**LESSON 16: INTERGROUP CONFLICT MANAGEMENT**

**Introduction**

This lesson consists of:

1. Intergroup Conflict Management

2. Case Study

3. Student Journal Entry

**Assignment**

1. **Read Course Guide**, pages 2 – 11.

2. When you solve a case study or act as a leader in your organization:

I. ***Identify*** the **Areas of Interest.**

II. ***Analyze*** the situation using Intergroup Conflict Management.

A. ***Identify*** the Source(s) of Intergroup Conflict evident in the situation.

B. ***Identify*** any Intergroup Conflict Resolution Strategy(ies) evident in the situation.

III. ***Explain*** an Area of Interest in terms of the how the intergroup conflict affected the group’s individual, group, and organizational outcomes.

IV. ***Select*** an appropriate theoretical leader strategy(ies) to address Areas of Interest.

V. ***Apply*** the theoretical leader strategy(ies) to the situation in the form of a specific leader plan that addresses all Areas of Interest.

VI. ***Assess***, evaluate, and revise your leader plan.

3. **Complete a Student Journal entry** for Intergroup Conflict Management.

## Using any group that you belong(ed) to in your department, briefly describe any conflict between your group and another group in the department. Describe which Sources of Intergroup Conflict were responsible for the conflict between the two groups. Were any of the Intergroup Conflict Resolution Strategies applied? If so, which ones and by whom? What was the impact of this intergroup conflict on the group’s individual, group, and organizational outcomes? What other strategy(ies) could have been employed to manage this intergroup conflict?

**INTERGROUP CONFLICT MANAGEMENT**

One of our key objectives as police leaders is to build cohesive, high-performing teams that work collaboratively toward the organization’s goals. While competition between functional groups can be beneficial for overall organizational performance, it can also lead to conflict, which hampers mission accomplishment.

Conflict can manifest in obvious ways, such as physical fights or heated arguments, but it can also be subtle. For example, when one unit belittles another's work, when mechanics take longer to maintain vehicles due to previous discourteous interactions with officers, or when a patrol sergeant refuses to hand over control of a crime scene to an arriving S.W.A.T. team, it indicates that intergroup conflict has become dysfunctional.

Typically, the underlying causes of conflict are not malevolent schemes to undermine the mission but rather honest differences in perceptions about the best way to achieve objectives. Organizational policies and procedures, or individual leaders, can trigger conflicts between groups. For instance, there is an inherent conflict between the training division and the geographic patrol divisions. The training division aims to ensure compliance with state training requirements, address tactical or interpersonal shortcomings, reduce civil liability, and enhance the professionalism and knowledge base of police personnel. In contrast, field divisions are focused on responding to radio calls, solving problems, investigating crimes, and serving citizens.

In situations like these and countless others you will encounter in your career, employees from each division often feel justified in their efforts to achieve their objectives. Supported by the unity of their teams, they may rigidly defend their viewpoints and aggressively challenge opposing perspectives. From an organizational standpoint, it is crucial to find ways to reduce friction and restore productivity.

For leaders, understanding Intergroup Conflict Management allows us to elevate these disputes beyond mere personality clashes. By identifying the sources of intergroup conflict, we can recognize them as reflections of our organization’s strengths and weaknesses. This insight enables leaders to devise informed strategies to address specific situations. Instead of seeking to eliminate conflict, enlightened leaders aim to manage it, using disagreements as opportunities to diagnose and address systemic weaknesses. Through this approach, police leaders can foster an environment of teamwork, significantly enhancing effectiveness and efficiency both within and outside the organization.

In this lesson, we will explore how to identify current and potential sources of intergroup conflict, as well as conflict resolution strategies that leaders can employ to prevent or recover from dysfunctional conflict.

**Sources of Intergroup Conflict**

Several important factors can contribute to intergroup conflict. Key among these are goal orientation, time orientation, the tangible nature of work, frequency of interaction, physical separation, competition over scarce resources, and ambiguous work assignments. Examining each of these factors will help leaders understand why conflict often arises during group interactions. By understanding these variables, leaders can more effectively manage conflicts and enhance the organization’s overall effectiveness.

Goal Orientation

Within teams, individuals usually share similar goals. For instance, members of a Maintenance and Supply (M&S) group would likely agree on the objective of minimizing costs related to supplies and repair parts. Logically, they would want to limit equipment usage to reduce wear and tear and ensure that only experienced workers use the equipment to prevent damage or misuse.

However, another subgroup within the same team, such as the Operations and Training (O&T) group, may have different, even conflicting, goals. For example, the O&T group would likely aim to use the equipment as much as possible to enhance their effectiveness and to train new and inexperienced workers. Thus, within the same team, two subgroups can have completely different goal orientations.

Often, one group's methods may not make sense to the other. For instance, the O&T section might struggle to understand why the M&S section is so focused on limiting equipment wear and tear. It is a common reality in organizations that they pursue multiple goals simultaneously, and different work groups are assigned to achieve those goals. Research has shown that goal incompatibility is a frequently identified source of intergroup conflict.

Time Orientation

Different groups within an organization may have varying expectations regarding the time it takes to see results from their efforts. For instance, one group might achieve quick outcomes, while another group might need to wait longer. This phenomenon is referred to as a difference in time orientation.

Relatively straightforward tasks, such as ordering supplies, can be managed with shorter deadlines. In contrast, more complex and uncertain tasks, like leadership training and development programs, typically require longer deadlines.

Frustration between groups regarding the varying speed of outcomes can often lead to conflict.

Tangible Nature of Work

Some groups within an organization can produce tangible and measurable results, such as the M&S section. It is relatively straightforward to determine whether equipment is functioning properly or if there is an adequate supply of materials—one can simply observe and count. However, what does the O&T section produce? Is it efficient junior leaders, effective training, or a state of preparedness? And how can we assess these outcomes?

There is a significant difference between these two example subgroups regarding the tangible nature of their work. The O&T section not only has to wait for the results of its programs but may also find it difficult to observe and measure those results. These critical differences can further contribute to conflicts between groups.

Frequency of Interaction

In a group, members tend to interact with each other frequently. As a result, they get to know one another well—their personalities, habits, and quirks—and better understand each other's problems. Take, for example, the members of the M&S section. Although they may work on different aspects of the final product, they likely have multiple opportunities for daily interaction. In addition to collaborating during work hours, they probably arrive at the office at the same time, take breaks together, and finish their tasks as a team. This consistent interaction—both formal and informal—provides them with ample opportunities for communication.

However, this is not always the case in intergroup situations. Members of certain organizational groups may only interact infrequently, without a compelling reason to meet more often. As a result, they have limited chances to get to know or understand one another. This lack of frequent interaction can lead to conflicts between groups when they do meet and need to cooperate to achieve an organizational goal.

Physical Separation

The physical separation of groups is an important factor to consider in intergroup relations. When two groups cannot be in the same place at the same time, it creates challenges. In larger organizations, groups are often located farther apart, sometimes even in different geographic locations.

Even in smaller organizations, groups may occupy separate buildings, making face-to-face interaction less likely. Although computers and advanced technologies, such as videoconferencing, have improved communication among groups, physical separation remains a significant challenge for organizational leaders. Communication tends to be more formal and written rather than spontaneous and verbal, which can lead to misunderstandings and a lack of clarity.

Furthermore, when groups are physically separated, they often develop their own distinct identities. This separation allows members of one group to focus primarily on their own issues, often overlooking the challenges faced by other groups. Infrequent interactions can lead to differing perceptions and attitudes between groups, which significantly influence their behavior toward one another. Researchers have found that groups tend to undervalue the activities of others while exaggerating their own successes.

This dynamic can lead to a “we-they” mentality within the organization. Our perceptions of other groups are often shaped by our own experiences, which can result in misunderstandings and discord.

Additionally, when interactions between groups are limited, a single individual’s experience can unfairly represent entire groups. A negative encounter might tarnish the reputation of the whole group, and when coupled with the issues of physical separation, it can adversely affect the future relationships between the groups involved.

Competition over Scarce Resources

The resources of most organizations are limited and occasionally scarce. When organizational resources, such as money, space, or human resources, become limited, conflicts often arise among the competing groups. This competition can be intense, especially when fulfilling a task is at stake.

Consider an organization preparing to determine its annual operating budget. This situation often exemplifies a win-lose dynamics for the various groups within the organization. If one group receives a larger operating budget, it typically does so at the expense of others. Capital expenditures are finite; decisions must be made about whether limited funds will be allocated to modernizing maintenance facilities or to enhancing training facilities. As expected, each side will likely hold strong, differing opinions on which initiative is more crucial.

Research indicates that when competition occurs between groups, members of each group tend to band together. They become more focused and unified in their purpose, driven by a new clear goal—to win, sometimes even at the expense of the overall organizational objectives.

Often, group leaders unintentionally escalate the situation by demanding loyalty, developing slogans, or raising emotional stakes. These actions can overshadow the primary issue and lead to hostility between groups—similar to the heightened enthusiasm seen after a significant football or basketball game where fans exhibit misplaced loyalty to "our team." Since competition for scarce resources is prevalent in many organizations, it's important to examine the outcomes for both winners and losers in these competitions.

While winners maintain cohesion, they may also release tension, lose their competitive edge, and become complacent or overly relaxed. This can lead to a "fat and happy" attitude. Winners may prioritize addressing members’ needs over work responsibilities, believing that their victory solidifies a positive self-image and reinforces a negative perception of their opponents. Rarely do they reevaluate their perceptions or reassess their operational methods for improvement.

Conversely, losers often exhibit a strong tendency to deny or distort the reality of their defeat. They may seek psychological escapes, blaming external factors, such as saying "the judges were biased," "the boss didn't fully understand our solution," or "the rules of the game weren't clearly explained."

If a loss is acknowledged, the losing group may splinter, bringing unresolved conflicts to the surface. Losers may become more tense and more driven to work harder, desperate to find someone or something to blame—be it their leader, the judges’ decision, or the established rules. They may show reduced cooperation within their group and lack concern for the needs of other members. However, this experience can also be a valuable learning opportunity, as the defeated group’s previously held positive stereotype may be challenged, prompting them to reevaluate their perceptions. Once the loss is realistically accepted, the losing group may reorganize and potentially become more cohesive and effective as they collaborate to avoid future losses.

In a win-lose scenario, there are distinct costs and benefits for both winners and losers that leaders must monitor to ensure that neither work group loses efficiency.

Ambiguous Work Assignments

Organizational leaders sometimes contribute to intergroup conflict by assigning ambiguous tasks without providing clear direction. Often, this ambiguity leads to conflicts between groups. For example, consider a leader who calls together two department heads—one from the Marketing and Sales (M&S) section and the other from the Operations and Technology (O&T) section. The leader gives them the vague directive, “I want the two of you to see what we can do to improve our organization’s morale. Report back to me in two weeks.”

As a result, the employees in these two departments will likely engage in research and discussions, but they will lack a clear understanding of authority, responsibilities, and the priority of this task. It's probable that these groups will have differing perspectives on the situation. Unless their work is closely coordinated, the two groups may clash as they attempt to fulfill their ambiguous assignment.

We’ve established that differences among groups lead to conflict; therefore, we can conclude that intergroup conflict is inevitable. Given this reality, how can leaders learn to effectively manage or reduce conflict?

Is Conflict Necessarily Bad?

Historically, leaders have viewed conflict as something undesirable—an issue to be eliminated.

While it's true that conflict between groups can have dysfunctional aspects, it’s important to recognize that groups, much like individuals, have limited energy. If their energy is entirely consumed by scheming against or attacking one another, there will be little left for fulfilling their primary organizational responsibilities.

However, intergroup conflict is not always dysfunctional. In fact, it can play a beneficial and constructive role in organizational life. Let’s explore this further.

Firstly, intergroup conflict can serve as a catalyst for change. When operations run smoothly and conflicts are absent, groups may avoid self-analysis and evaluation, which can hinder their effectiveness. This stagnation prevents them from realizing their potential for growth and development.

Moreover, intergroup conflict tends to stimulate interest and curiosity concerning the organization's operations. This can lead to a greater diversity of viewpoints, an exchange of ideas, and a heightened sense of urgency, which in turn boosts innovation among individual group members and within the organization as a whole. Additionally, when groups engage in conflict, it forces them to articulate their positions and present supporting arguments, enhancing their understanding of their own viewpoints.

Consequently, a leader may not be serving the organization well by attempting to eliminate intergroup conflict. Valuable insights may be overlooked, and the natural conflicts among subgroups can help the organization explore various issues and set priorities. The challenge for leaders, therefore, is not to eliminate conflict but to manage it effectively, minimizing its dysfunctional aspects while capitalizing on its positive ones. Since one group's gains do not automatically translate to another group's losses, such conflicts may lead to new arrangements that benefit both sides.

With this challenge in mind, we will now look at some strategies that leaders can employ to manage intergroup conflict.

**Intergroup Conflict Resolution Strategies**

When a leader recognizes the need to address intergroup conflict, they must consider the most effective course of action. After carefully assessing the underlying causes, the leader may choose to tackle the source directly. However, there are instances where the leader may not have the necessary resources or authority to influence the situation directly. In such cases, what should be done? This section will explore five strategies available to leaders for resolving conflict:

1. Avoidance

2. Establishing liaison groups

3. Introducing superordinate goals

4. Forcing

5. Problem solving

Let’s examine each of these strategies in detail.

Avoidance

Intergroup conflict can be uncomfortable for both leaders and group members. People often try to avoid conflict, which may lead a leader to adopt a passive strategy. This strategy can involve ignoring the conflict and hoping that the groups will resolve their differences on their own, or limiting the frequency and amount of interaction between the groups. Leaders may choose this approach as long as the conflict does not seriously disrupt the organization’s effectiveness. If they decide to intervene, they might focus on highlighting the commonalities between the groups while downplaying their differences.

However, this avoidance strategy does not address the underlying sources of intergroup conflict, allowing issues to fester beneath the surface. A significant risk for the leader is that the intensity of the conflict may escalate at an inopportune time, leading to very negative outcomes for the organization. Consequently, the organization may need to allocate considerable resources to manage the conflict later, often when it is least able to afford such expenditures.

The challenge for a leader who opts for this strategy is to carefully monitor the degree and intensity of intergroup conflict, considering the potential impact of strained relationships. While avoidance may be appropriate in cases of low-level conflict, leaders often need to take a more proactive role in conflict management.

Liaison Groups

A second conflict management strategy that a leader should consider is the establishment of liaison groups. Taking the example of the supply and training teams, these groups usually have little reason to interact. However, if the organization suddenly receives a large influx of new and untrained personnel, these two groups will need to collaborate. This is because the training goal cannot be achieved unless the necessary supplies are available in the right types and quantities on a timely basis.

In this context, the leader may opt to create a liaison group to facilitate the interactions between the two teams. The liaison role serves as an internal bridge, connecting the two groups.

It's important for the leader to consider that the role of a representative in a liaison group can be challenging and uncomfortable. Research has shown that members of liaison groups often experience lower job satisfaction, higher role conflict, ambiguity, and other negative consequences as a result of their position.

The challenge for the leader is to select individuals who are particularly capable of performing this boundary-spanning role. Alternatively, the leader might rotate this responsibility among different group members to mitigate the drawbacks mentioned earlier. Additionally, establishing liaison groups is also a suitable strategy when conflicts arise between organizational groups that frequently interact.

***Superordinate Goals***

Introducing superordinate goals—higher objectives that can only be achieved through the cooperation of conflicting groups—serves as a valuable conflict management strategy. When mutual dependence exists between groups, this approach can enhance organizational effectiveness.

Consider the conflict between the M&S and O&T groups regarding the frequency of supply orders. M&S prefers to reduce the frequency of orders to minimize associated administrative costs. In contrast, O&T advocates for placing orders more frequently due to significant fluctuations in their supply needs throughout the year. They cannot afford to run out of supplies when needed, nor do they want to accumulate excess supplies when they are not required. The conflict between these groups is evident.

Given their mutual dependence, establishing a superordinate goal may be an effective solution. For instance, the leader could set a goal to double the organization’s output. This objective, which is both compelling and appealing to members of both groups, cannot be attained by either group working alone; cooperation is essential.

Think of it as creating a common challenge that requires the conflicting groups to unite in order to overcome it. Both groups must engage in give-and-take to achieve their shared goal.

By fostering cooperation between the groups, driven by new superordinate goals, existing intergroup conflict may be diminished. In fact, the organizational leader may find that this conflict now serves to clarify the superordinate goal, benefiting the overall mission.

Forcing

The fourth strategy for managing intergroup conflict is known as "forcing," a method commonly seen in hierarchical organizations.

In this strategy, a leader or the groups involved in the conflict use their available power to manage and ultimately resolve the issue forcefully. Essentially, the leader mandates a resolution that may result from a compromise between the conflicting groups' positions or simply be a decision favoring one group over the other.

From the viewpoint of the conflicting groups, there are two ways to initiate a forcing procedure. First, one group can directly seek the leader's support for its position, thus enforcing a unilateral solution. Second, one group may try to increase its power by forming a coalition with other groups in the organization. The unified stance from such coalitions can often compel other groups to accept a particular position.

The essence of the forcing strategy lies in its ability to mobilize and apply power. It has two main advantages. First, this strategy requires a limited amount of time and resources because the leader alone mandates the resolution. This approach is especially effective when a higher organizational leader resolves the conflict. Second, the use of a forcing strategy leads to a decision rather than simply deferring problems.

However, there is a significant disadvantage to the forcing strategy: important information might be overlooked. Some groups may feel that their perspectives were not adequately considered, which can lead to a lack of motivation to implement the decisions effectively. While the forcing strategy may save time for the leader in the short term, it could ultimately require even more time and resources to address the more intense intergroup conflicts that arise later on.

Problem Solving

The fifth and final strategy for managing intergroup conflict is problem solving. This approach is the most confrontational, as it brings representatives from the conflicting groups together in one location to address and resolve their differences. The goals of this meeting are to define the problems, identify the origins of the disagreements, propose alternatives, and ultimately reach a mutually satisfactory resolution. Effective face-to-face communication can enhance understanding between groups when managed properly. Research has shown that better-performing organizations often confront conflict instead of avoiding it for two main reasons.

First, groups begin to empathize with each other's concerns. Issues become less black and white, and groups realize they are not the only ones with genuine problems. Second, a problem-solving session can provide catharsis for the involved parties, allowing each group to express their emotions. This often clears the air and helps prevent future conflicts.

One approach to problem solving designed to address longstanding conflict is called Image Exchanging. In this process, groups gain insight into how they are perceived by others. Here’s how the activity unfolds:

1. Each group writes down its self-image and its perception of the other group. Groups are encouraged to express whatever they feel or think; consensus is not necessary.

2. Each group designates a representative to present these images to the other group.

3. The groups then meet separately to discuss behaviors that may have contributed to the image formed by the other group.

4. The conclusions about each group's behavior are exchanged with the other group and discussed jointly.

5. In the final stage, specific action plans are developed to reduce the discrepancies between each group’s self-image and the perception held by the other group. While it may not be possible to address all discrepancies, the goal is for each group to create strategies that reduce conflict and foster cooperation.

Sometimes, it may be more appropriate to use a third-party consultant to facilitate a problem-solving session instead of relying on the organizational leader. Typically, this consultant is an external management professional. Here are several reasons for choosing this approach:

1. The consultant can promote open discussions about group differences, emphasizing that these differences are valuable because they provide a range of alternatives for resolving conflicts. This perspective helps conflicting groups avoid defining success solely based on their initial desired outcomes.

2. The consultant listens to understand rather than to evaluate. Conflicting parties often do not listen to each other; each is preoccupied with being understood or assessing the other group. By offering attentive listening, the consultant can enhance each party's understanding of the other's position. Moreover, the consultant's example of active listening can encourage participants to adopt a similar approach.

3. The consultant can clarify the nature of the dispute. Conflicting groups frequently veer away from the original issue, getting sidetracked by tangential points or misrepresenting the issue at hand. A detached third-party consultant can help the groups refocus and better comprehend the core issue.

4. The consultant can acknowledge and accept the feelings of the group members involved. Intergroup disagreements often generate irrational emotions such as fear, jealousy, anger, and anxiety. When a consultant expresses understanding and acceptance of these feelings, it helps others to do the same. This validation allows groups to move beyond their emotions and work toward resolving their conflicts.

5. The consultant can suggest specific procedures for resolving differences. The appropriate techniques will depend on various factors, including facts, methods, goals, values, and issues.

This material is not an exhaustive list of conflict management strategies; rather, it provides a range of approaches that may be useful to organizational leaders. The chosen strategy largely depends on the specific situation, the personality and style of the leader, and the nature of the conflicting groups. Unfortunately, selecting a particular strategy can be complex and nuanced. The leader must consider factors such as goal orientation, time constraints, the tangible nature of the work, frequency of interaction, physical separation, competition for limited resources, and the ambiguity of work assignments. This examination will help illuminate the variables influencing a particular conflict. Additionally, understanding the relationship between the conflicting groups will assist the leader in selecting the most effective intergroup conflict management strategy.
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Case Study

You have recently been promoted to the rank of lieutenant and assigned as the evening watch commander in the downtown area. This evening, one of your patrol supervisors, SGT Harry Reese, approached you and said, “Lieutenant, we have a problem! It’s been festering for a while now and it just blew up. One of my officers, Terry Kane, just had an argument with the evening watch detective supervisor, Franco Manelli, and a bunch of other guys joined in.

“Apparently, while SGT Manelli was out in the field, he left a follow-up report on his desk. When he got back, there was grease all over the report and some cheeseburger wrappers nearby. SGT Manelli started yelling at the patrol officers, calling them ‘disrespectful heathens’ and ‘pigs’. Manelli shouted, ‘Out, out of my squad room, right now and forever!’

“Then, Officer Kane told SGT Manelli that he had no right to be yelling at them, since he didn’t even know who made the mess. I guess some headquarters staff officers and civilians, a few narcotics guys, and even a team of state troopers all used the room while Manelli was out. You know, it gets busy like this all the time. There is no room left in the patrol officers’ Report Writing Room and everybody scrambles to find somewhere to write their reports.

“Well, after Kane spoke up, several other patrol officers told Manelli that they were tired of the detectives acting like they were better than everyone else. They complained that the detectives never let patrol officers know what happens to their arrests. One officer said, ‘I know you detectives ask district attorneys to reject cases. You let bad guys back on the street, just because you’re too lazy to do a decent follow-up.’

“This caused Manelli and two other detectives to get really hostile. They began saying things like, ‘If you supercops would learn to put a few elements of the crime and some probable cause in your arrest reports, you might keep some bad guys in jail. While you’re at it, a little information on the victims and witnesses, like maybe an address or phone number, couldn’t hurt.’ The detectives said that, from now on, if this basic information wasn’t in the report they would simply get the case rejected.

“I asked both Officer Kane and SGT Manelli to join me in an interview room. Manelli marched in and made it clear that he’s a detective sergeant who does not answer to a patrol sergeant. I assured him that I just wanted to work out a solution. Manelli said that this was not the first time patrol officers had made a mess of the squad room, and he feels they do it intentionally. I told him that I would meet with all the officers at roll call and tell them to keep the detectives’ area clean.

“Manelli said, ‘Not good enough, Blue Boy! I’m the Detective in charge of that squad room on evening watch, and I’m sticking to my guns! Like I said before, I want your officers out of there right now, and out of there forever.’

“Actually, the crowd at the station had thinned out by then, so I told Kane and the others to move into the officers’ Report Writing Room. Then, I counseled Officer Kane about the way he spoke to a detective supervisor. Kane said he would try to control his mouth, but it didn’t change the way he feels. ‘These patrol officers have some justified complaints, sergeant.’ Kane said that twice last week, when the day watch detectives released juveniles near 3 o’clock in the afternoon, they went to the watch commander and pressured him to have patrol units transport the subjects to juvenile hall or back to their parents’ house. He said the patrol officers are always getting stuck doing errands for the detectives, even when we’re backed up on radio calls. After listening to him, I know that Kane has some valid points.”

You tell Sergeant Reese that you’ll look into the matter. You realize that your boss, Captain Donacare, isn’t going to be much help. His biggest concern these days is planning his retirement. He’s told you several times that the watch commanders are “getting lieutenant pay” and “should be able to work any problems out by themselves.”

I. ***Identify*** the **Areas of Interest**.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

(If necessary, continue listing **Areas of Interest** on another page.)

II. ***Analyze*** the situation using Intergroup Conflict Management Theory.

What is the relationship among the Areas of Interest listed above? More specifically, is there a chronological order or **logical chain of events** that helps you make sense of the facts you have? If so, outline the time sequence of events.

Which, if any, of the Common Sources of Intergroup Conflict are present?

Which, if any, of the Intergroup Conflict Resolution strategies are present?

III. ***Explain*** an Area of Interest in terms of the how the intergroup conflict affected the group’s individual, group, and organizational outcomes.

How has the intergroup conflict affected the motivation, satisfaction, and/or performance of individual employees in each of the groups?

How has the intergroup conflict affected the group’s structural dimensions and performance?

Has the performance of the organization been affected by this intergroup conflict? How?

Do the facts of the case and your explanation form a pattern that allows you to identify a fundamental or **root cause** (i.e., is there something in the case information that suggests it is the underlying cause of all or most of the Areas of Interest)?

IV. ***Select*** an appropriate theoretical leader strategy(ies) that would be effective in this situation.

Which leader strategy(ies) should the leader use to address the Areas of Interest in this situation?

V. ***Apply*** the theoretical leader strategy(ies) to the situation in the form of a specific leader plan that addresses all Areas of Interest. The plan should be realistic and holistic, address all the Areas of Interest you have identified, and translate the theoretical leader strategies into action. What will you do and say to whom, when, where, and how?

VI. ***Assess*** the effectiveness of your leader plan and revise as needed. After your leader plan, list the measures you would use to evaluate your actions. In this step, leaders need to ask, “What information do I need to tell whether or not my leadership is having the desired effects? How will I obtain the information I need? How can it be generated? Who can help me get what I need? How often should I collect data and in what form?”

Name:

**Complete a Student Journal entry** for Intergroup Conflict Management.

Using any group that you belong(ed) to in your department, briefly describe any conflict between your group and another group in the department. Describe which Sources of Intergroup Conflict were responsible for the conflict between the two groups. Were any of the Intergroup Conflict Resolution Strategies applied? If so, which ones and by whom? What was the impact of this intergroup conflict on the group’s individual, group, and organizational outcomes? What other strategy(ies) could have been employed to manage this intergroup conflict?