovered real differences between your positions. This is where a technique like [win-win negotiation](http://www.mindtools.com/CommSkll/NegotiationSkills.htm) can be useful to find a solution that, at least to some extent, satisfies everyone.

**Understanding the Theory: Conflict Styles**

In the 1970s Kenneth Thomas and Ralph Kilmann identified five main styles of dealing with conflict that vary in their degrees of cooperativeness and assertiveness. They argued that people typically have a preferred conflict resolution style. However they also noted that different styles were most useful in different situations. They developed the Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument (TKI) which helps you to identify which style you tend towards when conflict arises.

Thomas and Kilmann's styles are:

**Competitive:** People who tend towards a competitive style take a firm stand, and know what they want. They usually operate from a position of power, drawn from things like position, rank, expertise, or persuasive ability. This style can be useful when there is an emergency and a decision needs to be make fast; when the decision is unpopular; or when defending against someone who is trying to exploit the situation selfishly. However it can leave people feeling bruised, unsatisfied and resentful when used in less urgent situations.

**Collaborative:** People tending towards a collaborative style try to meet the needs of all people involved. These people can be highly assertive but unlike the competitor, they cooperate effectively and acknowledge that everyone is important. This style is useful when you need to bring together a variety of viewpoints to get the best solution; when there have been previous conflicts in the group; or when the situation is too important for a simple trade-off.

**Compromising:** People who prefer a compromising style try to find a solution that will at least partially satisfy everyone. Everyone is expected to give up something and the compromiser him- or she also expects to relinquish something. Compromise is useful when the cost of conflict is higher than the cost of losing ground, when equal strength opponents are at a standstill and when there is a deadline looming.

**Accommodating:** This style indicates a willingness to meet the needs of others at the expense of the person's own needs. The accommodator often knows when to give in to others, but can be persuaded to surrender a position even when it is not warranted. This person is not assertive but is highly cooperative. Accommodation is appropriate when the issues matter more to the other party, when peace is more valuable than winning, or when you want to be in a position to collect on this "favour" you gave. However people may not return favours, and overall this approach is unlikely to give the best outcomes.

**Avoiding:** People tending towards this style seek to evade the conflict entirely. This style is typified by delegating controversial decisions, accepting default decisions, and not wanting to hurt anyone's feelings. It can be appropriate when victory is impossible, when the controversy is trivial, or when someone else is in a better position to solve the problem. However in many situations this is a weak and ineffective approach to take. Once you understand the different styles, you can use them to think about the most appropriate approach (or mixture of approaches) for the situation you're in. You can also think about your own instinctive approach, and learn how you need to change this if necessary.

Ideally you can adopt an approach that meets the situation, resolves the problem, respects people's legitimate interests, and mends damaged working relationships.

**Conflict Resolution Techniques in the Workplace**

**listen and then Speak Out:** This is a very important point that the leader should think on before taking the first step in [conflict resolution](http://www.buzzle.com/articles/conflict-resolutions/). The manager should first listen and understand the nature of conflict and then start to think about its possible solutions. If without listening to and realizing the actual situation, he does speak out something inappropriate, it may make the matter even worse.

**Have a Group Meet:** The team leader can arrange for a meeting, and discuss all that happened. In the meeting, he should give everyone a chance to speak out about their views. This is a good method of understanding what actually a reason for the conflict was. Having a group meeting is also a suitable alternative for clearing off any misunderstanding between those involved in the conflict.

**Communicate in Person:** Along with discussing the issue in the group and understanding and noting down everyone's views, the manager should also communicate in person with those involved in the conflict. In this manner, he as a leader can make the persons understand about the bad results of the conflict, if it is not resolved as soon as possible.

**Do not be Partial:** If you are the person who is trying to resolve the conflict, you should make sure that you are not partial to any particular person. If you are partial to one person, you will in no way be able to reach the right decision which will lead to an end to the matter. Trying and thinking from all angles and then accessing the situation will certainly make the situation better than worse.

**Do not Postpone Conflict Resolution:** In order to not have the conflict affect the [employee performance](http://www.buzzle.com/articles/employee-performance/), a manager should address the conflict on topmost priority. It becomes very difficult if the conflict has been in the air for a while, and then it is tried to be resolved. Make sure that you do not come to a wrong decision, just to solve the problem as soon as possible.

**Give Examples of Teamwork:** One of the most effective conflict resolution techniques is to motivate the employees about what they are there for. The leader needs to present examples of successful projects when all members worked as a team. This will really make the employees think about the importance of working in a team. And this may finally make the [workplace conflict](http://www.buzzle.com/editorials/3-5-2005-66648.asp) fade away.

These are few conflict resolution techniques that are mostly used in the corporate world. When [handling conflicts](http://www.buzzle.com/articles/handling-conflicts.html), you also should consider the policies and regulations of the organization. Whatever decision you take, make sure you handle the problem with a truly professional attitude that harmonizes the relations among all the employees.

**WHAT IS SOCIOMETRY?**

      The word Sociometry comes from the Latin “socials,” meaning social and the Latin “met rum,” meaning measure.    As these roots imply, Sociometry is a way of measuring the degree of relatedness among people.  Measurement of relatedness can be useful not only in the assessment of behaviour within groups, but also for interventions to bring about positive change and for determining the extent of change.  For a work group, Sociometry can be a powerful tool for reducing conflict and improving communication because it allows the group to see itself objectively and to analyze its own dynamics.  It is also a powerful tool for assessing dynamics and development in groups devoted to therapy or training.

      Jacob Levy Moreno coined the term Sociometry and conducted the first long-range Sociometry study from 1932-38 at the New York State Training School for Girls in Hudson, New York.  As part of this study, Moreno used Sociometry techniques to assign residents to various residential cottages.  He found that assignments on the basis of Sociometry substantially reduced the number of runaways from the facility. (Moreno, 1953, p. 527)  Many more Sociometry studies have been conducted since, by Moreno and others, in settings including other schools, the military, therapy groups, and business corporations.

      A useful working definition of Sociometry is that it is a methodology for tracking the energy vectors of interpersonal relationships in a group.   It shows the patterns of how individuals associate with each other when acting as a group toward a specified end or goal (Criswell in Moreno, 1960, p. 140).  Moreno himself defined Sociometry as “the mathematical study of psychological properties of populations, the experimental technique of and the results obtained by application of quantitative methods” (Moreno, 1953, pp. 15-16).

Sociometry is based on the fact that people make choices in interpersonal relationships. Whenever people gather, they make choices--where to sit or stand; choices about who is perceived as friendly and who not, who is central to the group, who is rejected, who is isolated.  As Moreno says, “Choices are fundamental facts in all ongoing human relations, choices of people and choices of things.  It is immaterial whether the motivations are known to the chooser or not; it is immaterial whether [the choices] are inarticulate or highly expressive, whether rational or irrational.  They do not require any special justification as long as they are spontaneous and true to the self of the chooser.  They are facts of the first existential order.” (Moreno, 1953, p. 720)

**SOCIOMETRIC CRITERIA**

      Choices are always made on some basis or criterion.  The criterion may be subjective, such as an intuitive feeling of liking or disliking a person on first impression.  The criterion may be more objective and conscious, such as knowing that a person does or does not have certain skills needed for the group task.

      When members of a group are asked to choose others in the group based on specific criteria, everyone in the group can make choices and describe why the choices were made.  From these choices a description emerges of the networks inside the group. A drawing, like a map, of those networks is called a sociogram.  The data for the sociogram may also be displayed as a table or matrix of each person’s choices.  Such a table is called a sociomatrix.

**A SIMPLE EXAMPLE**

      A simple example of applied Sociometry is to have group members make a selection on the basis of a simple, non-threatening criterion.  Ask everyone in the group to stand up and then say: “Who in this group would you choose to take sandwich orders from everyone in this room, go to the store, and come back with the right sandwiches and the right change?   Show your choice by placing your right hand on the shoulder of the person you choose.  Move about the room as you need to in order to make your choice.  There are only two requirements: (1) you may choose only one person and (2) you must choose someone.”  Typically the group members will make their choices after only a little hesitation.

      This exercise may be repeated several times in the period of just a few minutes using different criteria each time. The exercise graphically illustrates not only the social reality of choice-making, but also the fact that different criteria evoke different patterns of choices.  The sandwich money criterion would probably identify someone who is good with details.  An intuitive, big picture, future-oriented person would be likely to be identified by this criterion: “If you had to project a new cultural phenomenon, unheard of at this point in time, whom in this room would you ask for information?”

      Regardless of the criterion, the person who receives the most hands on his or her shoulder is what is known as the Sociometry star for that specific criterion. Other Sociometry relationships which may be observed are mutual’s , where two people choose each other; chains, where person A chooses person B who chooses person C who chooses person D and so on; and gaps or cleavages when clusters of people have chosen each other but no one in any cluster has chosen anyone in any other cluster.

      Here are some other sample criteria that could be used for this exercise:  Whom in this room would you choose…

* 1. For advice on repairing the transmission of your car?
	2. To generate creative ideas?
	3. For support in taking risks?
	4. To relay messages accurately?
	5. For help in dealing with a difficult client?
	6. To run a business for profit?
	7. To get reliable information on top management decisions?
	8. To keep a confidence?
	9. Who gives recognition for a job well done?
	10. Who has shown the most growth in the past year?

      This "hands-on" exercise can be very helpful for teaching a group about Sociometry and about the reality of the informal organization.  While the group is in each pattern, the consultant can ask the group to describe the pattern, how the pattern reflects “real life”, and what the group would need to do to close up any cleavages. Participants learn very quickly and concretely about the informal organization underlying their formal organization.  As one participant said, “It shows how we really feel, but we don’t say it very often.”

**GROUP NORMS**

      **NORMS Definition:**

      The rules of behaviour that are part of the ideology of the group Norms tend to reflect the values of the group and specify those actions that are proper and those that are inappropriate, as well as rewards for adherence and the punishment for conformity.

      **GROUP NORMS:**

               Behaviour norms applied to group members. Group norms are extremely important in determining group behaviours and how they will conform to management goals.

             Group norms are the informal rules that groups adopt to regulate members' behaviour. Norms are characterized by their evaluative nature; that is, they refer to what should be done. Norms represent value judgments about appropriate behaviour in social situations. Although they are infrequently written down or even discussed, norms have powerful influence on group behaviour. If each individual in a group decided how to behave in each interaction, no one would be able to predict the behaviour of any group member; chaos would reign. Norms guide behaviour and reduce ambiguity in groups.

**Supervision**

**Definition:** [The](http://ardictionary.com/The/2611) [act](http://ardictionary.com/Act/1734) [of](http://ardictionary.com/Of/869) [overseeing;](http://ardictionary.com/Overseeing/3910) inspection; [superintendence;](http://ardictionary.com/Superintendence/18920) [oversight.](http://ardictionary.com/Oversight/3946)

**Definition:** [management](http://ardictionary.com/Management/1061) [by](http://ardictionary.com/By/9543) [overseeing](http://ardictionary.com/Overseeing/3910) [the](http://ardictionary.com/The/2611) [performance](http://ardictionary.com/Performance/3914) [or](http://ardictionary.com/Or/1924) [operation](http://ardictionary.com/Operation/1617) [of](http://ardictionary.com/Of/869) [a](http://ardictionary.com/A/1) [person](http://ardictionary.com/Person/4420) [or](http://ardictionary.com/Or/1924)  [group](http://ardictionary.com/Group/4562)

**High Support**

**Pastoral Style**

* Low structure and high support
* Candidate has personal low management skill but takes advantage of all the support facilities that are on offer
* Supervisor provides considerable personal care and support but not necessarily in a task-driven, directive capacity

**Contractual Style**

* High structure and high support
* Candidate highly motivated and able to take direction and to act on own initiative
* Supervisor able to administer direction and exercises good management skills and interpersonal relationships

**Low Support**

**Laissez-faire Style**

* Low structure low support
* Candidate has limited levels of motivation and management skills
* Supervisor is non-directive and not committed to high levels of personal interaction
* Supervisor may appear uncaring and uninvolved

**Directorial Style**

* High structure and low support
* Candidate highly motivated and sees the necessity to take advantage of engaging in high structural activities such as setting objectives, completing and submitting work on time on own initiative without taking advantage of institutional support
* Supervisor has a close and regular interactive relationship with the candidate, but avoids non-task issues

**Low Structure**

**High Structure**

**CHARACTERISTICS OF SUPERVISORS**

Good supervisors seem to have many of the same qualities of good teachers and good practitioners. They are empathic, genuine, open, and flexible. They respect their supervisees as persons and as developing professionals, and are sensitive to individual differences (e.g., gender, race, and ethnicity) of supervisees. They also are comfortable with the authority and evaluative functions inherent in the supervisor role, giving clear and frequent indications of their evaluation of the counsellor’s performance. Even more, good supervisors really enjoy supervision, are committed to helping the supervisee grow, and show commitment to the supervision enterprise by their preparation for and involvement in supervision sessions. These supervisors show high levels of conceptual functioning, have a clear sense of their own strengths and limitations as a supervisor, and can identify how their personal traits and interpersonal style may affect the conduct of supervision. Finally, good supervisors have a sense of humour which helps both the supervisor and supervisee get through rough spots in their work together and achieve a healthy perspective on their work. Such personal traits and relationship factors are considered as significant as technical prowess in supervision.

In terms of professional characteristics (roles and skills), good supervisors are knowledgeable and competent practitioners and supervisors. They have extensive training and wide experience in the field, which have helped them achieve a broad perspective of the work. They can effectively employ a variety of supervision interventions, and deliberately choose from these interventions based on their assessment of a supervisee's learning needs, learning style, and personal characteristics. They seek ongoing growth in counselling and supervision through continuing education activities, self-evaluation, and feedback from supervisees, clients, other supervisors, and colleagues.

Good supervisors also have the professional skills of good teachers (e.g., applying learning theory, developing sequential short-term goals, evaluating interventions and supervisee learning) and they are good consultants (e.g., objectively assessing problem situation, providing alternative interventions and/or conceptualizations of problem or client, facilitating supervisee brainstorming of alternatives, collaboratively developing strategies for supervisee and client growth). In fact, good supervisors are able to function effectively in the roles of teacher, practitioner, and consultant, making informed choices about which role to employ at any given time with a particular supervisee.

**DEVELOPMENT OF THE SUPERVISOR**

Existing models of supervisor development (Alonso, 1983; Hess, 1986; Stoltenberg & Dilworth, 1987) give brief descriptions of supervisor stages of growth, and are quite different in their theoretical perspectives. Two assume that supervisors receive no training for their role, but change with experience and age. Only a few researchers have investigated novice supervisors; even fewer have conducted comparison studies of novice and experienced supervisors. These writings provide a fairly consistent profile of novices, but little information is available about how novices learn about supervision and develop a supervisor identity, how they think and behave at various stages of development, and what factors encourage (and discourage) their development.

In general, novices are characterized as self-doubtful, apprehensive about being evaluative or confronting, tending to be highly supportive and/or didactic, concrete, structured, and task-oriented. There is little flexibility in approach, with novices relying on their more familiar practice skills and focusing more on the client and client-worker dynamics than on counsellor development. Novice supervisors also seem to have personalized supervision styles that remain stable across supervisees.

Perhaps surprisingly, comparison studies have yielded few differences between novices and experienced supervisors. In general, more experienced supervisors seem to use more teaching and sharing behaviours, and they and their supervisees are more active. Ratings of effectiveness, however, find novices to be equally as effective as experienced supervisors.

There are several plausible explanations for these results. First, novices typically supervise beginning workers, which may be the pairing that allows novices to be and/or to be seen as most effective by their supervisees. Second, "experienced" supervisors in these studies often are relatively inexperienced and, most importantly, typically have received no training in supervision. In other words, comparisons of inexperienced and experienced are not representative of comparisons of novice and expert. In fact, the expert supervisor has yet to be described empirically, particularly in terms of their actual behaviours and conceptual skills.

**CONCLUSION**

One joy and challenge of being a supervisor is the necessity of using skills from a variety of professional roles and knowing when to use each one. I must draw on my teaching, practice, and consultation background, but integrate them in a unique way. During one supervision hour I may be highly structured; at the next, I may deliberately avoid giving suggestions. With each I am operating on today's goals within a larger context of long-term development.

A second challenge is the necessity of attending to several different levels at the same time. I am responsible for what happens to the client and to the supervisee. I must be aware of worker-client dynamics, supervisor-supervisee dynamics, and any similarities between them. I must think about what the client needs, then determine how I can help the worker provide that for the client. I must consider the impact of the client on the front line worker, client on supervisor, worker on client, and supervisee on supervisor, in addition to the supervisor's impact on worker and client. I must assess the worker's readiness for my intervention, taking into account a myriad of factors (e.g., developmental level, skill level, anxiety and typical ways of handling anxiety, motivation, learning style, response to authority figures, etc.). I must maintain an optimum balance of challenge and support during the supervision session and across time. I have to be aware of all of these dynamics and then, almost instantaneously, create an elegant response.

As a novice supervisor, these were the exhilarating aspects of my new professional role, and they are the aspects that those I work with repeatedly cite as the great fun in doing supervision. When I think back to time spent with my own good supervisors, this is, gratefully, what I received. Today, as an experienced supervisor, these are the standards I set for myself — and sometimes achieve. And, as a supervisor educator, these are the measures I offer supervisor trainees so that they, too, can become "good supervisors."