JTS

Journal of Techno
Social

Trust-Building and Consensus Approach to Conflict Resolution: Alternative Tactics to Strike Actions in Nigeria

Olushola J. Omolekan[1*], Umar Gunu[1]

[1]Department of Business Administration,
 University of Ilorin, Ilorin, NIGERIA

*Corresponding Authors

Abstract: Over the years, industrial actions have been one of the crucial issues resulting to the decline in organizational productivity in Nigeria. Strike actions have been considered by the organized unions as a means of expressing their grievances and struggling for their rights and privileges. These actions have serious and negative effects on organizational efficiencies such as low productivity, loss of profit, low performance, and the eventual collapse of some promising ventures. Owing to these consequences, there is a need for alternative tactics to end this menace. Thus, the influence of trust-building and consensus approach on conflict resolution as alternative strategies to strike actions in Nigeria is examined in this study. The study adopted a survey design. A sample of selected organized labour union leaders and key top executive officers formed the respondents of the study. Cluster and simple sampling techniques were used to select sampled respondents. A validated structured questionnaire and interview were adopted to gather needed information for this study. Ordinary least square regression, correlation, and cross tabulation were used to analyze the collated data. The findings revealed that honesty, loyalty and sacrifice are significant in conflict resolution and crisis management. It was deduced from the study that conflict is unavoidable in a workplace but can be managed through a proactive measure of trust and consensus-building approach. The study recommended among others that keeping to the agreement, openness, understanding, collaborative and participative efforts are needed to enhanced organizational efficiency.

Keywords: Trust-building, consensus approach, conflict resolution, conflict management, Industrial actions, organizational efficiency

1. Introduction

Nature has endowed human beings to interact and relate with one another. This among human existence is a source of conflict capable of causing disagreement. Conflict is inevitable in an organization especially when a party feels their rights, entitlements and privileges are trampled (Saldert, Polk& Stepanova, 2020). Reactions are expected from the perceived unfavourable treatment and it can hamper productivity and efficiency.

Over the years, organizational productivity and efficiency have declined due to perceived conflict. Many organized unions embark on strike actions to protest their rights and communicate their grievances on issues of interest. The common term ranges from warning strike, sit down strike, go slow strike to total strike. It is practically becoming a general norm and belief by the organized unions that the only language employers understand in industrial conflict is strike action (Körppen, 2011). These actions are detrimental to the organizational objectives irrespective of the nature of organizations whether public or private.

On the other hand, top executives have also adopted the concept of no work no pay to deal with the erring employees during the industrial actions. Others threaten demotion, half salary, and lay off of key members of the employees' union. But the critical issue here is that no matter the strategies adopted by management, it has a far-reaching effect on the organizational objectives (Levine, 2009). For example, a demoted employee will refuse to give his/her best to the organization. Also, the cost, time, and resources involved in replacing a sacked and competent employee is a source of concern.

The lack of trust and inability to reach consensus on agreements between the parties births the occurrence of industrial actions. Trust is measured in the potential of the parties to be honest, open, keeping of agreements, understanding, and loyal. While consensus-building is a collaborative problem-solving approach or collaboration. It is a win-win approach where both parties are ready to sacrifice and let go of some concerns for organizational growth and development (Dickie, 2015). These approaches are seen as alternative tactics to the resolution of conflict.

Conflict resolution simply means an amicable way of resolving organizational concerns and issues without necessarily shutting down the work process towards the accomplishment of laid down goals and objectives of the organization (Rivas et al., 2014). It is necessary because it establishes smooth working processes, promotes efficiency, effective delivery of products and services, promotes creativity and innovation, increases market share, leads to survival and continuity of business enterprises, and contributes significantly to national growth and development. To achieve these, trust-building and consensus-building are essential (Myers, Smith & Ostergren, 2019).

Organizational psychologists, researchers, public opinion analysts, and stakeholders have shown a reasonable concern on the persistent industrial actions organized by the unions in settling disputes and conflicts in Nigeria. In the bid to check and control the consequences of strike actions, the effect of trust-building and consensus approach to conflict resolution in Nigeria was assessed in this study. The study specifically assessed the influence of trust-building on conflict resolution; evaluated the effect of consensus-building on management of conflict; and determine the level of trust, consensus-building, and conflict resolution on organizational efficiency.

2. Review of Literature and Hypotheses Development

2.1 Concept of Conflict

Conflict implies a process of negative feelings or resentment that occurs when a particular person is aware that another person has had or is about to harm their objectives. Numerous conflicts that people experience in organizations are - inconsistencies in goals, differences in the clarification of facts, discrepancies based on behavioral expectations, and so on (Lewicki & Tomlinson, 2003). This submission covers all levels of conflict – ranging from open, violent actions to subtle disagreements.

Conflict is defined as the process in which the interest of an individual (or group) are harmed or negatively affected by the other (Gunu, 2014). This definition addresses inappropriate concerns among stakeholders and covers a variety of issues and conflicts.

There are four (4) main levels of conflict that can exist in any organization, which include; interpersonal, internal, intragroup, and intergroup conflict. Intrapersonal conflict usually occurs within a person and generally involves a type of target, cognitive, or affective conflict. Interpersonal conflict is usually between/among two/more individuals who find out that their attitudes, behaviours, or preferences are at odds. Intragroup conflicts are disputes between some or all members of a group that often affect the effectiveness and dynamics of the group. Intergroup conflicts are more of opposition, disagreement, and dispute between groups or teams. Most times, the intergroup conflict is strong, costly and long-lasting for the parties involved (Lewicki, McAllister & Bies, 1998).

2.2 Concept of Conflict Management

Conflict management refers to a diagnostic process, interpersonal style, and communication strategy created to avoid unnecessary conflict and also to reduce or resolve extreme conflicts. The ability to understand conflicts and diagnose them correctly is important for management. It can be said that there are conflicts in organizations and groups over the role of confrontation (Jerome, 2003). It was asserted by a school of thought that conflicts should be avoided, indicating that there was a split within the group. It is called a traditional view. This early view of conflict thinks that all conflicts are bad and has to be prevented. The interactive view of conflicts leads to conflicts becoming harmonious, peaceful, calm, and cooperative. Group tends to be static, and indifferent to the need for renewal and change (Loh, 2011). The main contention of the study is to accept that little rivalry help a group to be lively, creative and competitive.

The interactive view on conflict does not imply that all conflicts are good, but that functional confrontation aids the group's goals and enhances its performance. Therefore, it is a form of constructive confrontation. Destructive conflict is one that obstructs the group's activities and hinders expected performance.

The resolution focus view of conflict has the notion that conflicts at the workplace are not productive. Conflicts take the time of employees to do their job or interact with customers, hurt feelings and promote anger that often remain after conflicts (Myers, Smith & Ostergren, 2019). Most times, people find it difficult to clarify conflict which can either be "task" or "relationship disputes". Often, task disputes usually escalate to relationship disputes.

In conclusion, the traditional view was learned to assume that conflicts has to be evaded. The interactionist view is of the opinion that conflict can arouse active interaction without overflowing with disruptive and negative emotions is insufficient. The conflict management perspective recognizes the conflict as a process that is likely to be unavoidable in most organizations and is determined to focus more on productive conflict resolutions.

2.3 Trust-building Approach to Conflict Resolution

The concept of trust has been defined by different scholars as it affects their disciplines and interests. The views gathered by these researchers provide a basis for extensive opinions on the general perception of the concept of trust. These divergent views were observed as stated in the diverse definition provided by different scholars:

Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt and Camerer (1998) opined that trust is a psychological condition that one intends to admit sensitivity in line with optimistic prospects of another's behavior or intention. Also, Lewicki, McAllister and Bies (1998) understand trust as one's belief and one's willingness in keeping promises with anticipation of fulfillment. Trust is a positive expectation built on the behaviour of others within an environment of sensitivity and dependence (Hosmer, 1995).

Trust is essential in relationships as a result of interdependence. As a man does not exist in isolation, we depend on each other to achieve results. It is important to understand that there is a risk element because our interests are mixed with those of others, and we are often confronted with situations where there is a need for other people's cooperation (Leung, 2008). Thus, trust is valuable and paramount in social interaction. It is an important aspect of negotiation, mediation and conflict resolution. Trust encourages collaboration, sharing of information, and solving problems (Lewicki & Tomlinson, 2003).

Interpersonal trust theory is a view from three dimensions viz: the explanation of confidence variations in an individual; knowledge of individuals credible behavior; and proposing individual trust level development (Kelman, 2005). On the other hand, one of the oldest theories on trust is the personality theory which is of the view that some individuals trust earlier than others. Though, trust is built overtime but the common trait of trust-building is subjected to some verifiable individual attitudes (Myers, Smith & Ostergren, 2019).

This expectation shows the level of confidence a person will have in the history of previous social interactions and will be most effective in new and uncertain future situations. The expectations generally shaped people's perceptions of character. Recent scholars have defined the attributes of trust-building and the different ways to which it can be raised to higher levels (Beierle & Cayford 2001). One's trust in another party can be based on one's appreciation of his abilities, integrity, and kindness. That is, if we perceive these features more in an individual, our trust in them increases. These aspects are related and depend on each other as it affects behavior. Therefore, both integrity and skill as trust attributes are effective at the beginning of a relationship, as it takes longer for information about a person's kindness to emerge. Thus, as this interaction is deepened between the parties, the effect of goodwill will rise (Jerome, 2003). In the early trust theories, it is described as a one-dimensional event which explains a decrease or increase in a relationship. While the contemporary trust approach suggests that trust exists in chronological order and as it reaches the top, trust becomes strong which influences behavioural change.

At the commencement of the relationship, trust is computational which implies that one will critically analyze the other person's behavior and reaction to the situation of reward to ascertain their reliability or otherwise. At this point, penalties and rewards are the key basis of a trustor's oversight to ensure the trustee's conduct is consistent. People who decide to trust another person think about the importance and value of the relationship with the cost of breaking the relationship (Dickie, 2015). Trusting another person only by calculating these costs and benefits shows that continued trust provides a net positive benefit.

However, a clear cut of understanding between/among parties as a result of continuous interaction promotes unify goal and values. As a result, confidence rises significantly to a higher level. As trust reaches the peak, it acts as an identitybased trust (IBT). In this regard, trust is built by the parties through co-opted intentions and wishes. The understanding shared by the parties is strong enough to mediate disputes (Kelman, 2005). At this advanced stage, an emotionally strong connection among parties increases confidence for a common goal and a sense of values. Thus, unlike Cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT), IBT is a more emotional event established on the concepts of interpersonal care, anxiety and shared satisfaction.

2.4 Aspects of Trust

Trust as five major features which are: honesty, openness, compliance with agreements, understanding, and loyalty. "Honesty means that I can believe that you are telling the truth as much as you know - you will not deliberately lie to me. Transparency means that, on your initiative and request, you share all the information or thoughts that someone else has given so that someone else can make a more informed decision. They say they will do meetings if they say they will. To understand that, trust others with my well-being - personal or organizational –it is important that I know a person understands me. I have to know that a person understands my goals, values, motives, and what health is for me. Loyalty is support in the face of adversity. I must trust you in difficult times" (Gunu, 2014). Honesty, openness, understanding,

understanding, and loyalty are key to building and maintaining trust, showing quality relationships that allow for significant direct impact.

Confidence comes from resolving positive conflicts that improve relationships, that is, the ability to settle disputes amicably in a relationship builds trust (Segal, Smith, Robinson & Segal, 2017). Conflicting parties often associate themselves with "misunderstandings of different needs," but dispute settlement requires respect and a sense of security. Thus, trust-building requires variables such as interdependence, control, risk, expectation, and powers are important.

The secret of good working relationships is not only in responding to suggestions for positive communication but encompasses and include disputes settlement. It is believed that an individual who has a positive relationship resolves conflict easily (Gottman & DeClaire, 2001). The work environment is a very complex environment but trust can ameliorate the complex nature. Also, trust promotes cooperative attitudes (Gambetta, 1988). Trust mishandle hamper relationships which can lead to disputes, damage confidence, and non-cooperative behaviour that affect employee productivity.

When there is an existence of trust between individuals, then, there is a high tendency to belief especially in their character and competence which explain what they can do and who they are. Where trust exists in a team, there are common goals and directions in achieving the predetermined objectives (Gunu, 2014). An individual who is competent in resolving disputes in a team is an important element for trust-building in the 'system'. However, system security implies variations of trust in individual competence and character or cooperation and commitment in a team. It is one belief in an organization to solve contingency problems based on their integrity (Beierle & Cayford, 2001). This overtime affects the perception and belief individuals have regarding a particular organization even when members of the organization or team are weak. Yet, the organization perceived trust remains reliable and focused.

2.5 Consensus-building Approach

Consensus-building which is sometimes referred to as collaboration or joint problem solving is the process of resolving complex, multi-party disputes (Burgess& Spangler, 2003). Consensus-building has been widely used in the fields of environment and public policy. It is mostly used when conflict or complex dispute involves many parties. Consensus-building process gives room for stakeholders to unanimously develop an acceptable solution to an identified problem. The idea promotes local participation and involvement in decision-making process. Moreover, the consensus reached meets the interests of all stakeholders and agrees unanimously. Although not everyone could get what they wanted at first, it was agreed that everyone could live with what was offered after doing everything possible to represent the interests of all stakeholders (Susskind, 1996).

Consensus-building allows individuals and organizations to work together to resolve disputes in an acceptable way to everyone. It is a process that allows individuals to participate in decision-making processes rather than making controversial decisions. Stakeholders always have a broad view or perception of a problem (Angelo, 2019). The process of building consensus helps them create a mutual framework of understanding in providing acceptable solutions to all (Gray, 1989). This process encourages common interests, negotiations, and consolidative solutions. It gives room for the stakeholders to resolves divergent issues amicably.

Consensus-building is a conflict resolution strategy especially when it involves multiple parties. It is a method that turns conflicting interactions to generating possible alternatives causes of action in solving the problem through information gathering, generating alternative causes of action, considering available options, and selecting the best option possible that are feasible to all. Among the most prominent application area of consensus process is environmental disputes over the location and natural resources. Other application areas of consensus-building to settle disputes are intergovernmental, product liability, government policy on a key sector of the economy (Gray, 1989).

Issues usually resolved through consensus-building are generally known with some similar attributes such as common features include (Brower & Darrington, 2012):
- When problems are not properly identified or problems identified based on misunderstanding.
- When there are divergent personal interests among the stakeholders on issues.
- The absence of unified goals and directions for the stakeholders as a team.
- The differences in background and experience of the stakeholders create inequality in expertise and power which affect the resolution of issues.
- In a case of uncertainty and technical complication. • Stakeholders' different perceptions and views may be contradictory.
- Step-by-step or one-sided attempts in resolving issues usually produce fewer results.
- The methods used for settling issues may be inadequate in majority of cases and at times impaired new ideas (Gray, 1989).

2.6 Stages of Consensus-building

There is a difference in consensus-building models, but they are designed to settle issues. Usually, the processes were itemized in eight steps where in some instances the processes were lesser (Kelman, 2005). However, consensus-building stages were summarized below:

- Identification of problem
- Participant identification and recruitment
- Convening (Sourcing for Funds, determination of meeting point, and selecting the host, facilitator, and the likes)
- Design outline of step by step process
- Definition of problem and analysis
- Review of an alternative cause of actions
- Making a decision
- Approval of the agreement
- Implementation (Burgess & Spangler, 2003)

The contributing factors to positive consensus-building in the resolution of disputes (Gray, 1989);
- Stakeholder interdependence to facilitate collaboration
- All differences between/among stakeholders must be clear
- Decisions must be unilateral and acceptable to all the parties
- Consensus-building or collaboration must be an emergent process

2.7 Benefits of Consensus-building

Proper application of consensus-building processes can bring many benefits to multi-party problems. A vital paramount benefit of consensus-building is that the quality and solution of ideas pooled together is enhanced (Gottman, & DeClaire, 2001). Besides, consensus-building takes into cognizance the view of all stakeholders with the sense of ownership of interest. This is possible because the final decisions are made by the participants themselves. The interests of each party are represented and their views are captured on the consensus agreement.

However, consensus-building pushes the problems to the people that understand them well to proffer solutions. With this, no need to hire an outsider who is not familiar with the root cause of the problem (Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt & Camerer, 1998). Stakeholders' involvement in problem-solving increases decision-making and implementation in achieving the expected result. Participation, interdependence, and interrelationship involve in the consensus process assist in developing a better relationship between/among the stakeholders. Consensus-building, specifically, can help save money spent on litigation (Beierle & Cayford, 2001). Finally, working together with stakeholders can create a problem-solving team who can deal with related problems in the nearest future (Gray, 1989).

2.8 Development of Hypotheses

Gottman and DeClaire, (2001) concluded in their study that some element of trust are necessary for dispute resolution in an organization but failed to highlight the trust components while Beierle and Cayford, (2001) also agree in their study that trust is needed in resolving issues amicably but argue that the element of trust differs based on the individual. Gunu (2014) in his study evaluated the levels of conflict that can be resolved through trust but trust variables were not clearly identified. Literature evidence shows that trust is capable of resolving dispute but the principal element of trust is required to help conflict resolution. Thus, this study hypothesized: Ho1: trust components does not significantly influence conflict resolution

The traditional view assumed that conflicts should be avoided. This theory was supported by the conclusion of Burgess and Spangler (2003) who found out that conflict can be avoided through consensus agreement. Loh (2011); Brower and Darrington, (2012) in their different studies concluded that conflict is unavoidable (interactionist view) in human sphere but can be manage while Angelo (2019) in his study stated that stakeholders have broad view of problems and should be allow to participate in decision making. Evidence from past researches revealed that consensus-building variables; collaboration, participation and sacrifice are needed to manage conflict. This study hypothesized: Ho2: consensus-building has no significant effect on conflict management.

Notable researchers and scholars such as Hosmer (1995); Kelman (2005); Gunu (2014); Dickie (2015); Angelo (2019); and Myers, Smith, and Ostergren, (2019) in their different studies have measured the effect of trust or consensusbuilding on the resolution of dispute in different fields of endeavors but the aftermath of smooth and dispute free working relationship has been neglected. Therefore, this study hypothesized:
Ho3: trust, consensus-building and conflict resolution do not determine organizational efficiency

3. Methodology

The study adopted a survey design through the administration of a questionnaire to elicit information directly from the respondents to obtained valid and reliable information for cause and effect analysis. The population of the study comprised of organized and recognized unions in Nigeria such as ASUU, NUPENG, PENGASSAN, NUJ, NUT, SSANU, NASU, NULGE, IPMAN, and the likes. Based on the chosen population, the leaders of these unions at national and state levels are the only focus for the study. The sampling techniques adopted for the study are cluster and simple random techniques to select a sample of eighty-four (84) sample size that cut across the union leaders across states and national level. Primary data was employed to collect data for the study. An electronic structured questionnaire with a seven (7) points Likert scale was developed on quadratic and survey monkey sites and circulated through emails and available platforms on social media to elicit information from the respondents. Telephone calls were employed to persist for prompt response. Interviews were also conducted for all top executive officers who are usually positioned to represent management in negotiation during industrial actions to cross-examined information obtained from structured questions. The questionnaire was validated adopting face and content validity and the reliability results show a Cronbach alpha of 0.85. Inferential statistics such as ordinary least square, correlation analysis, and cross tabulation were used as inferential statistics to analyze the collated data.

4. Data Analysis and Presentation

Presentation of data and its analysis was done in a systematic way to aid good discussion of findings and interpretation of results.

4.1 Test of Multicollinearity

To determine the correlation level between and among the independent variables, the Multicollinearity tests were conducted to determine the collinearity among the identified variables. The variance inflation factor (VIF) in Table 1 reveals that the values of VIF obtained for all the identified variables ranges between 1 and 10. With this, it is evident that the multicollinearity issue does not exist among the variables of study. Likewise, the tolerance value for the variables identified is greater than 0.10. This implies a normal distribution of the residual and goodness of fit of the model.

Table 1 - Tolerance and VIF Values

Model		Collinearity Statistics	
		Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)		
	Honesty	0.225	3.569
	Openness	0.165	6.012
	Agreement	0.192	7.587
	Understanding	0.187	5.266
	Loyalty	0.180	5.512
	Collaborative	0.191	5.489
	Participative	0.273	6.453
	Sacrifice	0.211	5.961

a. Dependent Variable: Conflict resolution, conflict management

Source: Authors computation, 2022

4.2 Test of Research Hypotheses I

Ho_1: trust does not significantly influence conflict resolution

To examine the influence of trust-building on conflict resolution, variables such as honesty, openness, the keeping of agreement, understanding and loyalty are the proxies used to measure trust on conflict resolution.

Table 2 - Coefficients [a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.954	.211		5.412	.005
	Honesty	.621	.085	.558	4.123	.000
	Openness	.345	.031	.324	3.011	.039
	Keeping agreement	.121	.011	.110	1.213	.045
	Understanding	.547	.142	.486	3.247	.021
	Loyalty	.621	.081	.550	4.138	.001

R = 0.765[a]
R^2 = 0.585
Adjusted R^2 = .553
Durbin-Watson = .154
F ratio = 20.142
Sig. = .005

a. Dependent Variable: Conflict resolution
b. Predictors: (Constant), Honesty, Openness, keeping of agreement, understanding, and loyalty.

Source: Authors computation, 2022

Table 2 shows the coefficient table with the R-value of 76.5% relationship between trust-building variables and conflict resolution and R square of 58.5% showing the variability of trust-building indices on conflict resolution. This implies that trust accounted for 58.5% of conflict resolution for the sampled respondents and the outstanding 41.5% is due to other variables that are not accounted for in the computation. Of course, trust as a variable cannot influence conflict resolution alone. The overall coefficient of the joint trust-building variables is statistically significant at a 0.05 significance level with a p-value of 0.005. This means that joint variables of trust-building were statistically significant which implies that the combined effect of trust-building indices is capable of influencing conflict resolution.

The result shows that honesty and loyalty have the highest value coefficient of 62% each with a p-value of 0.000 and 0.001 respectively. These variables are significant statistically. This implies that honesty and loyalty are needed in conflict resolution. Honesty and loyalty from both parties to the issue of concern are needed for conflict resolution. Loyal and sincere parties are prerequisites in resolving controversial issues. The other metrics of trust-building such as openness, keeping of agreement, and understanding though significant but they are variables to watch in conflict resolution. The pvalue of these variables were less than 0.05 but relatively close. Information obtained from the interview conducted revealed, openness, keeping to agreement, and understanding of the parties to the controversial issues is important in conflict resolution. The Durbin-Watson of 0.154 further confirmed that there is no autocorrelation among the identified indices. The F ratio of 20.142 with a p-value of less than 0.05 also strengthens the effect of significance of the coefficients. The p-value of trust-building metrics are below 0.05, it suffices to deduce that trust-building is statistically significant in resolution of conflict.

4.3 Test of Research Hypotheses II

Ho_2: consensus-building has no significant effect on conflict management. To ascertain the existing relationship between consensus-building and conflict management, variables such as Collaboration, Participation, and Sacrifice are the proxies used for consensus-building measured against conflict management.
Table 3 shows the coefficient table with the R-value of 65.7% relationship between the consensus-building variables and conflict management and R square of 43.2% showing the variability of the consensus-building indices on conflict management. This implies that consensus-building accounted for 43.2% of conflict management of the sampled respondents and the remaining 56.8% is as a result of variables not accounted for in the computation. From the interview conducted, it was revealed that consensus-building is not the only variable that can influence conflict management. The overall coefficient of the joint consensus-building variables is significant at a 0.05 significance level with the p-value of 0.000. This implies that the joint variable of trust-building was statistically significant which implies that the combined effect of consensus-building indices is capable of influencing conflict management.
The result shows that sacrifice has the highest value of coefficient of 49.8% with a p-value of 0.000. The variable is statistically significant. This implies that sacrifice from both parties is needed in conflict management. The willingness to sacrifice in controversial issues is important in management of conflict. The other metrics of consensus-building such as collaboration and participation were also significant but need close monitoring as their p-value are within close range

to 0.05. The support and involvement of involved parties in managing conflict in any organization is very essential. The Durbin-Watson of 0.427 further confirmed that there is no autocorrelation amongst indices identified. The F ratio of 6.968 with p-value of less than 0.05 also strengthens the effect of significance from the coefficients. Since a p-value of all the consensus-building metrics is less than 0.05, it suffices to say that consensus-building is statistically significant in conflict management.

Table 3 - Coefficients [a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.283	.565		5.815	.000
	Collaboration	.019	.032	.062	0.604	.048
	Participation	-.371	.108	-.416	-3.416	.001
	Sacrifice	.498	.113	.525	4.405	.000

R = .657[a]
R Square = .432
Adjusted R Square = .428
Durbin-Watson = .427
F ratio = 6.968
Sig. = .000

a. Dependent Variable: Conflict management
b. Predictors: (Constant), Collaboration, Participation and Sacrifice

Source: Authors computation, 2022

4.4 Test of Research Hypotheses III

Ho$_3$: trust, consensus-building, and conflict resolution do not determine organizational efficiency
To determine the variables association, resultant effects, and relationship between/among the conceptual issues of the study against organizational efficiency, cross tabulation analytical technique was adopted.
Table 4 is cross-tabulation variable that shows the association among the trust-building, consensus-building, conflict resolution, and organizational efficiency. The Pearson Chi-square of 249.097[a], 275.084[a] and 264.582[a] respectively show a great association between/among the conceptual issues. Also, the Pearson correlation of 80.3%, 79.4%, and 90.8% respectively shows that the correlation among the conceptual issues and organizational efficiency is strong and positive. This implies that for an organization to function efficiently, conflict resolution is important and for efficient conflict management, trust and consensus-building are expedient. Likewise, Spearman correlation shows 80.4%, 82.9% and 90.3% respectively. Since all the values tested are statistically significant i.e. 0.000 less than 0.05 level of significance, it means that trust, consensus-building, conflict resolution and organizational efficiency have significant association and positive correlation. Besides, information derived from the interview shows that for organizations to be effective in the discharge of their responsibilities, elements of trust-building and consensus approach are expedient.

Table 4 - Chi Square Tests

	Trust*Orgnal_Efficiency	Consensus*Orgnal_Efficiency	Conflict_Resolution*Orgnal_Efficiency	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	
	Value	Value	Value			
Pearson Chi Square	249.097[a]	275.084[a]	264.582[a]	36	.000	
Likelihood Ratio	199.210	221.812	214.608	36	.000	
Linear-By-Linear Association	52.845	51.698	67.544	1	.000	
Pearson's R	.803	.794	.908		.000	
Spearman Correlation	.804	.829	.903		.000	
Eta	.817	.802	.914		.000	
N of Valid Cases	83	83	83	83		

Source: SPSS Printout, 2022

4.5 Discussion of Findings

Trust-building was proxied by honesty, loyalty, understanding, keeping to agreement, and openness was important variables in conflict resolution. The analysis and information obtained from the interview revealed that most times, honesty and loyalty fade away among parties because one party always refuse to honour the agreement, this party in honesty does not want the issues in conflict to be resolved, and display a lack of in-depth knowledge of the consequences of lingering conflict and its effect on organizational goals and objectives. This finding agrees with the study of Burgess and Spangler (2003); Segal, Smith, Robinson and Segal (2017); Saldert, Polk and Stepanova, (2020) who believed trustbuilding have a strong effect on conflict resolution and disagrees with the findings of Lewicki and Tomlinson (2003) who stipulates that communication is the only factor in conflict resolution.

Consensus-building indices such as collaboration, participation, and sacrifice were identified as the major important variables in conflict management. The findings revealed that sacrifice by concerned parties is a major consideration in conflict management, as it is also crucial that the approach to management of conflict must be a win-win approach. Besides, support, involvement, and participation of parties involved in conflict would help in the resolution of conflict. This finding is in tandem with Burgess and Spangler (2003); Myers Smith, and Ostergren, (2019) who concluded that the consensus-building approach is needed in management of conflict in an organization.

The findings revealed that trust-building and consensus-building have a strong and positive effect on conflict resolution. By this, conflict resolution plays a major role in organizational efficiency. This implies that, if organizations are proactive in the management of conflict, then, organizational goals, and objectives can be achieved. To enhance organizational efficiency, trust, consensus-building and the conflict resolution are the major determinants.

Summarily, all three hypotheses of the study from findings revealed that trust-building proxies by openness, honesty, keeping of agreement, understanding and loyalty are capable of dispute resolution. While consensus-building of stakeholders' participation, collaboration and sacrifice are significant in conflict management which implies that stakeholder's involvement in conflicting issues resolves dispute amicably. The end result of trust and consensus-building in conflict resolution on the employee's productivity have a significant effect which eventually translated to organizational efficiency.

4.6 Policy Formulation and Implication

In line with the general believe that conflict is inevitable due to interdependence and interrelationship of human nature as suggested by the interactionist view of trust building. It is expedient for organizational psychology and managers to know that the organizational continuity, success and survival depend largely on a free, smooth relationship and good working atmosphere that is enjoyed by all stakeholders in running of day to day activities in the organization. This can only be accomplished in an atmosphere of trust and consensus agreement by all stakeholders.

It is rapidly becoming a norm by the organized labour that the single language employers understand in the case of dispute is strike or industrial action. The findings of this study have revealed that the fundamental reason is lack of trust (openness, honesty, keeping of agreement, understanding and loyalty) and consensus-building (collaboration, participation and sacrifice). Therefore, a policy framework is needed to build trust and motivate collaboration and stakeholder's participation in decision making. Besides, the implication of trust and consensus-building is that conflicts are resolve amicably without damage to organizational goals and objectives. It promotes organizational efficiency.

5.0 Conclusion and Recommendations

It is crystal clear that the traditional opinion of the conflict resolution with the perception that conflict is avoidable remains unpopular. The interactionist view that conflict can arouse active interaction without overflowing with disruptive and negative emotions is insufficient while the perspective of conflict management recognizes that conflict is not avoidable in most organizations which focus more on productive conflict resolutions. This implies that though conflict is unavoidable in an organization, it can be managed to achieve organizational goals and objectives.

The measures of being proactive in conflict management are trust and consensus-building. The key determinants in conflict resolution were honesty, openness, keeping to the agreement, understanding, loyalty, collaboration, participation, and sacrifice. For organizational goals and objectives to be achieved, a conflict-free organization is important.

In line with the findings, the study recommended that;

- The parties involved in the organizational dispute should keep an open mind to the terms and conditions of the resolution, follow through with the signed agreement and display a detailed knowledge of the terms and conditions agreed to in conflict resolution to build trust.

- Since conflict is unavoidable in a workplace system, then, all stakeholder's support, involvement, participation, and willingness should be sought at all times to promote a conflict free environment in the workplace.

- It is expedient that trust and consensus-building should be encouraged to facilitate conflict resolution in order to achieve organizational efficiency.

5.1 Recommendations for Future Studies

This study focused more on interactionist view of trust-building, future study can focus on traditional view, personality theory and trait theory of consensus-building. Also, this study evaluated cross responses from different organization, future study can be industry specific for uniqueness.

References

Angelo, E. (2019). Managing interpersonal conflict. Step for success. Nursing Management: 50(6), 22-28.

Beierle, T.C., & Cayford, J. (2001). Evaluating Dispute Resolution as an Approach to Public Participation. Discussion Paper 01–40.

Brower, N.,& Darrington, J. (2012).Effective communication skills: Resolving conflicts. Families and Communities. Utah State University. Retrieved from https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/extension_curall/787

Burgess, H., & Spangler, B. (2003). Conflicts and disputes. In G. Burgessand H. Burgess(Eds.), Beyond Intractability. Boulder: University of Colorado.

Dickie, J. (2015). Trust and Conflict Resolution: Relationship Building for Learning. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 197, 2066 – 2073.

Gambetta, D. (1988). Trust: Making and breaking cooperative relations. NY, USA: Basil Blackwell.

Gottman, J. M., & DeClaire, J. (2001).The relationship cure: A five-step Guide to strengthening your marriage, family and friendships. NY: Crown Publishers.

Gray, B. (1989). The Pathways of My Research: A Journey of Personal Engagement and Change. The Journal of Applied Behavioural Science, 25, 383-398.

Gunu, U. (2014). "Trust-building, consensus approach and conflict resolution". Unpublished seminar paper delivered at Michael Imodu Institute of Labour Studies, Ilorin, Nigeria.

Hosmer, L.T. (1995). Trust: The Connecting Link between Organizational Theory and Philosophical Ethics. Academy of Management Review, 20, 379-403.

Jerome, D. P. (2003). "Participation, consensus-building and conflict management training course: tools for achieving PCCP". Programme and meeting document retrieved from https://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/Portals/70/docs/cpc/UNESCO_PI_Course.pdf

Kelman, H. C. (2005). Building trust among enemies: The central challenge for international conflict resolution. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 29, 639-650.

Körppen, D. (2011). Space Beyond the Liberal Peacebuilding Consensus – A Systemic Perspective.doi: 10.2307/j.ctvbkjz66.8.

Leung, A. S. M. (2008). Interpersonal conflict and resolution strategies. Team Performance Management, 14, 165-178. doi: 10.1108/13527590810883433

Levine, S. (2009). Getting to resolution: Turning conflict into collaboration (2nd ed.). Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Lewicki, R. J.,& Tomlinson, E. C. (2003). Trust and Trust-building. Beyond intractability. Beyond Intractability. Boulder: University of Colorado.

Lewicki, R. J., McAllister, D. J.,& Bies, R.J. (1998). Trust and Distrust: New Relationships and Realities. The Academy of Management Review, 23, 438-458.

Loh, L. (2011). Managing heritage organisations: The Heritage of Malaysia Trust.Paper presented at the International Conference on Heritage Conservation in Hong-Kong, 2011.

Myers, D., Smith, S. N., & Ostergren, G. (2019).Consensus-building, Negotiation, and Conflict Resolution for Heritage Place Management. Proceedings of a Workshop Organized by the Getty Conservation Institute, Los Angeles California, 1-3 December 2009.

Rousseau, D.M., Sitkin, S.B., Burt, R.S.,& Camerer, C. (1998). Not So Different after All: A Cross-Discipline View of Trust. Academy of Management Review, 23, 393-404.

Saldert, H., Polk, M., & Stepanova, O. (2020). Understanding mechanisms of conflict resolution beyond collaboration: an interdisciplinary typology of knowledge types and their integration in practice. Sustainability Science, 15, 263–279.

Segal, J., Smith, M., Robinson, L., & Segal, R. (2017). Stress in the Workplace, Managing Job and Workplace Stress. Retrieved from www.helpguide.org/articles/stress/stress-at-work.html on 06/09/2020.

Susskind, L. E. (1996). Parallel Informal Negotiation: A New Kind of International Dialogue. Negotiation Journal, 12 (1). doi: 10.1111/j.1571-9979.1996.tb00076.x