

Introduction on the project and involved disciplines.

[Business](#)



Introduction The focal point of this report is on developing conflict management strategy to resolve conflict emerged between the project sponsor (PS) and preceding project manager (PM). By developing strategy through conflict resolution styles, current project manager ensure the conflicts are managed and are not repeated in future. The conflicts were analysed and identified in CW2A of the coursework. Critical

Conflicts In order to improve understanding of the analysis its worth to recapitulate the key issues shown in table 1. These issues were identified in CW2A case study analysis, alongside effects on the project and involved disciplines.

Critical Conflicts	Involved Parties	Effect on Project	Cause
Interpersonal conflict	Mr Armstrong (PM) Architects (EMBT/RMJM)	Ignoring communication channels and workflow processes	Architects in direct communication with project sponsor. Poor communication
Mrs Doig (PS) Mr Armstrong (PM)	Programme Cost	Priorities difference	lead to ineffective working environment. Delays
Mrs Doig (PS) Mr Armstrong (PM) Architects (EMBT/RMJM)	Programme Cost	Caused by client poor understanding of their requirements, lack of professional advisory.	

Incomplete package submittals delivered by architects. Lack of relevant information Mrs Doig (PS) Mr Armstrong (PM) Stage C & D submission Cost Changes to brief and client space requirements. Table 1 Critical conflicts

identification table. The above table clearly shows majority of issues relate to poor communication, ineffective collaborative work environment or both, these factors have negative impact on both costs and programme as well as damaged trust relationships. This justifies the requirements for

conflict management strategy as improvement in better project performance through resolving issues between involved people.

Conflict Management Approaches Clarification of conflicts relationship lead us to idea of different approach strategies described by Whetten, et al as suggested in CW2A analysis report (Whetten, et al, 2010). Whetten, et al, use the TKI (Thomas, et al, 1974) conflict mode instrument, which represents five management styles:

1. Forcing
2. Accommodating
3. Avoiding
4. Compromising
5. Assertiveness Cooperativeness 0 Collaborating

TKI Conflict Mode Instrument (Thomas, et al, 1975) As described by the authors these approaches express different levels of cooperativeness and assertiveness as shown in figure 1. Each approach is reflecting high or low cooperative response by person agreeing with opinion expressed by others. Whereas high or low assertiveness response is reflecting self-assurance of an individual, which focuses on particular issues. These resolution styles as shown in figure 1 are most favourable ways of resolving project issues as described in table 3 of "A Review of Conflict Management Techniques in Projects" (Sudhakar, 2015).

Forcing Management Approach Forcing is assertive but uncooperative approach, focusing on individual achieving their needs, with sacrifice of other individual demands. This is done through organisational authority, physical pressure or psychological manipulation; it all comes to ignoring other people's suggestions and opinions. It is an egocentric and introvertive approach, often relating to senior management staff leadership

<https://assignbuster.com/introduction-on-the-project-and-involved-disciplines/>

styles. The current Scottish Parliament project management falls into this particular category, as all parties try to impose their own ways on others; conflict of interest cause further relationship issues.

With that said, this approach is limited to single opinion and organisational hierarchy, limitations outweigh the desired conflict resolution in long term.

Therefore, the approach is unsuitable for PM to solve issues with other stakeholders in an effective and sustainable manner.

2. Accommodating Management Approach In contrast, accommodating approach is cooperative but unassertive, individual ignoring their own opinions and concerns to satisfy group/organisation concerns. In this case managers or even senior members in an organisation may neglect their true responsibilities in favour of others demands.

It could help to maintain agreement between the parties, thus one may be taking an advantage over the other group or individual. Evidently in Scottish Parliament project it's the Architects taking an advantage of PS, bypassing communication channel with PM and putting design concerns over project goals and budget. Subsequently, the approach has limited manoeuvres for group resolution and may lead to regular short-term agreements, which will affect project programme.

3. Avoiding Management Approach The approach is uncooperative and unassertive, by all means it seems to be least successful way of conflict resolution. As described by Whetten, et al, conflict is often postponed by managers who are not mentally prepared to cope with associated resolution stress and confrontations with parties (Whetten, et al, 2010). Repetitive use

<https://assignbuster.com/introduction-on-the-project-and-involved-disciplines/>

of this particular conflict strategy will result in unresolved issues, causing frustrations between involved parties. It reflects previous situation and the PM frustrations who resigned after being dismissed by the PS. The approach limitations are caused by complexity of the conflicts and confidence skills of individuals leading the conflict solution strategies.

Therefore the strategy should emphasise a collaborative approach to conflict resolution delivered by confident individuals, who could agree together on better ways to achieve project goals and improve the overall performance, as well as keep the teams motivated.

4. Compromising Management Approach

It is a compromise approach between cooperativeness and assertiveness, it attempts to obtain a consensus between two parties.

To achieve this approach both conflict parties are asked to sacrifice some of their demands to obtain a positive resolution. Nevertheless, the approach could be abused by managers for being fair to both sides and defining a common denominator. It could mean parties seeking twice as much demands as is required to resolve the issues.

In Scottish Parliament project case, being fair to both sides of the conflict may create more conflicts in future, as people could seek for new goals which are potentially irrelevant to the project. Although this approach seems to be neutral in conflict resolution, it is not suitable for the current project.

5. Collaborating Management Approach

Lastly, collaborative approach is cooperative and assertive, managers' intentions are to fully deal with issues by compromising satisfactory resolutions to involved parties. Blame is

not assigned to single individual but it is rather shared so that all people could feel they have won equally.

As described by the authors, similar to all listed approaches above this could not be adequate conflict resolution for all situations; this approach could have most beneficial outcome by creating team cooperation, trust and communication. Foremost the approach encourages individual to focus on their true problems rather than concentrating anger at personal levels. It could be the most appropriate long-term resolution strategy for Scottish Parliament project, establishing common language between PS and PM as well as between the PM and Architects. Collaboration provides foundation to share thoughts and ideas helping to tie PM project management skills and PS public relations and administrative skills. However, it could mean making decisions would take longer as all parties would need to discuss and agree.

By doing so PS could also improve her limited expertise in handling large scale and of such importance projects. In comparison, it is wise to take into account Jameson strategies in order to select the most appropriate conflict resolution (Jameson, 1999). Jameson suggests new resolution model as alternative approach to effective conflict resolution (Jameson, 1999):

1. Interest Based
2. Rights Based
3. Power Based

The construction sector has always been regarded as the most conflict and dispute industry. One of the traditional conflict resolution was litigation, which is a long a costly approach for resolving a dispute. Over the years the methods

improved and alternative dispute resolutions – ADR were introduced as means of avoiding lengthy and costly traditional procedures (Derrick, 2016).

This point is also sustained by Jamson, as she has simplified the ADR into three categories and introduced alternatives to established ADR processes. It is worth highlighting, ADR's are supported and made available to chartered members of various professional bodies i. e. RIBA, RICS, CIAT, etc.

The three resolution strategies are combination of formal and informal, and whether there is a requirement for internal or external mediator. Interest

Based Approach This strategy is based on negotiations and whether parties are able to settle the disputes between themselves or they require an external mediator; which could be someone from the organisation who is neutral to the conflict or an external party.

They will often act as counsellors and speak with single party to act as a middleman or help both parties to see and understand each other's view.

The approach can be broken down further into sub-approaches such as negotiation, advising, facilitation and mediation. All these systems focus on solving a problem by someone who is neutral, the 'problem solver' could use single or combination of ways to effectively help to resolve the issue.

In addition, these systems are informal way of dispute solving if organization peer act as counsellors, procedures may become formal if an external provide is used. The new manager could be seen as an ideal counsellor to resolve issues that arose between previous PM and PS as well as Architects.

However, this may not be feasible as it could create new issues as project proceed. Yet involving a neutral peer or external person would bring fresh

viewpoint on conflicts and help to make unbiased decisions between parties, without compromising overall project goals or timeline. Limitations of this approach could be the process required to be formal, employing an external mediator due to project complexity and importance. It could also mean that formal decisions may be politically influenced and followed by the public.

Rights Based Approach The approach is often referred to be a formal way of dealing with grievances by the organisations.

It means that HR procedures are triggered, arbitrator introduced or the case may end up in court. Informal approach could also be utilised in terms of senior staff member or superior intervention. In formal strategy, the third party only has power to judge what is right and wrong, but in fact have no authority to change policies or offer alternative solutions. Considering the project high profile brings the attention of the public, hence the approach should be considered as high risk as issues would be easily picked up by press. In this manner, formal proceedings would make the issues more transparent and open for public view. This would have a negative impact on the design and project delivery teams as pressure would come from politicians wanting to resolve issues as soon as possible, but also damage government creditability.

Power Based Approach As the name suggests, power based strategies involve authoritarian solutions imposed by those who deal with the conflicts between parties. Along these lines, solution is given to disputants by i.

e. manager, to solve the issues quickly without synergistic consideration of both parties' view. Based on other studies Jamson describe middle person

tend to avoid dealing directly with the conflicts, threatening disputants with their authority to manage the issues on their own (Jameson, 1999).

On the other hand, this approach may become convenient when there is limited time frame, broad impact on conflicts and low interconnection between parties. It is evident in project organisational hierarchy that PS has higher authority acting as client representative over PM and architects. For these reasons, power based approach would not be suitable to effectively manage the conflicts by project manager. Hence intervention of more senior member such as First Minister of Scotland, Mr Donald Dewar would be required. At the same time conflicts would be resolved quickly but not fully to maintain press transparency into the project. Advisory Negotiation

Strategy It can be seen from the above analysis that the negotiations must prioritise the improvement of communication so that the trust between all parties can be rebuilt, especially between PM and the Architects.

Negotiations also aim to ensure all parties respect the clear roles distinction and follow the organisation communication hierarchy as shown in figure 1 of CW2A; to avoid uninformed decisions. Undoubtedly, this change will aid to establish project goals and closely monitor project performance ensuring decreased programme delays and improve advice service from the design team which would help to establish client priorities and requirements. It is evident in the preceding analysis that majority of conflict management involve formal approach to conflict resolutions, as discussed earlier it is not suitable for public project. For this reason, informal conflict management is the preferred approach. There are similarities between collaborative

approach and interest-based, as both involve mediation, negotiation and facilitation, so both would work; despite this collaborative approach seems to be easier to understand through TKI illustrative model and simpler follow (Thomas, et al, 1974). Looking at table 1 of conflict interdependence it could be said that effective strategy starts at conflict resolution between PM and Architects.

The new PM has an opportunity to improve the connection with EMBT and RMJM. PM would face difficulty of developing better communication methods rather than fax or telephone. Moreover, cultural differences and different locations impose the duty on PM to ensure messages are formulated in a way that is explicit to both architects especially by EMBT, and they both receive it at the same time. PM should suggest taking advantage of email as more convenient form of communication for general discussion and transfer of work in progress drawings. Live discussion and exchange of information will reduce the interpersonal tensions, and by all means relevant stakeholders could be carbon copied to see project team performance and comment if necessary, improving relationship in general. An equally significant aspect of this approach is facilitation.

PM should set up and facilitate regular meetings with all stakeholders to allow face to face discussion of issues. This would allow the parties to spend some time working 'off line' and communicate through above solution, before collaboratively presenting solutions at next meeting. Through facilitating the routine meetings PM, PS and Architects will be up to date with all relevant information's.

It will also enable the project design team to evolve design options and advise client on their requirements and help to establish better brief. This would potentially resolve delay and budgeting issues. Additionally, before each deliverable stage meetings should be held in Barcelona to ensure attendance of EMBT architects.

The conflict between PM and PS could be described as intergroup which makes it difficult for coordination of task activities (Thakore, 2013). Hence, many factors affecting both parties cause friction, straight forward resolution in this case would not be effective. The preceding study suggest PS stepped in between Mr. Armstrong and architects conflict, to manage it through forcing approach, bypassing communication channels and enforcing solutions on PM. Adequate approach would be the PM to re-build trust between the two through improved collaborative work results amongst PM and the architects.

Power of emails and regular meetings will create strong bond between PM and architects, ensuring that architects always communicate with PM in first instance for technical queries which could then be translated further in liaison with PS. Moreover, sporadically PM could set up relatively short workshops with the PS on various aspects of projects to either discuss potential fixes or present project performance. Disputants cooperation In addition to conflict resolution strategy it is equally important to consider the limitations and ways of communicating the strategy to disputants.

Communication improvement executions should will be driven by the PM and initial cooperation with RMJM, to establish joint IT requirements for electronic communications; established standards will then be passed on to other

stakeholders. would potentially require the parties to improve their IT abilities and capacity. This certainly will involve high costs and could be pushed back by the design team, especially by EMBT and their limited resources (Fraser, 2004). Moreover, official documentation issue would still need to follow official postal way. With regards to the regular meetings arrangement an obvious limitation is the distance of EMBT office in Barcelona. This was apparent in previous study as EMBT representative did not attend all important meetings set up by previous PM in Scotland (Fraser, 2004). To ensure high meeting attendance new PM will need to set up even number of milestone and coordination meetings in both Barcelona and Edinburgh; as well as to experience the different project delivery approach by Spanish Architects. During those meetings PS would act as mediator and support the PM in non-technical decisions making.

Any other minor questions should be solved during workshops between PM and Architects, PS would not need to be involved at those stage as PM would utilize their technical knowledge with other parties. Project performance, budgets and timeline would need to be summarized in formal reports format by the PM to PS and the further to the client and public. The reports would need to be in a simple, easy to understand format so that they could be quickly analyzed by PS then discussed with client to take immediate action if necessary, clearly communicate back to PM then the team to maintain project program under control. On the other hand, budgets would be under PS control and reporting to the client so that technical details could be compromised through consultations with PM. In return, this would gradually rebuild the trust worthy relationship between PS and PM when both

would realize the collaborative approach benefits of successful project.

Conclusion Conclusively comprehensive conflict management strategy analysis and limitations imposed by stakeholder's cooperation, will be passed on to individuals involved in identified conflicts and to others. The collaborative strategy is the most productive way for high profile public projects, maintaining long term relationships in order to prevent similar issues happening in future.

References Dr.

Digvijaysinh Thakore (2013) ' Conflict and Conflict Management ', IOSR Journal of Business and Management , 8(6), pp. 9. Jessica Katz Jameson (1999) ' TOWARD A COMPREHENSIVE MODEL FOR THE ASSESSMENT AND MANAGEMENT OF INTRAORGANIZATIONAL CONFLICT: DEVELOPING THE FRAMEWORK', International Journal of Conflict Management, 10(3), pp. 281-288. Thomas, K. W. and Kilmann, R. H.

(1974), Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument, Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, CA. Goodman Derrick (30/04/16) Different methods of dispute resolution in construction disputes, Available at: <https://www.lexology.com/library/detail.aspx?g=3c05af6b-1733-4e2b-a552-108163ba9319> (Accessed: 10/12/17). David A.

Whetten; Kim S. Cameron (2010) Developing Management Skills, 8 edn., : Prentice Hall. Goparaju Purna sudhakar (2015) ' A REVIEW OF CONFLICT MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES IN PROJECTS', Brazilian Journal of Operations & Product Management, 12(2), pp.

214-232. Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body. (2004) The Holyrood Inquiry.
Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body, pp108