

A conflict resolution strategy

Sociology



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Arguments are essential not only in clarifying politicians' position regarding an issue but also focusing on people around their position. For instance, when a policy is perfectly explained by a group of individuals seeking self-interest or goals, those who aim to justify the policy must plea to the interest of the public and the intellectual merits of the case under discussion.

Individuals often miss a great point when they try to comprehend the process of policymaking in terms of influence, bargaining, and power to the exclusion of argument and debate. Arguments are the only avenue through which policymakers and citizens arrive at moral policy choices and judgments. As a result, debates produce outcomes that are far beyond the authoritarian capabilities or policy-making technocratic methods (Majone, 1989).

Follet's Methods of Dealing with Conflict

In an environmental project, conflict is inevitable as change appears to be. As a matter of fact, it is impossible for individuals with backgrounds, norms, and skills that are diverse to make decisions, work together, and try to meet project objectives and goals without conflict. This raises the need to formulate tangible strategies for handling conflicts. According to Follet (1973), there are three principal ways of managing conflict. These include integration, compromise, and domination. Domination is the triumph of one party over another. It is perceived to be the simplest way of managing conflicts. However, domination can only work in the short run as it is hard to dominate a rival party in the long term.

Compromise as a conflict resolution strategy works whereby the parties involved in conflict cede some ground to reach a common consensus for the sake of peace and let the continuation of an activity that has been disturbed

by the conflict. This is the approach most favored by trade unions. It is a significant method of putting an end to controversies in situations where no party is willing to shoulder the blame. Finally, we have an integrated approach. In this method, a solution is only reached when both parties' desires have found a place. The place is only found when no party has sacrificed anything. Integration involves various steps. The first step is uncovering the real conflict and the next step is taking the demands of both parties involved in a conflict. After that, the demands are broken down into their constituent segments. It is noteworthy that integration is different from compromise. In a compromise, an individual can sacrifice his/her needs for purposes of ending a controversy unlike in integration. In addition to that, in compromise, the true demands of a party are not clearly known unlike in integration.