INTERDEPENDENCE AMONG EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND CONFLICT MANAGEMENT OF EMPLOYEES IN TECHNO PARK TRIVANDRUM, KERALA

Leeba Thomas*   Dr.A.A.Ananth**

*Ph.D Research Scholar, Department of Management Bharathiar University, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India.
**Associate Professor, Department of Business Administration, Annamalai University, Chidambaram, Tamil Nadu, India.

Abstract
Conflicts are the normal part of life, how to identify and manage conflicts effectively in the organizational context could be a daunting task. Addressing conflict should be viewed as an important element in achieving organizational effectiveness and enhancing productivity. The productivity and overall performance of these enterprises wholly or largely depend on the human resources within them. The effectiveness of individuals, teams and entire organization depends on how they manage interpersonal conflict at work. Studies have revealed that managers spend an average of 20 percent of their time managing conflict (Thomas,Maan,1992) and evidence suggests conflict and conflict management at work substantially influences individual, group organizational effectiveness. Organizations strive to develop cohesiveness and promote agreement on work environment that engenders positive thinking among the employees. However it is candidly opined that conflict among the employees' remains in some form or other. The conflicts create dissatisfaction among the employees. In the wake of such a situation, routine tasks are adversely affected than non-routine tasks.

Key Words: Emotional Intelligence, Conflict Management, Integrating Style (IS), Obliging Style (OS), Dominating Style (DS),Avoiding Style (AS) and Compromising Style (CS).

INTRODUCTION

Emotional intelligence is the ability to perceive and express emotion, assimilate emotion in thought, understand and reason with emotion, and regulate emotion in the self and others. (Mayer et.al. 2000). For Mayer emotional intelligence is the ability to understand how others' emotions work and to control one's own emotions. In the traditional management view, conflict is regarded as destructive and is eliminated or resolved only at high levels of management. This was the situation until the 1940s (Stephen, 1978). This perspective held that a concerning party will take action whenever there are disagreements of any magnitude. This is because the concerning parties are reluctant to endure any level or kind of conflict. The traditional view is easily comprehended and accepted. Conflict management is recognition and control of conflict in a rational, fair and effective way. Conflict can be managed by utilizing skills such as effective communication, problem solving and negotiation.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Alon and Higgins (2005) opined that with the current rise of globalization, both emotional and cultural intelligence has become important for cross-cultural leaders to excel. Global leaders can make the best use of emotional intelligence and maximize success when they understand and work within diverse foreign environments. This multiple intelligence framework helps to clarify adaptations to implement in leadership development programs of multinational firms. **Darolia and Darolia (2005)** studied the role of emotional intelligence in coping with stress and emotional control behavior. The research clearly established that emotionally intelligent people who are able to understand and recognize their emotions, manage themselves appropriately so that their impulsiveness and aggression is kept under control in stressful situations.**Chabungban (2005)** proposed that by developing emotional intelligence one can build a bridge between stress and better performance. The effects of stress are costly to both the organization and the employee if left unattended within a given timeframe. Regular administration of emotional intelligence abilities can help employees at workplace to control impulses and persist in the face of frustration and obstacles, prevent negative emotions from swamping the ability to think, feel motivated and confident and to accurately perceive emotions, to empathies and get along well with others.**Fahim (2005)** study about emotional intelligence relation with conflict management among operational and teaching managers in selected universities revealed that emotional intelligence is negatively associated with control style and positively associated with problem solving style whereas it is not related to bargaining style.**Keramati and Roshan(2005)** study about emotional intelligence relevance to conflict management styles demonstrated that emotional intelligence is positively associated with bargaining style. This result indicates that along with escalation in emotional intelligence tendency to use problem solving style increases in comparison to control and bargaining styles.**Conte (2014)** emphasizes that EI measures cannot be applied in the organisation unless more rigorous, predictive and incremental validity evidence for EI measures is shown. EI has been characterised by some researchers as a cognitive ability involving the cognitive processing of emotional information),which should be measured by ability-type tests .An alternative approach to EI proposes that it is a dispositional tendency, which can therefore be measured by a self-report questionnaire .

OBJECTIVE
- To identify the level of various conflict management styles of employees in Techno park, Trivandrum.

METHODOLOGY
Sampling Design: Sampling is the process of selecting a sufficient number of elements from the population. The sampling for this study will be conducted at 2 stages. Hence it is multi-stage random sampling technique.
- In the first stage 20 companies were selected randomly out of the list of total 200 companies functioning at Techno Park, Trivandrum.
- In the second stage, 20 employees were selected from the muster roll of each selected companies using simple random sampling technique so as to have a total sample size of 400.

Methods of Data Collection: The geographic domain for the study was various industries in techno park Trivandrum. The research was conducted under actual environmental conditions and the study involved no simulations. The respondents were managerial and non-managerial employees. Personally administered structured questionnaire was used for primary data collection. Secondary data was collected from peer-reviewed journals, books, conference proceedings, published theses, websites, EBSCO, J-STOR, and Google Scholar.

Statistical Tools Used: The percentage analysis with respect to all the variables of each conflict management style was made. The mean score, standard error and standard deviation were found out. The statistical significance of response was tested using Z test.
In line with the objective of the study hypothesis was set as
H_0: The employees are not able to manage organizational conflicts among peers.
The literature on organizational conflict has identified five conflict management styles:
1. Integrating Style (IS)
2. Obliging Style (OS)
3. Dominating Style (DS)
4. Avoiding Style (AS)
5. Compromising Style (CS)

To test the hypotheses, percentage analysis of responses with respect to each of the above factors was done. The statistical significance was tested using Z test. The analysis is detailed below.

Integrating Style: The factor Integrating Style includes items that indicate the extent to which the employees have concern for themselves as well as the other party when they handle their disagreement or conflict with their peers. Integrating Style contributes seven items represented serially from IS1 to IS7 as follows:

IS1 - I try to investigate an issue with my peers to find a solution acceptable to us
IS2 - I try to integrate my ideas with those of my peers to come up with a decision jointly
IS3 - I try to work with my peers to find solution to a problem that satisfies our expectations
IS4 - I exchange accurate information with my peers to solve a problem together
IS5 - I try to bring all our concerns out in the open so that the issues can be resolved in the best possible way
IS6 - I collaborate with my peers to come up with decisions acceptable to us
IS7 - I try to work with my peers for a proper understanding of a problem

The below table shows percentage analysis of conflict management with respect to Integrating Style (IS).
Conflict Management with respect to Integrating Style

Items	Strongly agree		Agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
IS1	90	22.5	220	55.0	80	20.0	8	2.0	2	.5
IS2	86	21.5	196	49.0	101	25.3	17	4.3	0	0
IS3	87	21.8	193	48.3	106	26.5	12	3.0	2	.5
IS4	84	21.0	181	45.3	114	28.5	14	3.5	7	1.8
IS5	80	20.0	192	48.0	111	27.8	14	3.5	3	.8
IS6	70	17.5	209	52.3	103	25.8	16	4.0	2	.5
IS7	85	21.3	198	49.5	103	25.8	4	1.0	10	2.5

Source: Primary data

From the table it is found that out of the total 400 respondents, 90 (22.5%) strongly agree and 220 (55.0%) agree that they exhibit Integrating Style of conflict management by trying to investigate an issue with their peers to find a solution acceptable to all of them. With respect to the item IS2 86 (21.5%) strongly agree and 196 (49.0%) agree. The table shows that 87 (21.8%) strongly agree and 193 (48.3%) agree with respect to the item IS3; 84 (21%) strongly agree and 181 (45.3%) agree with respect to the item IS4; 80 (20%) strongly agree and 192 (48%) agree with respect to the item IS5; 70 (17.5%) strongly agree and 209 (52.3%) agree with respect to the item IS6. It is found from the table that 85 (21.3%) strongly agree and 198 (49.5%) agree with respect to the item IS7.

The Mean, Standard Error, Standard Deviation and Z-Test Values of Different Items of Integrating Style of Conflict Management

Items	Average	Standard Error	Standard Deviation	Test Value = 3		
				Z	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
IS1	3.97	.037	.742	26.148	399	.000
IS2	3.88	.039	.790	22.216	399	.000
IS3	3.88	.040	.796	22.040	399	.000
IS4	3.80	.043	.869	18.467	399	.000
IS5	3.83	.041	.811	20.468	399	.000
IS6	3.82	.039	.779	21.105	399	.000
IS7	3.86	.042	.847	20.310	399	.000

Source : Primary Data

The above table shows that average score for item IS1 is 3.97. It shall vary between 3.90 and 4.04 (mean +/- 1.96*SE). It shows that the extent to which the employees try to investigate an issue with their peers to find a solution acceptable to them is greater than the mean score of 3. Z value at 5 per cent level of significance (26.148) is greater than the critical value of 1.96 and p value is less than .05. Therefore, employees were able to manage conflicts using Integrating Style with respect to the item IS1.

The average score for item IS2 is 3.88 which shall vary between 3.80 and 3.96. Since the mean score is above 3, z value at 5 percent level of significance is 22.216 which is greater than table value, and p value less than .05, it can be inferred that employees try to integrate their ideas with those of peers to come up with a decision jointly.

The table shows that the average score for IS3 is 3.88 which shall vary between 3.80 and 3.96. It shows the he mean score of respondents' opinion regarding working with their peers to find solution to a problem that satisfies their expectations is above 3. Z value at 5 per cent level of significance (22.040) is greater than the table value of 1.96 and p value is less than .05. Therefore, employees were able to manage conflicts with respect to the item IS3.

The mean score of IS4 is 3.80 which shall vary between 3.72 and 3.88 (mean +/- 1.96*SE). This is above 3, Z value is 18.467 at 5 per cent level of significance is greater than critical value of 1.96, and p value is less than .05. Hence it is inferred that employees exchange accurate information with peers to solve a problem together.

The table shows that the mean score for the item IS5 is 3.83 and it shall vary between 3.75and 3.91. This is above 3 and Z value (20.468) at 5 per cent level of significance is greater than the table value. The p value is less than .05. From the table it is found that employees try to bring all their concerns in the open so that the issues can be resolved in the best possible way.

The item IS6 in the table indicates collaboration with peers to come up with decisions acceptable to all which has an average score of 3.82. This shall vary between 3.74 and 3.90 which is above the score of 3. The calculated Z value is 21.105 at 5 per cent level of significance which is greater than the table value of 1.96. The p value is less than 0.05. Thus it is found that employees manage organizational conflict with respect to the item IS6.

From the table it is found that for IS7 the average score is 3.86 which shall vary between 3.78 and 3.94. This is above the mean score of 3. The Z value (20.310) at 5 per cent level of significance is greater than the critical value of 1.96 and the p value is less than .05. Thus the result is positive with respect to the item which means the employees manage organizational conflicts using Integrating Style by trying to work with peers for a proper understanding of a problem.

In short employees were able to manage conflicts using Integrating Style with respect to all the seven items.

Obliging Style
Obliging Style constitutes items that indicate the opinion of the respondents regarding low concern for their self and high concern for the other party involved in the conflict. This style attempts to play down the differences and emphasizes the commonalities to satisfy the concerns of the other party. Obliging Style contributes five items represented serially from OS1 to OS5 as follows:

OS1 - I generally try to satisfy the needs of my peers
OS2 - I usually accommodate the wishes of my peers
OS3 - I give in to the wishes of my peers
OS4 - I often go along with the suggestions of my peers
OS5 - I try to satisfy the expectations of my peers

The below table shows percentage analysis of conflict management with respect to Obliging Style (OS)

Conflict Management with respect to Obliging Style

Items	Strongly agree		Agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
OS1	58	14.5	188	47.0	128	32.0	11	2.8	15	3.8
OS2	33	8.3	191	47.8	149	37.3	21	5.3	6	1.5
OS3	38	9.5	156	39.0	151	37.8	34	8.5	21	5.3
OS4	84	21.0	158	39.5	125	31.3	31	7.8	2	.5
OS5	61	15.3	159	39.8	141	35.3	23	5.8	16	4.0

Source: Primary data

The above table shows that58 (14.5%) strongly agree and 188 (47.0%) agree that they manage conflicts among peers with respect to the item OS1. With respect to the item OS2 33 (8.3%) strongly agree and 191 (47.8%) agree. It is found from the table that 38 (9.5%) strongly agree and 156 (39.0%) agree with respect to the item OS3; 84 (21%) strongly agree and 158 (39.5%) agree with respect to the item OS4; 61 (15.3%) strongly agree and 159 (39.8%) agree with respect to the item OS5.

The Mean, Standard Error, Standard Deviation and Z-Test Values of Different Items of Obliging Style of Conflict Management

Items	Average	Standard Error	Standard Deviation	Test Value = 3		
				Z	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
OS1	3.66	.045	.893	14.728	399	.000
OS2	3.56	.039	.780	14.365	399	.000
OS3	3.39	.048	.957	8.153	399	.000
OS4	3.73	.045	.897	16.214	399	.000
OS5	3.57	.048	.953	11.858	399	.000

Source: Primary Data

It is understood from the table that average score for item OS1 is 3.66. It shall vary between 3.57 and 3.75 (mean +/- 1.96*SE). It shows that the respondents trail to satisfy the needs of their peersis greater than the mean score of 3. Z value at 5 per cent level of significance (14.728) is greater than the critical value of 1.96 and p value is less than .05. Therefore, employees were able to manage conflicts using Obliging Style with respect to the item OS1.

The average score for item OS2 is 3.56 and it shall vary between 3.48 and 3.64. Since the mean score is above 3, Z value at 5 percent level of significance is 14.365 which is greater than table value, and p value less than .05, it can be inferred that employees manage conflicts using Obliging Style by accommodating the wishes of their peers.

The table shows that the average score for OS3 is 3.39 which shall vary between 3.30 and 3.48. It shows the he mean score of respondents' opinion regarding the item is above 3. Z value at 5 per cent level of significance (8.153) is greater than the table value of 1.96 and p value is less than .05. Therefore, employees were able to manage conflicts with respect to the item OS3, i.e, they give in to the wishes of their peers.

The mean score of OS4 is 3.70 which shall vary between 3.61 and 3.82 (mean +/- 1.96*SE). This is above 3, Z value is 16.214 at 5 per cent level of significance is greater than critical value of 1.96, and p value is less than .05. Hence it is inferred that employees manage conflicts by going along with the suggestions of their peers.

The table also shows that the mean score for the item OS5 is 3.57 and it shall vary between 3.48and 3.66. This is above 3 and Z value (11.858) at 5 per cent level of significance is greater than the table value. The p value is less than .05. Thus it is inferred that employees try to satisfy the expectation of their peers in order to manage conflicts through Obliging Style.

In short employees were able to manage conflicts using Obliging Style with respect to all the five items.

Dominating Style

The factor Dominating Style involves high concern for the self and low concern for the other party. It is a win-lose orientation and forces behavior to win one's position. Dominating Style constitutes five items represented serially from DS1 to DS5 as follows:

DS1 - I use my influence to get my ideas accepted
DS2 - I use my authority to make a decision in my favor
DS3 - I use my expertise to make a decision in my favor
DS4 - I am generally firm in pursuing my side of the issue
DS5 - I sometimes use my power to win a competitive situation

Conflict Management with respect to Dominating Style

Items	Strongly agree		Agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
DS1	63	15.8	59	14.8	123	30.8	126	31.5	29	7.3
DS2	63	15.8	61	15.3	143	35.8	113	28.3	20	5.0
DS3	45	11.3	50	12.5	108	27.0	157	39.3	40	10.0
DS4	41	10.3	56	14.0	145	36.3	135	33.8	23	5.8
DS5	66	16.5	59	14.8	115	28.8	130	32.5	30	7.5

Source: Primary data

The table shows that 63 (15.8%) strongly agree and 59 (14.8%) agree that they manage conflicts among peers using Dominating Style with respect to the item DS1. With respect to the item DS2 63 (15.8%) strongly agree and 61 (15.3%) agree. It is found from the table that 45 (11.3%) strongly agree and 50 (12.5%) agree with respect to the item DS3; 41 (10.3%) strongly agree and 56 (14.0%) agree with respect to the item DS4; 66 (16.5%) strongly agree and 59 (14.8%) agree with respect to the item DS5.

The Mean, Standard Error, Standard Deviation and Z-Test Values of Different Items of Dominating Style of Conflict Management

Items	Average	Standard Error	Standard Deviation	Test Value = 3		
				Z	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
DS1	3.00	.059	1.177	-.042	399	.000
DS2	2.92	.056	1.123	-1.514	399	.000
DS3	3.24	.057	1.145	4.234	399	.000
DS4	3.11	.053	1.053	2.042	399	.000
DS5	3.00	.060	1.198	-.042	399	.000

Source   Primary Data

It is understood from the table that average score for item DS1 is 3.00. It shall vary between 2.88 and 3.12 (mean +/-1.96*SE). It shows that the response is not much greater than the mean score of 3. Z value at 5 per cent level of significance (-.042) is less than the critical value of 1.96. The p value is less than .05. Therefore, employees were not managing conflicts using Dominating Style with respect to the item DS1.

The average score for item DS2 is 2.92 which is less than 3, Z value at 5 percent level of significance is -1.514 which is less than table value, and p value less than .05, it can be inferred that employees are not using Dominating Style by using authority to make a decision in favor of them.

The table shows that the average score for DS3 is 3.24 which shall vary between 3.13 and 3.35. It shows the he mean score of respondents' opinion regarding the item is above 3. Z value at 5 per cent level of significance (4.234) is greater than the table value of 1.96 and p value is less than .05. Therefore, employees were using dominating style with respect to DS3.

The mean score of DS4 is 3.11 which shall vary between 3.01 and 3.21 (mean +/- 1.96*SE). This is almost above 3, Z value is 2.042 at 5 per cent level of significance is greater than critical value of 1.96, and p value is less than .05. Hence it is inferred that employees manage conflicts by being firm in pursuing their side of the issue.

The table also shows that the mean score for the item DS5 is 3 and Z value (-.042) at 5 per cent level of significance is less than the table value. The p value is less than .05. Thus it is inferred that employees were not using power to win a competitive situation.In short employees were using Dominating Style with respect to all only two items; DS3 and DS4 out of the total five items.

Avoiding Style
The factor Avoiding Style involves low concern for self as well as the other party and is associated with withdrawal, sidestepping behavior. Avoiding Style contributes six items represented serially from AS1 to AS6 as follows:

AS1 - I try to investigate an issue with my peers to find a solution acceptable to us
AS2 - I try to integrate my ideas with those of my peers to come up with a decision jointly
AS3 - I try to work with my peers to find solution to a problem that satisfies our expectations
AS4 - I exchange accurate information with my peers to solve a problem together
AS5 - I try to bring all our concerns out in the open so that the issues can be resolved in the best possible way
AS6 - I collaborate with my peers to come up with decisions acceptable to us

The below table shows percentage analysis of conflict management with respect to Avoiding Style (AS)

Conflict Management with respect to Avoiding Style

Items	Strongly agree		Agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
AS1	55	13.8	144	36.0	165	41.3	24	24	12	3.0
AS2	34	8.5	161	40.3	141	35.3	46	11.5	18	4.5
AS3	47	11.8	153	38.3	146	36.5	45	11.3	9	2.3
AS4	43	10.8	157	39.3	153	38.3	32	8.0	15	3.8
AS5	41	10.3	139	34.8	151	37.8	60	15.0	9	2.3
AS6	55	13.8	165	41.3	139	34.8	28	7.0	13	3.3

Source: Primary data

From the table it is found that out of the total 400 respondents, 55 (13.8%) strongly agree and 144(36.0%) agree that they manage conflicts by attempting to avoid being 'put on the spot' and keeping conflicts with peers to themselves. With respect to the item AS2 34 (8.5%) strongly agree and 161 (40.3%) agree. The table shows that 47 (11.8%) strongly agree and 153 (38.3%) agree with respect to the item AS3; 43 (10.8%) strongly agree and 157 (39.3%) agree with respect to the item AS4; 41 (10.3%) strongly agree and 139 (34.8%) agree with respect to the item AS5; 55 (13.8%) strongly agree and 165 (41.3%) agree with respect to the item AS6.

The Mean, Standard Error, Standard Deviation and Z-Test Values of Different Items of Avoiding Style of Conflict Management

Items	Average	Standard Error	Standard Deviation	Test Value = 3		
				Z	Df	Sig.(2-ailed)
AS1	3.52	.045	.909	11.327	399	.000
AS2	3.37	.048	.951	7.727	399	.000
AS3	3.46	.046	.920	10.005	399	.000
AS4	3.45	.046	.922	9.817	399	.000
AS5	3.36	.047	.934	7.657	399	.000
AS6	3.55	.046	.927	11.920	399	.000

Source   Primary Data

The table shows that average score for item AS1 is 3.52 and it shall be within an interval of 3.43 and 3.61 (mean +/- 1.96*SE). It shows that the extent to which the employees try to avoid being put on the spot and keep conflicts within themselves is greater than the mean score of 3. Z value at 5 per cent level of significance (11.327) is greater than the critical value of 1.96 and p value is less than .05. Therefore, employees were using avoiding style to manage conflicts with respect to the item AS1.

The average score for item AS2 is 3.37 which shall vary between 3.43 and 3.46. Since the mean score is above 3, z value at 5 percent level of significance is 7.727 which is greater than table value, and p value less than .05, it can be inferred that employees usually avoid open discussion of their differences with peers.

The table shows that the average score for AS3 is 3.46 which shall vary between 3.37 and 3.55. It shows the mean score of respondents' opinion regarding working with their peers by staying away from disagreement with their peers is above 3. Z value at 5 per cent level of significance (10.005 is greater than the table value of 1.96 and p value is less than .05. Therefore, employees were using avoiding style to manage conflicts with respect to the item AS3.

The mean score of AS4 is 3.45 which shall vary between 3.35 and 3.54 (mean +/- 1.96*SE). This is above 3, Z value is 9.817 at 5 per cent level of significance is greater than critical value of 1.96, and p value is less than .05. Hence it is inferred that employees use avoiding style to manage conflicts by avoiding encounter with their peers.

The table shows that the mean score for the item AS5 is 3.36 and it shall vary between 3.27 and 3.45. This is above 3 and Z value (7.657) at 5 per cent level of significance is greater than the table value. The p value is less than .05. From the table it is found that employees try to keep disagreement with their peers to themselves in order to avoid hard feelings.

The item AS6 in the table indicates avoiding of unpleasant exchange with their peers which has an average score of 3.55. This shall vary between 3.46 and 3.64 which is above the score of 3. The calculated Z value is 11.920 at 5 per cent level of significance which is greater than the table value of 1.96. The p value is less than 0.05. Thus it is found that employees manage organizational conflict using avoiding style by avoiding unpleasant exchanges with peers.

In short employees were able to manage conflicts using Avoiding Style with respect to all the six items.

Compromising Style
The factor Compromising Style involves middle of the road approach in managing conflicts with peers. The compromising style is a reasonable strategy which balances the interests of two sides both in the short run and in the long run. Compromising Style constitutes four items represented serially from CS1 to CS4 as follows:

CS1 - I try to find a middle course to resolve an impasse
CS2 - I usually propose a middle ground for breaking deadlocks
CS3 - I negotiate with my peers so that a compromise can be reached
CS4 - I use 'give and take' so that a compromise can be made

The table shows percentage analysis of conflict management with respect to Compromising Style (CS)

Conflict Management with respect to Compromising Style

Items	Strongly agree		Agree		Neither agree nor disagree		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
CS1	56	14.0	142	35.5	177	44.3	22	5.5	3	.8
CS2	25	6.3	155	38.8	187	46.8	25	6.3	8	2.0
CS3	28	7.0	164	41.0	180	45.0	22	5.5	6	1.5
CS4	31	7.8	158	39.5	163	40.8	30	7.5	18	4.5

Source: Primary data

Out of the total 400 respondents, 56 (14.0%) strongly agree and 142 (35.5%) agree that they exhibit Compromising Style of conflict management by trying to find a middle course to resolve an impasse. With respect to the item CS2 only 25 (6.3%) strongly agree and 155 (38.8%) agree. The table shows that 28 (7.0%) strongly agree and 164 (41.0%) agree with respect to the item CS3; 31 (7.8%) strongly agree and 158 (39.5%) agree with respect to the item CS4.

The Mean, Standard Error, Standard Deviation and Z-Test Values of Different Items of Compromising Style of Conflict Management

Items	Average	Standard Error	Standard Deviation	Test Value = 3		
				Z	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
CS1	3.57	.041	.826	13.678	399	.000
CS2	3.41	.039	.783	10.470	399	.000
CS3	3.47	.038	.768	12.105	399	.000
CS4	3.39	.045	.902	8.536	399	.000

Source   Primary Data

The above table shows that average score for item CS1 is 3.57. Itshall vary between 3.49 and 3.65 (mean +/- 1.96*SE). It shows that the extent to which the employees try to find a middle course to resolve an impasse is greater than the mean score of 3. Z value at 5 per cent level of significance (13.678) is greater than the critical value of 1.96 and p value is less than .05. Therefore it is inferred that employees were using Compromising Style with respect to the item CS1 to manage conflicts with peers.

With respect to the item CS2 the mean score is 3.41. It may vary within an interval of 3.35 and 3.49. Since the mean score is above 3, Z value at 5 percent level of significance is 10.470 which is greater than table value, and p value less than .05, it can be inferred that employees usually propose a middle ground of breaking deadlocks.

The table shows that the average score for CS3 is 3.47 which shall vary between 3.40 and 3.54. It shows the average score of respondents' opinion regarding the item is above 3. Z value at 5 per cent level of significance is 12.105 which is greater than the table value of 1.96. The p value is less than .05. Therefore, employees were able to manage conflicts by negotiating with peers so that a compromise can be reached.The mean score for the item CS4 is 3.39 which shall vary between 3.30 and 3.48 (mean +/- 1.96*SE). This is above 3, Z value is 8.536 at 5 per cent level of significance is greater than critical value of 1.96, and p value is less than .05. Hence it is inferred that employees use 'give and take' so that a compromise can be reached.In short employees were able to manage conflicts using Compromising Style with respect to all the four items.

CONCLUSION
It can be concluded that the employees were able to manage conflict using five styles of conflict management - Integrating Style, Obliging Style, Dominating Style, Avoiding Style, and Compromising Style.

Hence the null hypothesis that 'the employees are not able to manage organizational conflicts among peers' is rejected and the alternative hypothesis that 'the employees are able to manage organizational conflicts among peers' is accepted.

REFERENCES
1. Amason, A.C., (1996). Distinguishing the effect of functional and dysfunctional conflict on strategic decision making: resolving a paradox for top management teams, *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 123-48
2. Alon, I., and Higgins, J. M. (2005). Global Leadership Success through Emotional and Cultural Intelligences, *Business Horizons*, Vol 48 (6), pp 501-512.
3. Cote, S., and Miners, C. T. H. (2006). Emotional Intelligence, Cognitive Intelligence,and Job Performance, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol 51 (1), pp 1-28.
4. Cherniss, C. & Adler, M. (2000), Promoting Emotional Intelligence in Organizations, Alexandria, VA: American Society for Training and Development.*Canada*, June, pp1-3
5. Cherniss, C, and Goleman, D., eds. (2001). The Emotionally Intelligent Workplace: How to Select for, Measure, and Improve Emotional Intelligence in Individuals, Groups, and Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
6. Chabungham, Parmananda (2005). The Soft Art of Being a Tough Leader, *Indian Management Journal*, pp 82-84.
7. Darolia, C. R., and Darolia, Shashi (2005). *The Punjab Heritage*, Vol.20.
8. Fahim H.,(2005), The relationship of emotional intelligence and relational skills with conflict management strategies among educational and executive managers of Iran's physical education faculties. *Doctoral Thesis*, Sciences and Researches University, Tehran branch,(inpersian).
9. Keramati M. and Roshan M., Relationship of school administrators self-awareness with conflict management Strategies, *Journal of New Thoughts on Education*.,1(4), 35-48(in Persian).