CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter illustrates the methodology that will be used in this research study. It will explain the research framework, research proposition, diagnostic measures, sampling design, data collection method and the data analysis techniques.

3.0 RESEARCH FRAMEWORK

This study applies the framework of Yusof Omar's Conflict Diagnostic and Resolution Model (2002) (Unpublished manuscript, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur). The framework is outlined into four sections, i.e., Conflict Diagnostic, Design Intervention, System Intervention Strategy (Window of Involvement and Emotional Aspect of Intervention) and the Concept of Emergence (Self Regulation and Self Organisation).

The first section of the research framework is the conflict diagnostic section. According to (Robbins, 2001, pp. 385-386) conflict was originated from a number of sources like communication, structure and personal factors. The communication barrier variables that were associated with conflict were semantic difficulties, insufficient exchange of information, and noise in channels of communication. As for semantic difficulties, this was said to arise as a result of people's selective perception, inadequate information about others and differences in training and upbringings. Too much and too little of information was said to be one of the causes of conflict. As numerous people in the communication process filter the information, there was plenty of room to create incorrect, distorted, or ambiguous messages, all of which can lead to hostility. The channels used to convey information, such as memo, meetings or grapevine have also been considered as the generation of conflict.
Yusof Omar's Conflict Diagnostic And Resolution Model (2002)

(Robbins, 2001, p. 387) also mentioned that the interpretation of structure, which includes size, specialisation, ambiguity, reward and leadership, also generated conflict. Size and specialisation were said to interact; the larger the group and the more specialised its activities, the greater the likelihood of conflict. With specialisation and differentiation within the organization, the development of distinctive expertise and the adoption of diverse range of goals were also a major source of conflict. Members of other functional groupings were likely to be seen as competitors for scarce resources. This can be aggravated by imbalances of power between the functional groups, thereby stoking the flames of conflict. This also applies to ambiguity. The greater the ambiguity when defining responsibility for action, the greater the likelihood of inter-group feuding to control resources and organisation domains. Nevertheless, participative leadership may stimulate conflict, on the understanding that participation encourages the expression of different points of view. Reward systems are also seen as a potential source of conflict. If one party secures rewards at the expense of another party, it will also caused the occurrence of conflict.
Personal factors referred by (Robbins, 2001, p. 387) covers personality characteristics and value systems to which people adhere. It is understandable that individual who are highly authoritarian and dogmatic, have within them the capacity to generate conflict. Value systems are a significant variable in the study of social conflict. It determines one's outlook and behaviour. It can also be seen as a significant force in prejudice, expression of views about good and bad practices, and notions of equitable rewards.

Subsequently, the conflict diagnostic that was developed were as follows:

1. Nonverbal communication (Kinesics) diagnostic;
2. Barriers to cross-cultural communication diagnostic;
3. Semantic difficulties diagnostic;
4. Structural dysfunctions diagnostic;
5. Personal variable differences diagnostic; and

This conflict diagnostic will be discussed in greater depth under the diagnostic measures section in this chapter. This conflict diagnostic will be used as a yardstick to measure the level of existence of conflict in the organisation selected for this study.

The next section is designing intervention, which involves a series of activities, actions and events intended to assist the organisation in improving its performance and effectiveness. Intervention designs vary from standardised programmes that have been developed and used in many organisations to relatively unique programmes tailored to specific organisation or department. Interventions purposely disrupt the status quo and they are deliberate attempts to change an organisation toward a different and more effective state (Cummings & Worley, 2001, p. 22).
As mentioned by (Cummings and Wolley, 2001, pp. 22-23) Lewin’s model of change, unfreezing destabilises the status quo and provides an opportunity to introduce new norms and behaviours. Refreezing stabilises the desired changes. Premature signalling of readiness to refreeze or stabilise may result in only partial completion of the needed changes. Therefore, (Cummings and Wolley, 2001, p. 142) mentioned that effective intervention needs to meet three criteria: the extent to which it fits the needs of the organisation, the degree to which it is based on causal knowledge of intended outcomes and the extent to which it transfer change management competence to organisation members.

Then the framework moves on to the System Intervention Strategy (SIS). SIS is intended as a structured approach for inquiry into a messy situation that requires change management (Yolles, 1999, p. 238). This structure approach is designed to enable development of a set of intervention strategies for change in the organisation by the change agent. This development occurs through an iteration process that enables any strategies to be clarified and fully defined. Hence, SIS is adopted in this study to enable the development and implementation of a set of interventions. In SIS, inquiries seeking change to a problem identified and resistance to change may be created by stakeholders. Such resistance to change can be reduced by involving stakeholders in the change situation at the preliminary stage. The Eason model will be used in this study to relate to stakeholders involvement in designing and implementation. The impact of human emotions shall also be taken into consideration since emotions are associated with people-related soft perception of situations (Yolles, 1999, p. 240).

Finally, the implementation of resolutions must take into cognisance the concept of self-regulation, self-organisation and self-organisation spiral (Yolles, 1999, p. 142). Self-regulation is the maintenance of a particular variable that is organised to keep the essential variables within definable limits. It relies on negative feedback and specified limits. Meanwhile, self-organisation is the self-amplification of fluctuations generated in the system as a consequence of perturbations from the environment. Self-organisation is
seen to occur as a spiral pattern of behaviour where the system under the impact of perturbation will adapt if it is to survive. Thereafter, the world of emergent behaviour manifests and unfolds itself where the phenomena often behave in surprising and unpredictable ways. (Bonabeau, 2002).

All reactions of conflict stem from two general impulses which are the desire to satisfy personal concerns and the desire to satisfy the concern of others. These two behavioural dimensions were further incorporated into a fuller model built around the idea that people react in one of the five basic ways when faced with conflict situations (Thomas & Kilmann, 1974, quoted in McKenna & Richardson, 1995).

• Competing - The competitive style is characterized by a desire to satisfy one’s own concern at the expense of others. In a general sense, competitively oriented people often act in an aggressive and uncooperative manner. The situation is often one of a win-lose situation, with attempts to dominate being common (Thomas & Kilmann, 1974, quoted in McKenna & Richardson, 1995).

• Collaborating - The collaborative style is concerned with trying to satisfy both parties’ concern in a conflict. People who want to satisfy the wishes of all parties to the conflict and sincerely wants to find solution that satisfies everyone (Champoux, 2000, p. 206). They seek a mutually beneficial solution, integration and a win-win situation.

• Compromising - The compromising style is a middling approach to conflict. Compromising people are satisfied if people achieve moderate levels of satisfaction with agreements in conflict. Compromising people do not fully avoid the problem, nor do they fully collaborate to
develop a *win-win* resolution (Thomas & Kilmann, 1974, quoted in McKenna & Richardson, 1995).

- **Avoiding** - People who practices the avoiding style tend to behave as if they were indifferent both to their own concern and to the concern of others. This type of strategy attempts to keep the conflict from surfacing at all (Luthans, 1998, p. 315).

- **Accommodating** - Those people that focuses on needs and desires of the other party to the conflict, ignoring his own needs and desires (Champoux, 2000, p. 206).

### 3.1 RESEARCH PROPOSITIONS

For the nonverbal communication (kinesics), barriers to cross-cultural communication, semantic difficulties, structural dysfunctions and personal variable differences diagnostic, a mean score of more than 4.0 reveals that conflict is present in the organisation. The greater the mean score from 4.0, the more excessive conflict is in the organisation. A mean score of less than 4.0 reveals that conflict might be absent in the organisation. The lesser the mean score from 4.0, the less likely conflict occurs in the organisation.

As for leadership theories and leadership styles diagnostic, a mean score more or less than 4.0 reveals that there is an imbalance of practice of leadership theories and styles in the organisation. The greater the mean score from 4.0, more emphasis is on a certain leadership theory or style by the leaders. Whereas, the lesser the mean score from 4.0, the less emphasis is on a particular leadership theory and style by the leaders.

**Proposition 1:**
In the nonverbal communication (kinesics) diagnostic, a mean score of 4.0 will denote that conflict exits as a normal functioning in SHCFMSB.
Proposition 2:
In the barriers to cross-cultural communication diagnostic, a mean score of 4.0 will denote that conflict exits as a normal functioning in SHCFMSB.

Proposition 3:
In the semantic difficulties diagnostic, a mean score of 4.0 will denote that conflict exits as a normal functioning in SHCFMSB.

Proposition 4:
In the structural dysfunctions diagnostic, a mean score of 4.0 will denote that conflict exits as a normal functioning in SHCFMSB.

Proposition 5:
In the personal variable differences diagnostic, a mean score of 4.0 will denote that conflict exits as a normal functioning in SHCFMSB.

Proposition 6:
In the leadership theories and styles diagnostic, a mean score of 4.0 will denote that there is a balance of practice of leadership theories and styles by those leaders in SHCFMSB.

3.2 DIAGNOSTIC MEASUREMENT

Scores given to the target samples during the observation for each diagnostic measurement uses a seven-point Likert scale as indicated in Appendix 1.

3.2.1 NONVERBAL COMMUNICATION DIAGNOSTIC

The nonverbal communication diagnostic is operationalised under the combination of two dimensions, which are the body language and paralinguistic. In this study, the body language looks at the body motions and
facial expressions of the observed individuals. In a study conducted by Sundaram and Webster (2000) to explore the importance of service employees' nonverbal communication during service interaction, it was found that in all service situations, the use of frequent eye contact accompanied by other complementary nonverbal cues would help enhance perceptions of trust, believability and sincerity. On the other hand, kinesics uses the gestures, facial expressions, eye movements and body postures in communicating emotions.

Paralinguistic looks at the tone of voice, pacing and pitch of the observed individuals. In the similar studies, Sundaram and Webster (2000) also mentioned that verbal statements convey states of being, while listeners use paralinguistic cues such as vocal pitch, vocal loudness, pitch variation, pauses to perceive the exact state of being. This nonverbal communication is very important during communication as it can inadvertently translate certain ideas to others through the tone of voice and pace of speech. Below describes several forms of nonverbal communication.

- Body Motions - body orientation (leaning forward posture), nodding of head and eye contact are some of the positive body motion. Posture signals one's degree of self-confidence or interest in what is being discussed. The more interested a person is, the more likely the person is to lean forward toward the person who is talking.

A seven-point Likert Scale ranging from "Completely Absent (1), Absent (2), Slightly Absent (3), Neutral (4), Slightly Present (5), Present (6) to Norm (7) was used to reflect the overall degree of conflict due to body motions. Scale 1 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' body motion that causes organisational conflict is completely absent. Scale 2 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' body motion that causes organisational conflict is absent. Scale 3 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' body motion that causes organisational conflict is slightly absent. Scale 4 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' body motion that causes
organisational conflict is neutral. This is the ideal stage whereby organisational conflict is present at the appropriate level. Scale 5 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' body motion that causes organisational conflict is slightly present. Scale 6 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' body motion that causes organisational conflict is present. Scale 7 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' body motion that causes organisational conflict is norm. This stage means that the presence of organisational conflict has exceeded the appropriate level. Thus, it will jeopardise the organisation.

- Facial expression – facial expression tells about feeling (Champoux, 2000, p. 246). A smile while speaking shows liking while a frown indicates disgust or despair. The movement of the eyes and how they are focused on other people, objects reveal a lot of information. With a direct look, it denotes to another person that they are ready to communicate. When trying to convince a person, direct eye contact is very useful.

A seven-point Likert Scale ranging from "Completely Absent (1), Absent (2), Slightly Absent (3), Neutral (4), Slightly Present (5), Present (6) to Norm (7) was used to reflect the overall degree of conflict due to facial expression. Scale 1 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' facial expression that causes organisational conflict is completely absent. Scale 2 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' facial expression that causes organisational conflict is absent. Scale 3 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' facial expression that causes organisational conflict is slightly absent. Scale 4 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' facial expression that causes organisational conflict is neutral. This is the ideal stage whereby organisational conflict is present at the appropriate level. Scale 5 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' facial expression that causes organisational conflict is slightly present. Scale 6 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' facial expression that causes organisational conflict is present. Scale 7 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' facial expression that causes
organisational conflict is norm. This stage means that the presence of organisational conflict has exceeded the appropriate level. Thus, it will jeopardise the organisation.

- Tone of voice – a person’s voice can be loud or soft, high or low pitched, fast or slow, pleasant or harsh, monotonous or interesting. Tone of voice such as vocal loudness translates to the listener the emotions of the one communicating.

A seven-point Likert Scale ranging from “Completely Absent (1), Absent (2), Slightly Absent (3), Neutral (4), Slightly Present (5), Present (6) to Norm (7) was used to reflect the overall degree of conflict due to tone of voice. Scale 1 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ tone of voice that causes organisational conflict is completely absent. Scale 2 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ tone of voice that causes organisational conflict is absent. Scale 3 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ tone of voice that causes organisational conflict is slightly absent. Scale 4 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ tone of voice that causes organisational conflict is neutral. This is the ideal stage whereby organisational conflict is present at the appropriate level. Scale 5 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ tone of voice that causes organisational conflict is slightly present. Scale 6 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ tone of voice that causes organisational conflict is present. Scale 7 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ tone of voice that causes organisational conflict is norm. This stage means that the presence of organisational conflict has exceeded the appropriate level. Thus, it will jeopardise the organisation.

- Pacing and pitch - pacing and pitch looks at the pitch variation and the pauses used during communication.
A seven-point Likert Scale ranging from "Completely Absent (1), Absent (2), Slightly Absent (3), Neutral (4), Slightly Present (5), Present (6) to Norm (7) was used to reflect the overall degree of conflict due to pacing and pitch. Scale 1 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' pacing and pitch that causes organisational conflict is completely absent. Scale 2 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' pacing and pitch that causes organisational conflict is absent. Scale 3 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' pacing and pitch that causes organisational conflict is slightly absent. Scale 4 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' pacing and pitch that causes organisational conflict is neutral. This is the ideal stage whereby organisational conflict is present at the appropriate level. Scale 5 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' pacing and pitch that causes organisational conflict is slightly present. Scale 6 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' pacing and pitch that causes organisational conflict is present. Scale 7 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' pacing and pitch that causes organisational conflict is norm. This stage means that the presence of organisational conflict has exceeded the appropriate level. Thus, it will jeopardise the organisation.

The overall degree of conflict attributed to nonverbal communication was measured by averaging the mean scores of these four scales - body motion, facial expression, tone of voice, pacing and pitch. This assumes that the four scales have an equal weight. The higher the mean score, the more excessive conflict is present in the organisation as a result of the nonverbal communication cues. If the mean score is greater than 4.0, we will then bring down the mean score to 4.0 through the proposed intervention strategy in the following chapters. Then again, if the mean score is less than 4.0, which is in the absence of conflict, we will then jazz-up the score to 4.0 through the proposed intervention strategy in the following chapters.
3.2.2 BARRIERS TO CROSS-CULTURAL COMMUNICATION DIAGNOSTIC

Culture differences may lead to communication breakdown because of semantics problems, word connotation problems, tone differences and perception differences. Kelly (2000) defined semantics as the meaning of words or other symbols. Semantic is viewed as a barrier to effective communication because words can be used imprecisely, accurately or may mean different things to different people. As a result, misinterpretation of the meaning of words between two parties would lead to communication barrier. This is usually due to the words that are commonly used in communication that carries different meanings for different people. For example, the word "mata" to a Malay means eye whereas to Chinese especially to hokkien means police. Therefore different interpretation by different culture may actually lead to misinterpretation of the meaning of words during communication. According to (Szilagyi Jr. & Wallace, Jr., 1980, p. 431), there are two kinds of semantic problems. First, some words and phrases are so general or abstract that they invite varying interpretation. The second semantic problem arises when different groups develop their own technical language and argot.

A seven-point Likert Scale ranging from "Completely Absent (1), Absent (2), Slightly Absent (3), Neutral (4), Slightly Present (5), Present (6) to Norm (7) was used to reflect the overall degree of conflict due to semantics. Scale 1 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' semantic that causes organisational conflict is completely absent. Scale 2 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' semantic that causes organisational conflict is absent. Scale 3 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' semantic that causes organisational conflict is slightly absent. Scale 4 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' semantic that causes organisational conflict is neutral. This is the ideal stage whereby organisational conflict is present at the appropriate level. Scale 5 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' semantic that causes organisational conflict is slightly present. Scale 6
denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' semantic that causes organisational conflict is present. Scale 7 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' semantic that causes organisational conflict is norm. This stage means that the presence of organisational conflict has exceeded the appropriate level. Thus, it will jeopardise the organisation.

Another cross-cultural barrier is the distinction in style of communication among different cultural groups. Usually styles of communication are interpreted differently among different culture groups (King, 2000). Ghemawat (2001) mentioned that a country's cultural attributes would determine how people interact with one another. Differences in religion, belief, race, social norms and language are capable of creating distance between two countries. Some cultural attributes like language are easily perceived and understood while others are more subtle. For example, some words used may be interpreted as rude while others may perceive it as normal. As a result, different interpretation among people from different culture communicating may lead to miscommunication. People in the state of Malacca sometimes uses "rowdy word" to acknowledge a person they are close too or high affinity with whereas people in other states may interpret it as being rude.

A seven-point Likert Scale ranging from "Completely Absent (1), Absent (2), Slightly Absent (3), Neutral (4), Slightly Present (5), Present (6) to Norm (7) was used to reflect the overall degree of conflict due to word connotations. Scale 1 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' word connotations that causes organisational conflict is completely absent. Scale 2 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' word connotations that causes organisational conflict is absent. Scale 3 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' word connotations that causes organisational conflict is slightly absent. Scale 4 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' word connotations that causes organisational conflict is neutral. This is the ideal stage whereby organisational conflict is present at the appropriate level. Scale 5 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' word connotations that
causes organisational conflict is slightly present. Scale 6 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' word connotations that causes organisational conflict is present. Scale 7 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' word connotations that causes organisational conflict is norm. This stage means that the presence of organisational conflict has exceeded the appropriate level. Thus, it will jeopardise the organisation.

Tone modulation can express surprise, anger, frustration or fear, which means the inability to control the tone while communicating, may lead to receiver interpreting the message differently. Gardenswartz (2001) mentioned that culture influences how close an individual stand, how loud an individual speak and how they participate in a meeting. As such, an individual's behaviour at work is actually influenced by their culture. People from different cultures speak in different tone modulation. For example, those people speaking in the hakka language tend to speak abrasively whereas those people speaking in mandarin tend to speak more politely.

A seven-point Likert Scale ranging from “Completely Absent (1), Absent (2), Slightly Absent (3), Neutral (4), Slightly Present (5), Present (6) to Norm (7) was used to reflect the overall degree of conflict due to tone modulation. Scale 1 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' tone differences that causes organisational conflict is completely absent. Scale 2 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' tone differences that causes organisational conflict is absent. Scale 3 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' tone differences that causes organisational conflict is slightly absent. Scale 4 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' tone differences that causes organisational conflict is neutral. This is the ideal stage whereby organisational conflict is present at the appropriate level. Scale 5 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' tone differences that causes organisational conflict is slightly present. Scale 6 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' tone differences that causes organisational conflict is present. Scale 7 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' tone differences that causes organisational conflict is norm. This stage means that
the presence of organisational conflict has exceeded the appropriate level. Thus, it will jeopardise the organisation.

Perception differences as a result of difference cultures may also contribute to conflict. Appelbaum, Shapiro and Elbaz (1998) in their study mentioned that communication problems occur as a result of cross-cultural differences. Cross-cultural perception differences occur, as patterns are selective, learned and culturally determined. As a result, different individual may have different perception on a message that is received during communication due to their different culture background. (MacMillan & Powell, 1973, quoted in Moore, 2001) defined perception in the context of learning as being "the mental activity of interpreting the impressions received through the senses of sight, hearing, tasting, feeling and smelling". Perception is therefore deemed to be an active response to stimuli. For example, westerners view teammanship as being designed to forge a collaborative work unit whereas many other cultures do not see things that way. Social status, family connections, gender, seniority and age have a powerful impact on the expectations of the team members who have been differently acculturated.

A seven-point Likert Scale ranging from "Completely Absent (1), Absent (2), Slightly Absent (3), Neutral (4), Slightly Present (5), Present (6) to Norm (7) was used to reflect the overall degree of conflict due to perception differences. Scale 1 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' perception differences that causes organisational conflict is completely absent. Scale 2 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' perception differences that causes organisational conflict is absent. Scale 3 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' perception differences that causes organisational conflict is slightly absent. Scale 4 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' perception differences that causes organisational conflict is neutral. This is the ideal stage whereby organisational conflict is present at the appropriate level. Scale 5 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' perception differences that causes organisational conflict is slightly present. Scale 6 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' perception
differences that causes organisational conflict is present. Scale 7 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ perception differences that causes organisational conflict is norm. This stage means that the presence of organisational conflict has exceeded the appropriate level. Thus, it will jeopardise the organisation.

Therefore, the more excessive semantic and word connotation problems encountered, the greater the chances of conflict arising. Semantic and word connotation problem arises when vague words, inaccurate words, jargons are used which leads to misinterpretation. It goes the same with tone differences where differences in vocal pitch may give different interpretation to the party that is listening. Perception differences occur when an object or an event brings different meaning to different people as a result of different culture background.

The overall degree of conflict attributed to cross cultural communication was measured by averaging the mean scores of these four scales – semantics, word connotations, tone differences and perception differences. This assumes that the four scales have an equal weight. The higher the mean score, the more excessive conflict is present in the organisation as a result of the cross-cultural communication. If the mean score is greater than 4.0, we will then bring down the mean score to 4.0 through the proposed intervention strategy in the following chapters. Then again, if the mean score is less than 4.0, which are in the absence of conflict, we will then jazz-up the score to 4.0 through the proposed intervention strategy in the following chapters.

3.2.3 SEMANTIC DIFFICULTIES DIAGNOSTIC

According to (Champoux, 2000, p. 248) semantic problems are said to be communication dysfunctions. Some of the semantic difficulties are people’s selective perception, inadequate information about others and differences in training and upbringings. Among the barriers to effective communication
process identified in this study are filtering, defensiveness apprehensions, language, selective perception, information overload and channels chosen.

Filtering means that part of the attention in which some perceptual information is blocked out and not recognized, while other information receives attention and is subsequently recognized. Filtering limits the amount of information that can be recognized at one point of time, which might lead to misinterpretation of information (Reed, 2000, p. 6). Both speakers and listeners actually have communication filter or barriers through which message must come. Speaker sends a message through his/her filter, the listener receives the message through his/her filter. As a result, it is difficult to achieve a total and accurate communication.

A seven-point Likert Scale ranging from "Completely Absent (1), Absent (2), Slightly Absent (3), Neutral (4), Slightly Present (5), Present (6) to Norm (7) was used to reflect the overall degree of conflict due to filtering. Scale 1 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' filtering that causes organisational conflict is completely absent. Scale 2 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' filtering that causes organisational conflict is absent. Scale 3 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' filtering that causes organisational conflict is slightly absent. Scale 4 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' filtering that causes organisational conflict is neutral. This is the ideal stage whereby organisational conflict is present at the appropriate level. Scale 5 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' filtering that causes organisational conflict is slightly present. Scale 6 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' filtering that causes organisational conflict is present. Scale 7 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' filtering that causes organisational conflict is norm. This stage means that the presence of organisational conflict has exceeded the appropriate level. Thus, it will jeopardise the organisation.

Usually defensiveness is developed by individuals in response to the unknown and where they are going into unfamiliar or threatening situations.
For example, an individual become very formal when dealing with strangers, an individual will show resistance when dealing with change and aggression when dealing with threats.

According to Carter (1987), people feel threatened and practise defensive strategy when they are

- Evaluated – they fear someone else is passing judgment on them.
- Controlled – they do not like to feel that others can make us do something.
- Manipulated – they do not like to be conned or tricked.
- Ignored – they want to feel as though they have value and are important.

A seven-point Likert Scale ranging from "Completely Absent (1), Absent (2), Slightly Absent (3), Neutral (4), Slightly Present (5), Present (6) to Norm (7)" was used to reflect the overall degree of conflict due to defensiveness apprehensions. Scale 1 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ defensiveness apprehensions that causes organisational conflict is completely absent. Scale 2 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ defensiveness apprehensions that causes organisational conflict is absent. Scale 3 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ defensiveness apprehensions that causes organisational conflict is slightly absent. Scale 4 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ defensiveness apprehensions that causes organisational conflict is neutral. This is the ideal stage whereby organisational conflict is present at the appropriate level. Scale 5 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ defensiveness apprehensions that causes organisational conflict is slightly present. Scale 6 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ defensiveness apprehensions that causes organisational conflict is present. Scale 7 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ defensiveness apprehensions that causes organisational conflict is norm. This stage means that the presence of organisational conflict has exceeded the appropriate level. Thus, it will jeopardise the organisation.
Language when communicated orally or in written form, the way a person expressed it will affect whether the message is received positively or negatively. Even when receiving bad news, using positive language can soften the impact. Jargon is a specialized language used by members of a profession or those in a select group or organisation. Jargon might be necessary for technical communication among members or might be widely understood within the organisation or it is possible that it is utterly unknown by non-members (Watson, 1997). The preciseness of language can be very specific (only suitable to be communicated to certain people) or vague or abstract where it might give different interpretation to different people.

A seven-point Likert Scale ranging from “Completely Absent (1), Absent (2), Slightly Absent (3), Neutral (4), Slightly Present (5), Present (6) to Norm (7) was used to reflect the overall degree of conflict due to language. Scale 1 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ language that causes organisational conflict is completely absent. Scale 2 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ language that causes organisational conflict is absent. Scale 3 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ language that causes organisational conflict is slightly absent. Scale 4 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ language that causes organisational conflict is neutral. This is the ideal stage whereby organisational conflict is present at the appropriate level. Scale 5 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ language that causes organisational conflict is slightly present. Scale 6 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ language that causes organisational conflict is present. Scale 7 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ language that causes organisational conflict is norm. This stage means that the presence of organisational conflict has exceeded the appropriate level. Thus, it will jeopardise the organisation.

Selective perception affects the information the sender gets from the receiver about the receiver’s interpretation of the sender’s message (Champoux, 2000, p. 248). Most people have the tendency to listen to only part of the message and filter out other information that conflicts with their
beliefs, values and expectation. This is referred to as selective perception where it may also lead to misunderstanding during communication. For example, a person may believe that good feng sui in the office helps to improve organisation performances whereas others may believe otherwise. So when these people communicate with each other, there may be a tendency of one party to only listen to part of the message and ignore those parts that are against his/her belief.

A seven-point Likert Scale ranging from "Completely Absent (1), Absent (2), Slightly Absent (3), Neutral (4), Slightly Present (5), Present (6) to Norm (7) was used to reflect the overall degree of conflict due to selective perception. Scale 1 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' selective perception that causes organisational conflict is completely absent. Scale 2 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' selective perception that causes organisational conflict is absent. Scale 3 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' selective perception that causes organisational conflict is slightly absent. Scale 4 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' selective perception that causes organisational conflict is neutral. This is the ideal stage whereby organisational conflict is present at the appropriate level. Scale 5 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' selective perception that causes organisational conflict is slightly present. Scale 6 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' selective perception that causes organisational conflict is present. Scale 7 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' selective perception that causes organisational conflict is norm. This stage means that the presence of organisational conflict has exceeded the appropriate level. Thus, it will jeopardise the organisation.

Information overload arises when the information supply to its volume can no longer be processed. Information overload is characterized by high information load, decision situation and thus pressure to receive information and limited processing capacity. When an individual is loaded with extensive supply of information, he/she will consequently face a risk of an information flood and personal information overload (Meyer, 1998). When an individual is
overload with information, he/she can be said to be literally drowned in communication. On the other hand, insufficient information can also limit accurate information processing. As such, to ensure accurate information processing and effective communication, only the right kind and sufficient information is needed.

A seven-point Likert Scale ranging from “Completely Absent (1), Absent (2), Slightly Absent (3), Neutral (4), Slightly Present (5), Present (6) to Norm (7) was used to reflect the overall degree of conflict due to information overload. Scale 1 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' information overload that causes organisational conflict is completely absent. Scale 2 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' information overload that causes organisational conflict is absent. Scale 3 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' information overload that causes organisational conflict is slightly absent. Scale 4 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' information overload that causes organisational conflict is neutral. This is the ideal stage whereby organisational conflict is present at the appropriate level. Scale 5 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ information overload that causes organisational conflict is slightly present. Scale 6 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ information overload that causes organisational conflict is present. Scale 7 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ information overload that causes organisational conflict is norm. This stage means that the presence of organisational conflict has exceeded the appropriate level. Thus, it will jeopardise the organisation.

Channels are the pathways a message follows in going from the sender to the receiver. The information-carrying capacity of the channel will influence the extent of the information richness as not all channels carries the same richness of information. In Carlson and Zmud (1999) research paper, it was stated that all communication channels (telephone, conventional mail or e-mail) possess attributes that lead to distinct objective richness capacity. Appropriate channels used during different situation will determine the richness of information-carrying capacity. Some of the types of channels used
in communication are face-to-face, telephone, written communication and formal numeric documents.

The appropriate channel used will depend on the situation and the information that is going to be disseminated to the other party. For example, general announcement can be channelled through emails or memos, whereas decision-making matters may need to go through meetings where it involves face-to-face interaction. According to Kelly (2000), effective communication is a matter of getting the mechanics right and what we need to do is improve the way we send and receive messages. Communication breakdowns can be minimized if people can formulate the message clearly and choose the appropriate channels.

A seven-point Likert Scale ranging from “Completely Absent (1), Absent (2), Slightly Absent (3), Neutral (4), Slightly Present (5), Present (6) to Norm (7) was used to reflect the overall degree of conflict due to channels chosen. Scale 1 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ channels chosen that causes organisational conflict is completely absent. Scale 2 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ channels chosen that causes organisational conflict is absent. Scale 3 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ channels chosen that causes organisational conflict is slightly absent. Scale 4 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ channels chosen that causes organisational conflict is neutral. This is the ideal stage whereby organisational conflict is present at the appropriate level. Scale 5 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ channels chosen that causes organisational conflict is slightly present. Scale 6 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ channels chosen that causes organisational conflict is present. Scale 7 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ channels chosen that causes organisational conflict is norm. This stage means that the presence of organisational conflict has exceeded the appropriate level. Thus, it will jeopardise the organisation.
The overall degree of conflict attributed to semantic difficulties was measured by averaging the mean scores of these six scales – filtering, defensiveness apprehensions, language, selective perception, information overload and channels chosen. This assumes that the six scales have an equal weight. The higher the mean score, the more excessive conflict is present in the organisation as a result of semantic difficulties. If the mean score is greater than 4.0, we will then bring down the mean score to 4.0 through the proposed intervention strategy in the following chapters. Then again, if the mean score is less than 4.0, which is in the absence of conflict, we will then jazz-up the score to 4.0 through the proposed intervention strategy in the following chapters.

3.2.4 STRUCTURAL DYSFUNCTIONS DIAGNOSTIC

A research was conducted by Edwards and Walton (2000) to see the extent of intensity of changes in services, technologies, organisational constructs, ownership and access around the library that will cause conflict. Results from the survey showed that some of the causes of conflict was due to the organisational structure where the services of the departments overlapped, differences in individual background and cultures, lack of share vision and etc. From the survey, some conflict that arises was severe enough to demoralize people, reduce work efficiency and impoverish the service. Some of the structural dysfunctions that may lead to organisational conflict are stressful leadership style, roles diversity, member goals diversity, member goal incompatibility, jurisdictional ambiguities, size, reward systems ambiguities and degree of dependence between groups.

Style of leadership also may contribute to the level of conflict in an organisation. According to Calabrese (2000), apart from the decision that leaders make, the way in which the leader directs power may create interpersonal conflict. This type of leadership style can be considered to be stressful leadership style where leaders used their power to control, gain conformity and compliance from their subordinates. This type of leaders
makes it stressful for subordinates as it implies threat if the task is not done the way as intended and subordinates will be punished accordingly.

A seven-point Likert Scale ranging from “Completely Absent (1), Absent (2), Slightly Absent (3), Neutral (4), Slightly Present (5), Present (6) to Norm (7) was used to reflect the overall degree of conflict due to stressful leadership styles. Scale 1 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' stressful leadership styles that causes organisational conflict is completely absent. Scale 2 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' stressful leadership styles that causes organisational conflict is absent. Scale 3 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' stressful leadership styles that causes organisational conflict is slightly absent. Scale 4 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' stressful leadership styles that causes organisational conflict is neutral. This is the ideal stage whereby organisational conflict is present at the appropriate level. Scale 5 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' stressful leadership styles that causes organisational conflict is slightly present. Scale 6 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' stressful leadership styles that causes organisational conflict is present. Scale 7 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' stressful leadership styles that causes organisational conflict is norm. This stage means that the presence of organisational conflict has exceeded the appropriate level. Thus, it will jeopardise the organisation.

According to Bassett and Carr (1996) roles comprised of skill, experience and temperament factors. Role strain is the result of some deficiency in one or more of these role factors. Role sets represent the immediate range of complexity that must be understood within an organization. An individual has a great range and variety of roles where some are constant, some are continuous, some are intermittent, some are short term or long term. Problem of work roles is that there is a potential for conflict within and between roles (Bassett & Carr, 1996). Organisations today are mostly interfunctional, many employees have functions and tasks that are interdependent. The more diverse these roles played by each employee, the
more difficult for them to come to conformity which ultimately may lead to conflict.

A seven-point Likert Scale ranging from “Completely Absent (1), Absent (2), Slightly Absent (3), Neutral (4), Slightly Present (5), Present (6) to Norm (7) was used to reflect the overall degree of conflict due to roles diversity. Scale 1 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ roles diversity that causes organisational conflict is completely absent. Scale 2 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ roles diversity that causes organisational conflict is absent. Scale 3 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ roles diversity that causes organisational conflict is slightly absent. Scale 4 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ roles diversity that causes organisational conflict is neutral. This is the ideal stage whereby organisational conflict is present at the appropriate level. Scale 5 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ roles diversity that causes organisational conflict is slightly present. Scale 6 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ roles diversity that causes organisational conflict is present. Scale 7 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents’ roles diversity that causes organisational conflict is norm. This stage means that the presence of organisational conflict has exceeded the appropriate level. Thus, it will jeopardise the organisation.

Groups having common vision have the potential to direct constrain, motivate and unite organisational members toward the pursuit of legitimate superordinate outcomes. In the absence of common vision, they are unlikely to lead to cooperative relations among group members (Longenecker & Neubert, 2000). As a result, differences in goal are one of the sources of intergroup conflict. For example, Finance Division may emphasis on income and cash flow whereas for Marketing Division, emphasis may be on customer service.

Some of the fundamental differences in goals that have been found to lead to conflicts which include an emphasis on flexibility versus stability, emphasis on short-run versus long-run performance, emphasis on
measurable versus intangible results and emphasis on organisation goals versus societal needs.

A seven-point Likert Scale ranging from “Completely Absent (1), Absent (2), Slightly Absent (3), Neutral (4), Slightly Present (5), Present (6) to Norm (7) was used to reflect the overall degree of conflict due to member goal diversity. Scale 1 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' member goal diversity that causes organisational conflict is completely absent. Scale 2 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' member goal diversity that causes organisational conflict is absent. Scale 3 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' member goal diversity that causes organisational conflict is slightly absent. Scale 4 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' member goal diversity that causes organisational conflict is neutral. This is the ideal stage whereby organisational conflict is present at the appropriate level. Scale 5 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' member goal diversity that causes organisational conflict is slightly present. Scale 6 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' member goal diversity that causes organisational conflict is present. Scale 7 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' member goal diversity that causes organisational conflict is norm. This stage means that the presence of organisational conflict has exceeded the appropriate level. Thus, it will jeopardise the organisation.

When members' goals are incompatible, it can also cause conflict to arise among the members. Eisenhardt et al., (1997) mentioned in their research that team hobbled by conflict is because of lack of common goals among the team members. As members' goals are incompatible, they tend to perceive themselves to be in competition with one another and tend to frame decisions negatively as a reaction towards threat.

A seven-point Likert Scale ranging from “Completely Absent (1), Absent (2), Slightly Absent (3), Neutral (4), Slightly Present (5), Present (6) to Norm (7) was used to reflect the overall degree of conflict due to member goal incompatibility. Scale 1 denotes that the perception and opinions of
respondents' member goal incompatibility that causes organisational conflict is completely absent. Scale 2 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' member goal incompatibility that causes organisational conflict is absent. Scale 3 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' member goal incompatibility that causes organisational conflict is slightly absent. Scale 4 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' member goal incompatibility that causes organisational conflict is neutral. This is the ideal stage whereby organisational conflict is present at the appropriate level. Scale 5 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' member goal incompatibility that causes organisational conflict is slightly present. Scale 6 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' member goal incompatibility that causes organisational conflict is present. Scale 7 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' member goal incompatibility that causes organisational conflict is norm. This stage means that the presence of organisational conflict has exceeded the appropriate level. Thus, it will jeopardise the organisation.

Jurisdictional ambiguities arises when an organisation has not clearly defined individual areas of decision authority which lead to conflict especially when these people receives conflicting orders from their multiple superiors (Champoux, 2000, p. 208). Responsibilities that are not clearly delineated and there is an overlapping of responsibilities, it may also lead to conflict in the organisation.

A seven-point Likert Scale ranging from "Completely Absent (1), Absent (2), Slightly Absent (3), Neutral (4), Slightly Present (5), Present (6) to Norm (7) was used to reflect the overall degree of conflict due to jurisdictional ambiguities. Scale 1 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' jurisdictional ambiguities that causes organisational conflict is completely absent. Scale 2 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' jurisdictional ambiguities that causes organisational conflict is absent. Scale 3 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' jurisdictional ambiguities that causes organisational conflict is slightly absent. Scale 4 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' jurisdictional
ambiguities that causes organisational conflict is neutral. This is the ideal stage whereby organisational conflict is present at the appropriate level. Scale 5 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' jurisdictional ambiguities that causes organisational conflict is slightly present. Scale 6 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' jurisdictional ambiguities that causes organisational conflict is present. Scale 7 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' jurisdictional ambiguities that causes organisational conflict is norm. This stage means that the presence of organisational conflict has exceeded the appropriate level. Thus, it will jeopardise the organisation.

(Ashby, 1968, quoted in Yolles, 1999, p. 146) uses the concept of self-organisation to explain how purposeful human systems are able to organize themselves and adapt. A system under the impact of perturbation will be able to adapt if it is to survive. The Law of Requisite Variety has many forms, but it is very simple and common sensical: a model system or controller can only model or control something to the extent that it has sufficient internal variety to represent it. For example, in order to make a choice between two alternatives, the controller must be able to represent at least two possibilities, and thus one distinction. (Heylighen & Joslyn, 2000, quoted Backlund, 2002). In the study conducted by Wagner (1995), findings reveal that small group size is associated with greater cooperation in groups. Decrease in-group size has positive effect on productivity as physical constraint is weaker in small groups, lesser social distraction in small groups and lesser coordination requirement as there is fewer members in the group.

A seven-point Likert Scale ranging from "Completely Absent (1), Absent (2), Slightly Absent (3), Neutral (4), Slightly Present (5), Present (6) to Norm (7) was used to reflect the overall degree of conflict due to size. Scale 1 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' size that causes organisational conflict is completely absent. Scale 2 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' size that causes organisational conflict is absent. Scale 3 denotes that the perception and opinions of
respondents' size that causes organisational conflict is slightly absent. Scale 4
denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' size that causes
organisational conflict is neutral. This is the ideal stage whereby
organisational conflict is present at the appropriate level. Scale 5 denotes
that the perception and opinions of respondents' size that causes
organisational conflict is slightly present. Scale 6 denotes that the perception
and opinions of respondents' size that causes organisational conflict is
present. Scale 7 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' size
that causes organisational conflict is norm. This stage means that the
presence of organisational conflict has exceeded the appropriate level. Thus,
it will jeopardise the organisation.

Perception of distributive and procedural justice is one of the values to
which is most likely to improve an individual's commitment in the organisation.
Distributive justice seeks to explain how individuals react to the amount and
form of compensation they receive whereas procedural justice examines the
reactions of individuals to the procedures used to determine compensation
(Tremblay, Sire & Balkan, 2000). Justice perception on pay can help to
increase job satisfaction and satisfaction working in the organisation.

Reward is the source of motivating performance and reducing turnover,
as such clear and equity rewards helps employees understand the reward
systems and behave in the way the organisation rewards, which eventually
reduces misunderstanding. Victor H. Vroom in the 1960s formulated the
Expectancy theory, which talks about work motivation. As defined by (Jones,
George & Hill, 2000, pp. 430-432), expectancy is a person’s perception about
the extent to which effort will result in a certain level of performance. While
instrumentality is a person's perception about the extent to which performance
will result in the attainment of outcomes. Valence is about how desirable each
of the outcomes available from a job or organisation is to a person. According
to the Expectancy theory, high motivation results from high levels of
expectancy, instrumentality and valence.
A seven-point Likert Scale ranging from "Completely Absent (1), Absent (2), Slightly Absent (3), Neutral (4), Slightly Present (5), Present (6) to Norm (7) was used to reflect the overall degree of conflict due to reward systems ambiguities. Scale 1 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' reward systems ambiguities that causes organisational conflict is completely absent. Scale 2 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' reward systems ambiguities that causes organisational conflict is absent. Scale 3 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' reward systems ambiguities that causes organisational conflict is slightly absent. Scale 4 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' reward systems ambiguities that causes organisational conflict is neutral. This is the ideal stage whereby organisational conflict is present at the appropriate level. Scale 5 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' reward systems ambiguities that causes organisational conflict is slightly present. Scale 6 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' reward systems ambiguities that causes organisational conflict is present. Scale 7 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' reward systems ambiguities that causes organisational conflict is norm. This stage means that the presence of organisational conflict has exceeded the appropriate level. Thus, it will jeopardise the organisation.

Interdependence between two or more groups is the degree to which the interactions between the groups must be coordinated to attain a desired level of performance (Szilagyi, Jr. & Wallace, Jr., 1980, p. 237). The higher the degree of dependence between groups in accomplishing task, the greater chances of disagreement exits between members in different groups due to each group having their own goals and opinions. According to Zapf (1999), it may be easier to harass a person who is an out-group member because of his or her inability to integrate into the group (victim characteristics as causes of mobbing). It may be even easier to harass someone if there are working conditions with high uncertainty and high rates of organisational problems. Such working conditions may lead an individual to commit multiple errors at work, which, in turn, can be used as ammunition against the individual (the
organisation as a cause of mobbing). The occurrence of mobbing may be further supported if there are tensions in the work group for which a potential scapegoat is a good "lightning conductor" (the social system as a cause of mobbing).

A seven-point Likert Scale ranging from "Completely Absent (1), Absent (2), Slightly Absent (3), Neutral (4), Slightly Present (5), Present (6) to Norm (7) was used to reflect the overall degree of conflict due to degree of dependence between groups. Scale 1 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' degree of dependence between groups that causes organisational conflict is completely absent. Scale 2 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' degree of dependence between groups that causes organisational conflict is absent. Scale 3 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' degree of dependence between groups that causes organisational conflict is slightly absent. Scale 4 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' degree of dependence between groups that causes organisational conflict is neutral. This is the ideal stage whereby organisational conflict is present at the appropriate level. Scale 5 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' degree of dependence between groups that causes organisational conflict is slightly present. Scale 6 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' degree of dependence between groups that causes organisational conflict is present. Scale 7 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' degree of dependence between groups that causes organisational conflict is norm. This stage means that the presence of organisational conflict has exceeded the appropriate level. Thus, it will jeopardise the organisation.

The overall degree of conflict attributed to structural dysfunctional was measured by averaging the mean scores of these eight scales – stressful leadership styles, roles diversity, member goal diversity, jurisdictional ambiguities, size, reward systems ambiguities and degree of dependence between groups. This assumes that the eight scales have an equal weight. The higher the mean score, the more excessive conflict is present in the
organisation as a result of structural dysfunctional. If the mean score is greater than 4.0, we will then bring down the mean score to 4.0 through the proposed intervention strategy in the following chapters. Then again, if the mean score is less than 4.0, which is in the absence of conflict, we will then jazz-up the score to 4.0 through the proposed intervention strategy in the following chapters.

3.2.5 PERSONAL VARIABLES DIAGNOSTIC

A study was conducted by (Lewis et al., 1997) on a non-profit organisation providing post-school educational and social support to students with disabilities by developing, implementing and monitoring individual transition programmes from school to adult life which is not performing in a manner acceptable to its funding bodies. Further research to the matter reveals that conflict arises was partly due to value dissonance arising from accountability and efficiency procedures expected of them from government funding agencies and intolerance of others' opinions and motives which hindered them to set goals. Problems of the members have caused the rise of conflict - wide variety of personal motives for their participation also affected them from having a common goal, unwillingness to put aside their differences, and unable to recognize individual differences. Personal variable differences in this context will cover different value systems, personality types, psychographics, theological practices, physical characteristics, mental and philosophical characteristics.

Every people have a particular personal value system due to different upbringing, life's experience, belief systems and ethnic. People's values can influence their beliefs about money, social interaction, importance of work and also other aspect of work and nonwork lives. Once these values are internalised, it becomes a criterion for guiding one's action. According to Carlson (2000), the values that an individual holds about the role he or she must fulfil in each life domain have significant implication for experiencing conflict. The study focused on what the individual believes to be important to,
central to or a priority in his life. It was found that life role values do make a different in the way that work family conflict is experienced. Conflict was found to differ depending on the life role values held by the individual when expressed in terms of work centrality and importance.

A seven-point Likert Scale ranging from "Completely Absent (1), Absent (2), Slightly Absent (3), Neutral (4), Slightly Present (5), Present (6) to Norm (7) was used to reflect the overall degree of conflict due to differing individual value systems. Scale 1 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' differing individual value systems that causes organisational conflict is completely absent. Scale 2 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' differing individual value systems that causes organisational conflict is absent. Scale 3 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' differing individual value systems that causes organisational conflict is slightly absent. Scale 4 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' differing individual value systems that causes organisational conflict is neutral. This is the ideal stage whereby organisational conflict is present at the appropriate level. Scale 5 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' differing individual value systems that causes organisational conflict is slightly present. Scale 6 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' differing individual value systems that causes organisational conflict is present. Scale 7 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' differing individual value systems that causes organisational conflict is norm. This stage means that the presence of organisational conflict has exceeded the appropriate level. Thus, it will jeopardise the organisation.

According to (Szilagyi & Wallace, Jr., 1980, p. 58), personality is the combination of human characteristics or variable we employ to define an individual. Personality consists of human characteristics that are not quickly changed and lead to predictable patterns of behaviour in the short period. It is personality that determines the commonalities and differences in the behaviour of the individual.
Hogan, Curphy and Hogan (1994), 5 dimensions of personality can be used to measure the personality of an individual.

- Surgency – measures the degree where an individual is socialable, gregarious, assertive and leaderlike versus quiet, reserved, mannerly and withdrawn.
- Emotional Stability – measure the extent an individual is calm, steady, cool and self-confident versus anxious, insecure, worried and emotional.
- Conscientiousness – measures the extent an individual is hardworking, preserving, organized and responsible versus those who are impulsive, irresponsible, undependable and lazy.
- Agreeableness – measures the extent an individual is sympathetic, cooperative, good-natured, and warm versus grumpy, unpleasant, disagreeable and cold.
- Intellectance – measures the extend where an individual is imaginative, cultured, broad minded and curious versus concrete minded, practical and narrow interest.

A seven-point Likert Scale ranging from "Completely Absent (1), Absent (2), Slightly Absent (3), Neutral (4), Slightly Present (5), Present (6) to Norm (7) was used to reflect the overall degree of conflict due to personality types. Scale 1 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' personality types that causes organisational conflict is completely absent. Scale 2 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' personality types that causes organisational conflict is absent. Scale 3 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' personality types that causes organisational conflict is slightly absent. Scale 4 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' personality types that causes organisational conflict is neutral. This is the ideal stage whereby organisational conflict is present at the appropriate level. Scale 5 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' personality types that causes organisational conflict is slightly present. Scale 6 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' personality types that causes organisational conflict is present.
Scale 7 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' personality types that causes organisational conflict is norm. This stage means that the presence of organisational conflict has exceeded the appropriate level. Thus, it will jeopardise the organisation.

According to DeSanto (2000), psychographics is concerned with the lifestyles environment in which people live and work. People of the similar behaviour or lifestyles tend to have closer association. For example, people of the similar hobbies tend to get along better than people of different hobbies.

A seven-point Likert Scale ranging from "Completely Absent (1), Absent (2), Slightly Absent (3), Neutral (4), Slightly Present (5), Present (6) to Norm (7) was used to reflect the overall degree of conflict due to psychographics. Scale 1 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' psychographics that causes organisational conflict is completely absent. Scale 2 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' psychographics that causes organisational conflict is absent. Scale 3 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' psychographics that causes organisational conflict is slightly absent. Scale 4 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' psychographics that causes organisational conflict is neutral. This is the ideal stage whereby organisational conflict is present at the appropriate level. Scale 5 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' psychographics that causes organisational conflict is slightly present. Scale 6 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' psychographics that causes organisational conflict is present. Scale 7 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' psychographics that causes organisational conflict is norm. This stage means that the presence of organisational conflict has exceeded the appropriate level. Thus, it will jeopardise the organisation.

There has been a dramatic increase in the various types of formal and informal religious and spiritual expression practiced by workforce in organisation today. Religion can have a significant effect on how and what businesses are conducted, work schedules and attitudes about ethics. For
example, Christianity honours Sunday as their day of rest whereas Islam regards Friday as their prayer and holy day. It would be a sign of great disrespect to conduct a formal meeting at 1.00p.m. to 2.30p.m. on Fridays in Malaysia. In a multi culture country like Malaysia, an understanding organisation on this religion ritual would consider allowing employees to go for their prayer during the necessary hours. This would help to reduce differences.

However, if an employee's manifestation of religious freedom causes such a disturbance among other workers that the department cannot function and the company's work cannot be done, this will eventually lead to undue hardship on the productivity of the organisation. Then acceptable policies must be established that delineate the parameters of an individual employee's religious or spiritual rights in the workplace (Cash, Gray & Rood, 2000).

A seven-point Likert Scale ranging from "Completely Absent (1), Absent (2), Slightly Absent (3), Neutral (4), Slightly Present (5), Present (6) to Norm (7) was used to reflect the overall degree of conflict due to theological practices. Scale 1 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' theological practices that causes organisational conflict is completely absent. Scale 2 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' theological practices that causes organisational conflict is absent. Scale 3 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' theological practices that causes organisational conflict is slightly absent. Scale 4 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' theological practices that causes organisational conflict is neutral. This is the ideal stage whereby organisational conflict is present at the appropriate level. Scale 5 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' theological practices that causes organisational conflict is slightly present. Scale 6 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' theological practices that causes organisational conflict is present. Scale 7 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' theological practices that causes organisational conflict is norm. This stage means that the presence of organisational conflict has exceeded the appropriate level. Thus, it will jeopardise the organisation.
Physical characteristics are made up of age, appearance, height and weight (Szilagyi, Jr. & Wallace, Jr., 1980, p. 204). These physical characteristics are able to determine the performance of an individual or suitability of the individual in carrying out the task. For example, people over a certain age may have difficulty in developing some of the necessary skills to perform the task.

A seven-point Likert Scale ranging from "Completely Absent (1), Absent (2), Slightly Absent (3), Neutral (4), Slightly Present (5), Present (6) to Norm (7) was used to reflect the overall degree of conflict due to physical characteristics. Scale 1 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' physical characteristics that causes organisational conflict is completely absent. Scale 2 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' physical characteristics that causes organisational conflict is absent. Scale 3 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' physical characteristics that causes organisational conflict is slightly absent. Scale 4 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' physical characteristics that causes organisational conflict is neutral. This is the ideal stage whereby organisational conflict is present at the appropriate level. Scale 5 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' physical characteristics that causes organisational conflict is slightly present. Scale 6 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' physical characteristics that causes organisational conflict is present. Scale 7 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' physical characteristics that causes organisational conflict is norm. This stage means that the presence of organisational conflict has exceeded the appropriate level. Thus, it will jeopardise the organisation.

The totality of an individual's mental capacity includes summing across specific mental abilities such as verbal comprehension, quantitative aptitude, reasoning ability and deductive ability. Generally mental abilities influences how fast an individual can learn the job and how readily the person can adapt
to changes during the job. The more complex the job is, the more is required of an individual's cognitive ability (Wagner & Hollenbeck, 1995).

A seven-point Likert Scale ranging from "Completely Absent (1), Absent (2), Slightly Absent (3), Neutral (4), Slightly Present (5), Present (6) to Norm (7) was used to reflect the overall degree of conflict due to mental and philosophical characteristics. Scale 1 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' mental and philosophical characteristics that causes organisational conflict is completely absent. Scale 2 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' mental and philosophical characteristics that causes organisational conflict is absent. Scale 3 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' mental and philosophical characteristics that causes organisational conflict is slightly absent. Scale 4 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' mental and philosophical characteristics that causes organisational conflict is neutral. This is the ideal stage whereby organisational conflict is present at the appropriate level. Scale 5 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' mental and philosophical characteristics that causes organisational conflict is slightly present. Scale 6 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' mental and philosophical characteristics that causes organisational conflict is present. Scale 7 denotes that the perception and opinions of respondents' mental and philosophical characteristics that causes organisational conflict is norm. This stage means that the presence of organisational conflict has exceeded the appropriate level. Thus, it will jeopardise the organisation.

The degree of conflict attributed to personal variable was measured by averaging the mean scores of these six scales – differing individual value systems, personality types, psychographics, theological practices, physical characteristics and mental and philosophical characteristics. This assumes that the six scales have an equal weight. The higher the mean score, the more excessive conflict is present in the organisation as a result of personal variable. If the mean score is greater than 4.0, we will then bring down the mean score to 4.0 through the proposed intervention strategy in the following
chapters. Then again, if the mean score is less than 4.0, which is in the absence of conflict, we will then jazz-up the score to 4.0 through the proposed intervention strategy in the following chapters.

3.2.6 LEADERSHIP THEORIES AND STYLES DIAGNOSTIC

The imbalance manifestation in practice of leadership theories and styles will give rise to conflict in the organisation. For the leadership theories and styles diagnostic, in this research those individuals in the sample size chosen are those who are involve in leading a group of subordinates. Eleven (11) individuals out of the sample size of 42 were found to be involved in leading people in SHCFMSB. The imbalances of leadership practice that can be calibrated are trait, behavioural, development oriented, cognitive resource theory and situational leadership theory. Leadership is the force that energizes and directs group. It is important to understand how leaders emerge and what qualities make them effective in an organisation.

1. Trait Model of Leadership

Kirkpatrik and Locke (1991) mentioned that leaders usually have possession of certain traits that are different from others. These traits include drive (achievement, motivation, ambition, energy, tenacity and initiative), motivation (desire to lead but not to seek power as an end of itself), honesty and integrity, self confidence (emotional stability), cognitive ability and knowledge of business. These key leaders traits can help leaders to acquire the necessary skills, formulate an organisational vision and an effective plan and take the necessary steps to implement the vision in reality.

a. Ambition and energy

Ambition impels leaders to set hard, challenging goals for themselves and their organisation and to sustain a high achievement drive and get ahead, leaders must also have a lot of energy.
b. Honesty and integrity

Integrity is the correspondence between word and deed and honesty refers to being truthful or non-deceitful.

c. Intelligence

Leaders must be able to gather, integrate and interpret enormous amount of information.

d. Desire to lead

Leaders must have strong desire to lead their subordinates to achievement.

e. Self confidence

Leaders must engage an impression of knowing what decision to make during unsure situations.

f. Job-relevant knowledge

Leaders must have high degree of knowledge about the company, industry and work related knowledge.

A seven point Likert scale ranging from “Very Low Emphasis (1), Low (2), Slightly Low (3), Neutral (4), Slightly High (5), High (6), Very High Emphasis (7) was used to gauge the overall degree conflict result from practicalising of trait model of leadership. Scale 1 means that conflict arises from trait model of leadership is at very low emphasis. Scale 2 means conflict arises from trait model of leadership is at low emphasis. Scale 3 means that conflict arises from the trait model of leadership is at slightly low emphasis. Scale 4 means that conflict arises from trait model of leadership is neutral. This is an ideal stage that we aimed to achieve. Scale 4 is the desirable level. Scale 5 means that conflict arises from trait model of leadership is at slightly high emphasis. Scale 6 means that conflict arises from the trait model of leadership is at high emphasis. Scale 7 means that conflict arises from trait model of leadership is at very high emphasis. This stage is the most undesirable level as the existence of conflict, which will jeopardise the performance, and efficiency of the organisation.
A mean score of more or less than 4.0 reveals that there is an imbalance practice of trait model of leadership in the organisation. The imbalance practice of trait model of leadership will result in rising of conflict in the organisation. The higher the mean score, the more imbalance practice of trait model of leadership in the organisation. If the mean score is greater than 4.0, we will then bring down the mean score to 4.0 through the proposed intervention strategy in the following chapters. Then again, if the mean score is less than 4.0, we will then jazz-up the score to 4.0 through the proposed intervention strategy in the following chapters.

2. Behavioural Theories of Leadership

Late 1950s saw dissatisfaction with the trait approach to leadership, led leadership researchers to study leaders behaviour which were conducted in Ohio State of University and University of Michigan (Champoux, 2000, p. 222).

Ohio State of University Leadership Studies – Initiating Structure and Consideration
- Initiating Structure – where leaders has task-oriented leadership style. Leaders high in initiating structure make individual task assignments, set deadlines and clearly lay out what needs to be done.
- Consideration – where leader has employee-oriented leadership style. Leaders high in consideration show concern for members in their group. They are warm and interested in developing relationships with their subordinates.

University of Michigan Leadership Studies – Production-Orientation and Employee-Centred Behaviour
- Production-orientation – where leaders focused on tasks that had to be done, pressured subordinates to perform and had little concern for people.
Leaders of this kind lack of trust on his subordinates, therefore closely supervise their work.

- Employee-centred – where leaders are people oriented and emphasizes delegation of responsibility. Leaders of this kind have strong concern for the social aspects of his team subordinates with high performance expectation.

A seven point Likert scale ranging from "Very Low Emphasis (1), Low (2), Slightly Low (3), Neutral (4), Slightly High (5), High (6), Very High Emphasis (7) was used to gauge the overall degree conflict result from practicalising of behavioural theories of leadership. Scale 1 means conflict arises from behavioural theories of leadership is at very low emphasis. Scale 2 means conflict arises from behavioural theories of leadership is at low emphasis. Scale 3 means that conflict arises from the behavioural theories of leadership is at slightly low emphasis. Scale 4 means that conflict arises from the behavioural theories of leadership is neutral. This is an ideal stage that we aimed to achieve. Scale 4 is the desirable level. Scale 5 means that conflict arises from behavioural theories of leadership is at slightly high emphasis. Scale 6 means that conflict arises from the behavioural theories of leadership is at high emphasis. Scale 7 means that conflict arises from behavioural theories of leadership is at very high emphasis. This stage is the most undesirable level as the existence of conflict, which will jeopardise the performance and efficiency of the organisation.

A mean score of more or less than 4.0 reveals that there is imbalance of practice of behavioural theories of leadership in the organisation. The imbalances of practice of behavioural theories of leadership will result in rising of conflict in the organisation. The higher the mean score, the more imbalances of practice of behavioural theories of leadership in the organisation. If the mean score is greater than 4.0, we will then bring down the mean score to 4.0 through the proposed intervention strategy in the following chapters. Then again, if the mean score is less than 4.0, we will then jazz-up the score to 4.0 through the proposed intervention strategy in the following chapters.
3. Development Oriented Leadership

Development oriented leaders are leaders who are task oriented. Task oriented leaders are usually directive, structure situations, set deadlines and make task assignments (Champoux, 2000, p. 223). Leaders of this kind are always generating experiments, seeking new ideas and promoting change within the department and organisation.

a. Generating experiments Leaders who encourages their followers to try out new ideas.

b. Seeking new ideas Leaders who encourages their followers to be proactive and always searching for new and innovative ideas.

c. Promoting change Leaders who are always looking towards promoting changes in the organisation.

A seven point Likert scale ranging from “Very Low Emphasis (1), Low (2), Slightly Low (3), Neutral (4), Slightly High (5), High (6), Very High Emphasis (7) was used to gauge the overall degree conflict result from practicalising of development-oriented leadership. Scale 1 means conflict arises from development-oriented leadership is at very low emphasis. Scale 2 means conflict arises from development-oriented leadership is at low emphasis. Scale 3 means that conflict arises from the development-oriented leadership is at slightly low emphasis. Scale 4 means that conflict arises from the development-oriented leadership is neutral. This is an ideal stage that we aimed to achieve. Scale 4 is the desirable level. Scale 5 means that conflict arises from development-oriented leadership is at slightly high emphasis. Scale 6 means that conflict arises from the development-oriented leadership is at high emphasis. Scale 7 means that conflict arises from development-oriented leadership is at very high emphasis. This stage is the most undesirable level as the existence of conflict, which will jeopardise the performance and efficiency of the organisation.
A mean score of more or less than 4.0 reveals that there is imbalance of practice of development-oriented leadership in the organisation. The imbalances of practice of development-oriented leadership will result in rising of conflict in the organisation. The higher the mean score, the more imbalances of practice of development-oriented leadership in the organisation. If the mean score is greater than 4.0, we will then bring down the mean score to 4.0 through the proposed intervention strategy in the following chapters. Then again, if the mean score is less than 4.0, we will then jazz-up the score to 4.0 through the proposed intervention strategy in the following chapters.


Cognitive Resource Theory states that stress is the enemy of rationality. It's difficult for leader to think logically and analytically when they are under stress. The importance of a leader's intelligence and experience to his or her effectiveness differs under low- and high-stress situations.

According to Fiedler (2001), when stress is low, the leader and group members can take time to consider new solutions but the authority and impatience of the experienced leader may often get in the way of the search for new solutions. When stress is high or time is short, the intelligent leader's predilection for discussing and weighing alternative actions gets in the way of acting quickly on the basis of experience. On the other hand, when the leader's intelligence is relatively low, the leader's experience contributed highly to performance. The more experience the leader has, the less he relies on his intelligence. In groups led by highly experienced leaders, their high intellectual abilities impeded performance, in groups led by relatively inexperienced leaders, the leader's intelligence contributed highly to group performance. Generally, leaders who are intelligent have better communication skills, develops better plans, make better decisions, develop better strategies and have more directive behaviour.
a. Communication  Leaders who believe that communication is an essential tool and is needed daily in the functioning of the organisation.

b. Plans  Leaders who emphasizes on the importance of planning when dealing with work.

c. Decisions  Leaders who makes appropriate decisions under whatever condition.

d. Strategies  Leaders who are able to formulate effective strategies.

e. Directive Behaviour  Leaders who are able to give clear direction to their followers as to what is needed to be done.

A seven point Likert scale ranging from "Very Low Emphasis (1), Low (2), Slightly Low (3), Neutral (4), Slightly High (5), High (6), Very High Emphasis (7) was used to gauge the overall degree conflict result from practicalising of cognitive resource theory. Scale 1 means conflict arises from cognitive resource theory is at very low emphasis. Scale 2 means conflict arises from cognitive resource theory is at low emphasis. Scale 3 means that conflict arises from the cognitive resource theory is at slightly low emphasis. Scale 4 means that conflict arises from the cognitive resource theory is neutral. This is an ideal stage that we aimed to achieve. Scale 4 is the desirable level. Scale 5 means that conflict arises cognitive resource theory is at slightly high emphasis. Scale 6 means that conflict arises from the cognitive resource theory is at high emphasis. Scale 7 means that conflict arises cognitive resource theory is at very high emphasis. This stage is the most undesirable level as the existence of conflict, which will jeopardise the performance and efficiency of the organisation.

A mean score of more or less than 4.0 reveals that there is an imbalance practice of cognitive resource theory in the organisation. The imbalance practice of cognitive resource theory will result in rising of conflict in the organisation. The higher the mean score, the more imbalance practice of cognitive resource theory in the organisation. If the mean score is greater than 4.0, we will then bring down the mean score to 4.0 through the proposed
intervention strategy in the following chapters. Then again, if the mean score is less than 4.0, we will then jazz-up the score to 4.0 through the proposed intervention strategy in the following chapters.

5. Situational Leadership

According to Situational Leadership approach, leadership style and influence should only be initiated after the leader has successfully gauge the readiness of his employees to undertake a specific task. As the level of employee’s readiness increases, the demand for structure facilitation on the part of the leader decreases (Silverthorne, 2000). Findings for the author’s research indicated that there is a strong link between adaptability and effective leadership. The more adaptable the leaders are, the more effective they appear to be.

a. Readiness of followers
   The ability of the follower to take responsibility for their actions.

b. Behaviour of leaders
   The leaders ability to adapt their leadership style to suit the situation and the degree of readiness of their followers to undertake a specific task.

For the Situational Leadership Theory, 41 followers including the 3 managers who reports to the Senior Vice President was measured in terms of their ableness and willingness. For the behaviours of the leaders, only 11 individuals who were involved in leading were gauge of the facilitation structure like giving clear and specific directions, high task orientation, support and participation and let followers perform. The diagnostic conducted will look at the degree of emphasis of the leaders in the specific facilitation structure.

A seven point Likert scale ranging from "Very Low Emphasis (1), Low (2), Slightly Low (3), Neutral (4), Slightly High (5), High (6), Very High Emphasis (7) was used to gauge the overall degree conflict result from
practicalising of situational leadership. Scale 1 means conflict arises from situational leadership is at very low emphasis. Scale 2 means conflict arises from situational leadership is at low emphasis. Scale 3 means that conflict arises from the situational leadership is at slightly low emphasis. Scale 4 means that conflict arises from the situational leadership is neutral. This is an ideal stage that we aimed to achieve. Scale 4 is the desirable level. Scale 5 means that conflict arises situational leadership is at slightly high emphasis. Scale 6 means that conflict arises from the situational leadership is at high emphasis. Scale 7 means that conflict arises situational leadership is at very high emphasis. This stage is the most undesirable level as the existence of conflict, which will jeopardise the performance and efficiency of the organisation.

A mean score of more or less than 4.0 reveals that there is an imbalance practice of situational leadership in the organisation. The imbalance practice of situational leadership will result in rising of conflict in the organisation. The higher the mean score, the more imbalance practice of situational leadership in the organisation. If the mean score is greater than 4.0, we will then bring down the mean score to 4.0 through the proposed intervention strategy in the following chapters. Then again, if the mean score is less than 4.0, we will then jazz-up the score to 4.0 through the proposed intervention strategy in the following chapters.

6. Charismatic Leadership

According to (Jones et al., 2000, p. 484), charismatic leaders are those who are enthusiastic, self-confident leader able to clearly communicate it to their subordinates. They usually have a vision of how good things could be in their work groups and organisations that is in contrast with the status quo. Subordinates trust the correctness of a charismatic leader's belief and unquestioningly accept, show affection for and obey their leaders.
The legitimacy of charismatic leadership is sociology and psychologically attributed to the belief of the followers and not so much to the quality of the leaders. In this respect, leaders are important because they can charismatically evoke this sense of belief and can thereby demand obedience (Aaltio-Margosola & Takala, 2000). Charismatic leaders is said to have the following components:

- Vision and articulation – where leaders have idealized vision and strong articulation of the future vision and have the motivation to lead.
- Personal risk – where leaders are willing to take risk.
- Sensitivity to environment – where leaders have high needs towards environment sensitivity.
- Sensitivity to followers - where leaders are sensitive to their subordinates' needs.
- Unconventional behaviour – where leaders are unconventional or counter normative.

A seven point Likert scale ranging from “Very Low Emphasis (1), Low (2), Slightly Low (3), Neutral (4), Slightly High (5), High (6), Very High Emphasis (7)” was used to gauge the overall degree conflict result from practicalising of charismatic leadership. Scale 1 means conflict arises from charismatic leadership is at very low emphasis. Scale 2 means conflict arises from charismatic leadership is at low emphasis. Scale 3 means that conflict arises from the charismatic leadership is at slightly low emphasis. Scale 4 means that conflict arises from the charismatic leadership is neutral. This is an ideal stage that we aimed to achieve. Scale 4 is the desirable level. Scale 5 means that conflict arises charismatic leadership is at slightly high emphasis. Scale 6 means that conflict arises from the charismatic leadership is at high emphasis. Scale 7 means that conflict arises charismatic leadership is at very high emphasis. This stage is the most undesirable level as the existence of conflict, which will jeopardise the performance, and efficiency of the organisation.
A mean score of more or less than 4.0 reveals that there is an imbalance practice of charismatic leadership in the organisation. The imbalance practice of charismatic leadership will result in rising of conflict in the organisation. The higher the mean score, the more imbalance practice of charismatic leadership in the organisation. If the mean score is greater than 4.0, we will then bring down the mean score to 4.0 through the proposed intervention strategy in the following chapters. Then again, if the mean score is less than 4.0, we will then jazz-up the score to 4.0 through the proposed intervention strategy in the following chapters.

7. Transactional Leadership

In transactional leadership, leaders identify what his followers prefer and help them to achieve the desired results that satisfy them. According to Sarros and Santora (2001), transactional leaders pursue a cost-benefit, economic exchange with followers. In this relationship, followers' material and psychic needs are satisfied in return for expected work performance. In transactional leadership style, they usually rely on

- Contingent reward – where subordinates appreciate tangible, material rewards for their efforts. Performance of subordinates is expected to increase if they believed that it would result in receiving desired results (Sarros & Santora, 2001).
- Laissez-faire – where leaders works intentionally on avoiding involvement or confrontation keeping personal interactions to a minimum (Sarros & Santora, 2001).
- Management by exception (active) – where leaders have sense of adventure and new horizons. They are always seeking new ideas and searches for deviations from rules and standards and take corrective actions (Sarros & Santora, 2001).
- Management by exception (passive) – where leaders have implicit trust in their subordinates to finish the job to a satisfying standard. They do not
inspire subordinates to achieve beyond expected outcomes (Sarros & Santora, 2001).

A seven point Likert scale ranging from “Very Low Emphasis (1), Low (2), Slightly Low (3), Neutral (4), Slightly High (5), High (6), Very High Emphasis (7) was used to gauge the overall degree conflict result from practicalising of transactional leadership. Scale 1 means conflict arises from transactional leadership is at very low emphasis. Scale 2 means conflict arises from transactional leadership is at low emphasis. Scale 3 means that conflict arises from the transactional leadership is at slightly low emphasis. Scale 4 means that conflict arises from the transactional leadership is neutral. This is an ideal stage that we aimed to achieve. Scale 4 is the desirable level. Scale 5 means that conflict arises transactional leadership is at slightly high emphasis. Scale 6 means that conflict arises from the transactional leadership is at high emphasis. Scale 7 means that conflict arises transactional leadership is at very high emphasis. This stage is the most undesirable level as the existence of conflict, which will jeopardise the performance and efficiency of the organisation.

A mean score of more or less than 4.0 reveals that there is an imbalance practice of transactional leadership in the organisation. The imbalance practice of transactional leadership will result in rising of conflict in the organisation. The higher the mean score, the more imbalance practice of transactional leadership in the organisation. If the mean score is greater than 4.0, we will then bring down the mean score to 4.0 through the proposed intervention strategy in the following chapters. Then again, if the mean score is less than 4.0, we will then jazz-up the score to 4.0 through the proposed intervention strategy in the following chapters.

8. Transformational Leadership

As for transformational leadership style, (Bass, 1990, quoted in Jones et al., 2000, pp. 169-170) mentioned that this kind of leadership occurs when
a leader transforms, or changes, his or her followers in three ways that result in followers trusting the leader, performing behaviours that contribute to the achievement of organisational goals and being motivated to perform at a high level:

- Transformational leaders increase subordinated awareness of the importance of their tasks and the importance of performing them well.
- Transformational leaders make subordinates aware of their needs for personal growth, development and accomplishment.
- Transformational leaders motivate their subordinates to work for the good of the organisation rather than exclusively for their own personal gain or benefit.

Some of the characteristics of transformational leaders are

- Charisma – where leaders provide vision and a sense of mission, instilling prided in and among the group and gaining respect and trust (Humphreys & Einstein, 2003). They rise above inner conflicts and believe strongly in their own capabilities in handling matters.

- Inspiration – where leaders inspire their subordinates to accomplish great feats. This is characterized by the communication of high expectations, using symbols to focus efforts and expressing important purposes in simple ways (Humphreys & Einstein, 2003). They focuses on encouraging others in understanding and to stay committed to the vision so that everyone is clear about where their roles fit in the organisation and how they contribute to the achievement of the organization.

- Intellectual stimulation – where leaders promote intelligence, rationality, logical thinking and careful problem solving (Humphreys & Einstein, 2003). Leaders no longer answer all their employees’ questions; instead they now help their subordinates to answer all their own questions.

- Individualized consideration – where leaders pay close attention to the inter-individual differences among their subordinates. They often act as mentors to their subordinates (Humphreys & Einstein, 2003).
A seven point Likert scale ranging from "Very Low Emphasis (1), Low (2), Slightly Low (3), Neutral (4), Slightly High (5), High (6), Very High Emphasis (7) was used to gauge the overall degree of conflict result from practicalising of transformational leadership. Scale 1 means conflict arises from transformational leadership is at very low emphasis. Scale 2 means conflict arises from transformational leadership is at low emphasis. Scale 3 means that conflict arises from the transformational leadership is at slightly low emphasis. Scale 4 means that conflict arises from the transformational leadership is neutral. This is an ideal stage that we aimed to achieve. Scale 4 is the desirable level. Scale 5 means that conflict arises transformational leadership is at slightly high emphasis. Scale 6 means that conflict arises from the transformational leadership is at high emphasis. Scale 7 means that conflict arises transformational leadership is at very high emphasis. This stage is the most undesirable level as the existence of conflict, which will jeopardise the performance and efficiency of the organisation.

A mean score of more or less than 4.0 reveals that there is an imbalance practice of transformational leadership in the organisation. The imbalance practice of transformational leadership will result in rising of conflict in the organisation. The higher the mean score, the more imbalance practice of transformational leadership in the organisation. If the mean score is greater than 4.0, we will then bring down the mean score to 4.0 through the proposed intervention strategy in the following chapters. Then again, if the mean score is less than 4.0, we will then jazz-up the score to 4.0 through the proposed intervention strategy in the following chapters.

9. Visionary Leadership

Khaleelee and Woolf (1996) state that leading involves being able to conceptualise a vision, having the authority, energy and clarity to communicate the vision and the resilience to sustain the work programme necessary to bring the vision to reality. Leaders who are visionary in nature
usually focus on long term planning and they link subordinates’ needs and
goal to job or organisational long-term goals.

a. Express the vision Leaders are able to put across to their followers
the organisational goal and motivate them to
work towards achieving the goals.

b. Live the vision Leaders who continuously pursue the goals until
it is realized.

c. Extend the vision Leaders who are capable in transforming vision
into clarity of organisational purpose.

A seven point Likert scale ranging from "Very Low Emphasis (1), Low
(2), Slightly Low (3), Neutral (4), Slightly High (5), High (6), Very High
Emphasis (7) was used to gauge the overall degree conflict result from
practicalising of visionary leadership. Scale 1 means conflict arises from
visionary leadership is at very low emphasis. Scale 2 means conflict arises
from visionary leadership is at low emphasis. Scale 3 means that conflict
arises from the visionary leadership is at slightly low emphasis. Scale 4
means that conflict arises from the visionary leadership is neutral. This is an
ideal stage that we aimed to achieve. Scale 4 is the desirable level. Scale 5
means that conflict arises visionary leadership is at slightly high emphasis.
Scale 6 means that conflict arises from the visionary leadership is at high
emphasis. Scale 7 means that conflict arises visionary leadership is at very
high emphasis. This stage is the most undesirable level as the existence of
conflict, which will jeopardise the performance and efficiency of the
organisation.

A mean score of more or less than 4.0 reveals that there is an
imbalance practice of visionary leadership in the organisation. The imbalance
practice of visionary leadership will result in rising of conflict in the
organisation. The higher the mean score, the more imbalance practice of
visionary leadership in the organisation. If the mean score is greater than 4.0,
we will then bring down the mean score to 4.0 through the proposed
intervention strategy in the following chapters. Then again, if the mean score
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is less than 4.0, we will then jazz-up the score to 4.0 through the proposed intervention strategy in the following chapters.

The degree of emphasis on leadership theories and styles that give rise to conflict is result of the imbalance manifestations in practice. The degree of imbalances of leadership theories was measured by averaging the mean scores of these five scales – trait model of leadership, behavioural theories leadership, developmental oriented leadership, cognitive leadership and situational leadership. The degree of imbalances of leadership styles was measured by averaging the mean scores of these four scales – charismatic leadership, transactional leadership, transformational leadership and visionary leadership. A mean score of more or less than 4.0 reveals that there is imbalance practice of leadership theories and styles in the organisation. The imbalances practice of the leadership theories and styles in the organisation will result in rising of conflict in the organisation. The higher the mean score, the more imbalance practice of the leadership theories and styles in the organisation. If the mean score is greater than 4.0, we will then bring down the mean score to 4.0 through the proposed intervention strategy in the following chapters. Then again, if the mean score is less than 4.0, we will then jazz-up the score to 4.0 through the proposed intervention strategy in the following chapters.

3.3 SAMPLING DESIGN

Population for a study is the group about whom a researcher wants to draw conclusion. It almost never is able to study all the members of the population. As such, we will select a sample from among the data that might be collected and studied (Babbie, 1999, p. 89). This research uses the convenience sampling whereby the samples obtained are the people most conveniently available in SHCFMSB. There were 42 employees in SHCFMSB as at 31 July 2002 (cut off date). Since the population of the study is relatively small, this research will take into account all the 42 employees so as to ensure a more accurate and reliable result, meaning a 100% population was
used in this research. Of all 42 employees chosen, 4 are from the managerial level, 9 employees chosen are of the executive level, 1 secretary, 2 assistants, 2 clerks, 1 supervisor, 4 chargemans, 3 building technicians, 7 wiremen, 1 store keeper, 1 painter, 1 BAS operator and 6 gardeners.

3.4 DATA COLLECTION METHOD

According to Amaratunga, Baldry, Sarshar and Newton (2002), qualitative data is a source of well-grounded, rich descriptions and explanations of processes in identifiable local contexts. With qualitative data one can preserve chronological flow, see precisely which events led to which consequences, and derive fruitful explanations. When one’s concern is the experience of people, the way that they think, feel and act, the most truthful, reliable, complete and simple way of getting that information is to share their experience". This is precisely the outlook subscribed to by proponents and practitioners of participant observation (Waddington, 1994, quoted in Amaratunga et al., 2002).

This research requires the usage of qualitative data whereby the data collection method used is the participant observation. The primary observations involve observing what happened during the period and also recording what was said at the time. Statements by observer of what happened or what was said as well as the observer’s interpretation, i.e., secondary observations were also being practiced. Observation, like any data collection method must meet the requirements of reliability and validity of measurement (Judd, Smith & Kidder, 1986, p. 275)

Besides participant observation, data was also collected through informal interviews with the target samples that were identified for this study. According to (Zikmund, 2000, p. 221), direct observation can produce a detailed record of events or what people actually do. To further enhance the validity of the observations, informal interviews should be conducted with the respondents. The types of behaviour that are of interest here are those
behaviour that causes conflict to arise in SHCFMSB as a result of their daily interaction. In addition, other areas of concentration are observing the physical setting, activities of the target samples, particular events and their sequences and also the target samples' processes and emotions involved.

After the observation period is over, the observer fills up an instrument, which requires that, the observer to put an analysis on the baseline assessment of the organisation or departments against the conflict functional variables using the measurement scales between 1 to 7. Detailed scores given to the samples can be viewed in Appendix 2. According to Kwai and Marshall (1998), the attempt to put numbers into judgements adds rigour to qualitative research.

3.4.1 OBSERVATION

According to (Waddington, 1994, quoted in Amaratunga et al., 2002), participant observation is best suited to research projects: which emphasise the importance of human meanings, interpretations and interactions; where the phenomenon under investigation is generally obscured from public view; where it is controversial; and where it is little understood and it may therefore be assumed that an "insider" perspective would enhance the existing knowledge. The type of observation used in this research is the semi-structured observation. Observations were conducted during group and individual task/job environment, formal and informal meetings, social events such as during lunch breaks and after work gatherings. During the observation period, respondents' behaviour, action, verbal behaviour, expressive behaviour and temporal patterns were recorded. The observation on the respondents was conducted for a period of approximately 6 months to ensure certain reliability on the data that is obtained. Upon completion of the observation period, each respondent was given scores to each of the variables in the conflict diagnostic.
3.4.2 INFORMAL INTERVIEWS

Information was also obtained through informal interviews with the respondents. This is done through the daily discussion and conversation where certain characteristics or comments that were given towards other respondents where it was used as a confirmation of the researcher’s understanding towards the respondents’ behaviour or character. In addition, during the period of observation, the observer actually used direct observation of informal conversations of the respondents that is accessible only indirectly.

3.5 DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES

The data analysis used in this research study is to obtain the mean score across the dimensions of the conflict diagnostic. The mean score obtained from this study will be in the range of 1 to 7. For each dimension in each diagnostic, the scores given to the respondents were measured by averaging the mean scores.

Based on the proposition of this research study, a mean score of 4.0 denotes that conflict exits as a normal functioning in SHCFMSB. For nonverbal communication (Kinesics) diagnostic, barriers to cross-cultural communication diagnostic, semantic difficulties diagnostic, structural dysfunctions diagnostic and personal variable differences diagnostic, a mean score of 4.0 and above would indicate that there is an existence of conflict in SHCFMSB. A mean score of less than 4.0 would indicate conflict might be absent in the organisation.

Whereas for the leadership theories and styles diagnostic, a mean score more or less than 4.0 reveals that there is imbalance practice of leadership theories and styles in the organisation. This would mean there are critical areas that need to be viewed for interventions so that the level of
conflict in the organisation would be reduced to the normal functioning of the organisation.