

**THE EFFECTS OF CONFLICT ON TEAM DECISION-MAKING
EFFECTIVENESS: A CASE STUDY ON COSMOPOINT SDN. BHD.**

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Business Administration partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree Master of Science (Management), Universiti Utara Malaysia

By

ANNA ZAREENA BINTI AZAMAN

PERMISSION TO USE

In representing this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree from the Universiti Utara Malaysia, I hereby agree that the University Library (Perpustakaan Sultanah Bahiyah) may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying this thesis in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by my supervisor, Associate Professor Dr. Hasan Ali or by the Dean of Faculty of Business Administration. It is understood that any copying, publication, or use of this thesis or parts thereof for commercial purposes shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Requests for permission to copy or to make other use of material in this thesis in whole or in part should be addressed to:

Dean

Faculty of Business Administration

Universiti Utara Malaysia

06010 Sintok

Kedah Darulaman

ABSTRAK

Kajian ini bertujuan untuk mengkaji hubungan di antara jenis-jenis konflik dengan keberkesanan pembuatan keputusan dalam pasukan, di mana kajian ini telah dijalankan ke atas pasukan pengurusan Cosmopoint. Kajian ini telah mendapatkan maklumbalas daripada 135 individu dari 13 pasukan. Hanya 95 individu daripada 10 pasukan yang telah menjawab soal selidik yang telah diberikan. Soal selidik yang mempunyai 36 item telah digunakan dalam kajian ini, di mana ia dibahagikan kepada tiga segmen. Segmen-segmen tersebut adalah jenis-jenis konflik, keberkesanan pembuatan keputusan pasukan dan maklumat demografik. Analisis yang digunakan adalah analisis frekuensi, analisis deskriptif, korelasi Pearson, analisis regresi, ANOVA sehalu dan T-test sampel bebas. Konflik tugas didapati mempunyai hubungan signifikan dengan kualiti keputusan, penerimaan afektif, gelagat integratif dan gelagat distributif manakala konflik individu hanya berhubung signifikan dengan gelagat distributif. Sejalan dengan kajian lepas, faktor umur, jantina dan keturunan tidak lagi diterimapakai untuk menerangkan varian dalam konflik. Antara kemungkinan-kemungkinan yang terhasil daripada keputusan kajian adalah kajian ini berupa kajian kes yang memberikan keputusan eksklusif untuk Cosmopoint dan juga sifat perniagaan yang diceburinya. Walaupun bersifat kajian kes, hasil kajian dapat memberi laluan kepada penyelidikan akan datang berkenaan konflik dan pasukan, terutamanya keberkesanan pembuatan keputusan pasukan, dijalankan.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to study the relationship between types of conflict and team decision-making effectiveness, which this study has been carried out on Cosmopoint's management teams. This study elicited responses from 135 individuals from 13 teams. However, only 95 individuals from 10 teams answered the questionnaires given. Questionnaire with 36 items was used in this study, which was divided into three segments. The three segments were types of conflict, decision-making effectiveness and demographic data. Analyses used in this study were frequency analysis, descriptive analysis, Pearson correlation, regression analysis, One-way ANOVA and independent samples T-test. Task conflict was found to be significantly correlated with decision quality, affective acceptance, integrative behaviours and distributive behaviours; while person conflict only significantly correlated with integrative behaviours. In line with previous researches, age, gender and ethnic have become obsolete in explaining the variance of conflict. The results suggested that these could be due to the fact findings were exclusive to Cosmopoint and due to nature of business that it was dealing with. Despite being a case study, the results could be paved ways for further researches on conflict and further researches on team, especially team decision-making effectiveness.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In the name of ALLAH, Most Gracious and Most Merciful

First and foremost, Alhamdulillah, praises to Allah S.W.T for giving me the will and strength in enduring all the problems in completing this thesis.

My most sincere gratitude to my considerate supervisor, Associate Professor Dr. Hassan Ali for his guidance and encouragement throughout the beginning until the end of this study.

Love and thanks to my family, especially my loving mother, Puan Maimunah Md. Kassim and adoring siblings for their endless love, care and immense support through all thick and thin. Not forgetting my late father, Azaman bin Hassan, who had passed away while I am trying to complete my thesis. His loving words and encouragement has helped me in finishing this study.

I would also like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the President of Cosmopoint College of Technology, Dato' Idrus Mohd Satha for giving me the permission to study Cosmopoint's management teams; and also for all the members of Cosmopoint management teams for participating in this study.

Last but not least, millions of thanks to my friends who helped in giving ideas, advises and supports in completing this thesis. Thanks also to all parties involved directly and indirectly in the completion of this study. Thank you.

DEDICATIONS

Especially for my beloved parents

Mother, Puan Hajjah Maimunah binti Md. Kassim
Father, Allahyarham Tuan Haji Azaman bin Hassan

For my beloved siblings

Ruhil Naznin Azaman
Nadia Faseeha Azaman
Nur Dini Sorfina Azaman
Siti Aisyah Azaman
Muhammad Mukhlis Azaman

Not forgotten

Beloved grandmother
Aunts and uncles
All my cousins

Last but not least

Azah Hassan
Rina Illyana Kasa @ Halimi
Siti Salwa Shaari
Shamsinar Abdullah
Muhammad Rodhi Abd Rahman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PERMISSION TO USE	i
ABSTRACT (BAHASA MELAYU)	ii
ABSTRACT (ENGLISH)	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
DEDICATIONS	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	x
LIST OF FIGURES	xi
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Problem Statement	2
1.3 Objectives of the Study	
1.3.1 General objectives	3
1.3.2 Specific objectives	4
1.4 Significance of the Study	4
1.5 Theoretical Framework	5
1.6 Operational Definitions	6
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 Introduction	9
2.2 Conflict	
2.2.1 Previous definitions of conflict	9
2.2.2 Previous studies of conflict	13
2.3 Effects of Conflict	20
2.3.1 Task conflict	25
2.3.2 Person conflict	28
2.4 Team Decision-Making Effectiveness and Conflict	30

2.5	Team Composition and Conflict	36
CHAPTER 3: METHOD		
3.1	Introduction	41
3.2	Case Background	41
3.3	Unit of Analysis	43
3.4	Measures	
	3.4.1 Research instrument	44
	3.4.2 Research items	45
3.5	Analyses Used	
	3.5.1 Frequency analysis	48
	3.5.2 Descriptive analysis	48
	3.5.3 Pearson correlation	48
	3.5.4 Regression	49
	3.5.5 One-way ANOVA	50
	3.5.6 Independent samples T-test	50
3.6	Limitations of the Study	50
3.7	Pilot Test	51
CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH FINDINGS		
4.1	Introduction	53
4.2	Descriptives	
	4.2.1 Work Experience	54
	4.2.2 Number of Team Members	55
	4.2.3 Team Tenure	55
	4.2.4 Team Member Permanence	56
	4.2.5 Frequency of Meetings	57
	4.2.6 Project Complexity	58
	4.2.7 Levels of Skill Required	59
	4.2.8 Academic Qualification	60
	4.2.9 Professional Background	61
	4.2.10 Age	62

4.2.11	Race	63
4.2.12	Gender	64
4.2.13	Position	65
4.3	The Existence of Conflict in Team Decision-Making	66
4.4	The Relationships Among Dependent and Independent Variables	66
4.5	The Relationships Between Team Demographic Factors and Task Conflict	
4.5.1	The relationship between work experience and task conflict	71
4.5.2	The relationship between number of team members and task conflict	72
4.5.3	The relationship between team tenure and task conflict	72
4.5.4	The relationship between team member permanence and task conflict	73
4.5.5	The relationship between frequency of meetings and task conflict	73
4.5.6	The relationship between project complexity and task conflict	74
4.5.7	The relationship between level of skills required and task conflict	75
4.5.8	The relationship between academic qualification and task conflict	75
4.5.9	The relationship between professional background and task conflict	76
4.5.10	The relationship between age and task conflict	76
4.5.11	The relationship between position held and task conflict	77
4.5.12	The relationship between race and task conflict	77
4.5.13	The relationship between gender and task conflict	78
4.6	The relationship between team demographic factors and person conflict	
4.6.1	The relationship between work experience and task conflict	79
4.6.2	The relationship between number of team members and task conflict	79
4.6.3	The relationship between team tenure and task conflict	80
4.6.4	The relationship between team member permanence and task conflict	80
4.6.5	The relationship between frequency of meetings and task conflict	81
4.6.6	The relationship between project complexity and task conflict	81

4.6.7	The relationship between level of skills required and task conflict	82
4.6.8	The relationship between academic qualification and task conflict	82
4.6.9	The relationship between professional background and task conflict	83
4.6.10	The relationship between age and task conflict	83
4.6.11	The relationship between position held and task conflict	84
4.6.12	The relationship between race and task conflict	84
4.6.13	The relationship between gender and task conflict	85

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

4.3	Discussions	86
4.4	Conclusions	91
4.5	Recommendations	
4.5.1	Recommendations for Cosmopoint's Top Management	93
4.5.2	Recommendations for Future Researches	94

REFERENCES

APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

	Page	
Table 3.1	Summary of Independent and Dependent Variables	47
Table 3.2	Mcburney's (2001) Descriptions of Correlation Values	49
Table 4.1	Frequency of Respodents Based on Work Experience	54
Table 4.2	Frequency of Respodents Based on Numbers of Members	55
Table 4.3	Frequency of Respodents Based on Team Tenure	56
Table 4.4	Frequency of Respodents Based on Team Member Permanence	57
Table 4.5	Frequency of Respodents Based on Frequency of Meetings	58
Table 4.6	Frequency of Respodents Based on Project Complexity	59
Table 4.7	Frequency of Respodents Based on Levels of Skill Required	60
Table 4.8	Frequency of Respodents Based on Academic Qualification	61
Table 4.9	Frequency of Respodents Based on Professional Background	62
Table 4.10	Frequency of Respodents Based on Age	63
Table 4.11	Frequency of Respodents Based on Race	64
Table 4.12	Frequency of Respodents Based on Gender	64
Table 4.13	Frequency of Respodents Based on Position	65
Table 4.14	Descriptive Statistics	66
Table 4.15	Pearson Correlation	67
Table 4.16a	Regression	68
Table 4.16b	Regression	69
Table 4.16c	Regression	69
Table 4.16d	Regression	70

TASK CONFLICT

Table 4.17	ANOVA Results Based on Work Experience	71
Table 4.18	T-test Results Based on Numbers of Members	72
Table 4.19	ANOVA Results Based on Team Tenure	72
Table 4.20	T-test Results Based on Team Member Permanence	73

Table 4.21	ANOVA Results Based on Frequency of Meetings	73
Table 4.22	T-test Results Based on Project Complexity	74
Table 4.23	ANOVA Results Based on Level of Skills Required	75
Table 4.24	ANOVA Results Based on Academic Qualification	75
Table 4.25	ANOVA Results Based on Professional Background	76
Table 4.26	ANOVA Results Based on Age	76
Table 4.27	ANOVA Results Based on Position	77
Table 4.28	T-test Results Based on Ethnic	77
Table 4.29	T-test Results Based on Gender Difference	78

PERSON CONFLICT

Table 4.30	ANOVA Results Based on Work Experience	79
Table 4.31	T-test Results Based on Numbers of Members	79
Table 4.32	ANOVA Results Based on Team Tenure	80
Table 4.33	T-test Results Based on Team Member Permanence	80
Table 4.34	ANOVA Results Based on Frequency of Meetings	81
Table 4.35	T-test Results Based on Project Complexity	81
Table 4.36	ANOVA Results Based on Level of Skills Required	82
Table 4.37	ANOVA Results Based on Academic Qualification	82
Table 4.38	ANOVA Results Based on Professional Background	83
Table 4.39	ANOVA Results Based on Age	83
Table 4.40	ANOVA Results Based on Position	84
Table 4.41	T-test Results Based on Ethnic	84
Table 4.42	T-test Results Based on Gender Difference	85

LIST OF FIGURE

Figure 1	Diagram Showing The Relationship Between Types of Conflict and Team Decision Making Effectiveness	Page 5
----------	---	-----------

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

Conflict cannot simply be ignored. It happens all the time and everyone will experience conflict in everyday life and even at the workplace. Conflict comes from a Latin word that means “to strike together”, which also can be defined as any situation where incompatible activities, feelings, or intentions occur together. In other word, conflict happens when there is a gap between two or more things, for example A’s goal is for the company to achieve short-term profitability while B aims for the company to gain market leader position in long-term. The difference or gaps between these two persons create what is called conflict. According to Janssen (1999), conflict will occur when members of management teams make complex decisions, which give rise to task-related and person-oriented incompatibilities among team members.

Managers spend as much as 35% of their time processing routine complaints, dealing with decisions on hiring and/or retrenchment and facing pressures imposed through fast-

The contents of
the thesis is for
internal user
only

REFERENCES

- Alper, S, Tjosvold, A & Law, K.S. (2000). Conflict management, efficacy and performance in organizational teams. *Personnel Psychology*, 53, 625-642
- Amason, A.C. & Schweiger, D.M. (1994). Resolving the paradox of conflict: Strategic decision-making and organizational performance. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 5, 239-253
- Amason, A.C., Thompson, K.R., Hochwarter, W.A. & Harrison, A.W. (1995). Conflict: An important dimension in successful management teams. *Organizational Dynamics*, 23, 20-35
- Amason, A.C & Sapienza, H.J. (1997). The effects of top management team size and interaction norms on cognitive and affective conflict. *Journal of Management*, 23, 495-516
- Amason, A.C. & Thompson, K.R. (1995). Conflict: An important dimension in successful management teams. *Organizational Dynamics*, 24, 20-35
- Amason, A.C. (1996). Distinguishing the effects of functional and dysfunctional conflict on strategic decision-making: Resolving a paradox for top management teams. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 123-148
- Amason, A.C. (1999). The effects of past performance on top management team conflict in strategic decision-making. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 10, 340-359
- Appelbaum, S.H., Abdallah, C. & Shapiro, B. (1999). The self-directed team: A conflict resolution analysis. *Team Performance Management*, 5, 60-77

- Appelbaum, S.H., Shapiro, B. & Elbaz, D. (1998). The management of multicultural group conflict. *Team Performance Management*, 4, 211-234
- Banner, D.K. (1995). Conflict resolution: A recontextualization. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, 16, 31-34
- Bantel, K.A. & Jackson, S.E. (1989). Top management innovations in banking: "Does the composition of the top team make a difference?". *Strategic Management Journal*, 10, 107-124
- Brehmer, B. (1976). Social judgement theory and the analysis of interpersonal conflict. *Psychological Bulletin*, 83, 985-1003
- Campion, M.A. & Medsker, G.J. (1993). Relations between work group characteristics and effectiveness: Implications for designing effective work groups. *Personnel Psychology*, 46, 823-850
- Campion, M.A. & Papper, E.M. (1996). Relations between work team characteristics and effectiveness: A replication and extension. *Personnel Psychology*, 49, 429-452
- Cosier, R.A. & Schwenk, C.R. (1990). Agreement and thinking alike: Ingredients for poor decisions. *Academy of Management Executive*, 4, 69-74
- Darling, J.R. (1994). Crisis management in international business: Keys to effective decision-making. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 15, 3-8
- Dean Jr., J.W. & Sharfman, M.P. (1996). Does decision process matter?: A study of strategic decision-making effectiveness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 368-392

Deutsch, M. (1973). *The resolution of conflict: Constructive and destructive processes*.
New Haven: Yale University Press

Dixon, A.L., Gassenheimer, J.B. & Barr, T.F. (2002). Bridging the distance between us:
How initial responses to sales team conflict help shape core swelling team
outcomes. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 22, 247-257

Drach-Zahavy, A. & Somech, A. (2002). Team heterogeneity and its relationship with
team support and team effectiveness. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 40,
44-66

Eagly, A.H & Steffen, V.J. (1986). Gender and aggressive behavior: A meta-analytic
review of the social psychological literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, 100, 309-
330

Edwards, C. & Walton, G. (2000). Change and conflict in the academic library. *Library
Management*, 21, 35-41

Eisenhardt, K.M. (1989). Making fast decisions in high-velocity environments.
Academy of Management Journal, 32, 543-577

Eisenhardt, K.M & Schoonhoven, C.B. (1990). Organizational growth: Linking founding
team, strategy, environment and growth among U.S semiconductor ventures.
Administrative Science Quarterly, 35, 504-529

Esquivel, M. & Kleiner, B.H. (1996). The importance of conflict in work team
effectiveness. *Team Performance Management*, 2, 42-48

Folger, J.P, Poole, M.S & Stutman, R.K (2001). *Working through conflict* (4th ed.) NY:
Addison-Wesley Longman, Inc

- Guetzkow, H. & Gyr, J. (1954). An analysis of conflict in decision-making groups. *Human Relations*, 7, 367-382
- Guth, W.D. & MacMillan, I.C. (1986). Strategy implementation versus middle management self-interest. *Strategic Management Journal*, 7, 313-327
- Hyatt, David E. & Ruddy, Thomas M. (1997). An examination of the relationship between work group characteristics and performance: Once more into the breach. *Personnel Psychology*, 50, 553-585
- James, L.R. (1982). Aggregation bias in estimates of perceptual agreement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67, 219-229
- Janis, I.L. (1982). *Groupthink: Psychological studies of foreign policy decisions and fiascoes*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Janssen, O. & Van De Vliert, E. (1996). Concern for the other's goals: Key to (de-) escalation of conflict. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 7, 99-120
- Janssen, O, Van De Vliert, E. & Veestra, C. (1999). How task and person conflict shape the role of positive interdependence in management teams. *Journal of Management*, 25, 117-142
- Jehn, K.A. (1994). Enhancing effectiveness: An investigation of advantages and disadvantages of value-based intragroup conflict. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 5, 223-228
- Jehn, K.A. & Chadwick, C. (1997). To agree or not to agree: The effects of value congruence, individual demographic dissimilarity and conflict on workgroup outcomes. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 8, 287-305

- Jehn, K.A. (1995). A multimethod examination of the benefits and detriments of intragroup conflict. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40, 256-282
- Jehn, K., Northcraft, G.B. & Neale, M.A. (1999). Why differences make a difference: A field study of diversity, conflict and performance in workgroups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44, 741-763
- Kirkman, B.L. (2000). Why do employees resist teams?: Examining the “resistance barrier” to work team effectiveness. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 11, 74-92
- Kirkman, B.L., Tesluk, P.E. & Rosen, B. (2001). Assessing the incremental validity of team consensus ratings over aggregation of individual-level data in predicting team effectiveness. *Personnel Psychology*, 54, 645-667
- Korsgaard, M.A, Schweiger, D.M. & Sapienza, H.J. (1995). Building commitment, attachment and trust in top management teams: The role of procedural justice. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 60-84
- Lewis, D.S, French, E. & Steane, P. (1997). A culture of conflict. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 18, 275-282
- McBurney, D.H. (2001). *Research Methods (5th Ed.)*. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company
- McCann, C. & Baranski, J.V. (2000). On the utility of experiential cross-training for team decision-making under time stress. *Ergonomics*, 43, 1095-1111
- Mitroff, I.I. (1982). Talking past one’s colleagues in matters of policy. *Strategic Management Journal*, 3, 374-375

- Mohd Salleh, A. & Zaidatun, T. (2001). *Pengenalan kepada analisis data berkomputer SPSS 10.0 for Windows*. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: Venton Publishing
- Olorunsola, R. (1997). The anatomy and management of staff conflicts in Nigeria university library. *Library Management*, 18, 328-334
- Pinkley, R.L. (1990). Dimensions of conflict frame: Disputant interpretations of conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 117-126
- Pruitt, D.G. & Rubin, J.Z. (1986). *Social conflict: Escalation, stalemate and settlement*. New York: Random House
- Rahim, M.A. (1983). A measure of styles of handling interpersonal conflict. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 368-376
- Schweiger, D.M. & Sandberg, W.R. (1989). The utilization of individual capabilities in group approaches to strategic decision-making. *Strategic Management Journal*, 10, 31-43
- Schweiger, D.M., Sandberg, W.R. & Ragan, J.W. (1986). Group approaches for improving strategic decision-making: A comparative analysis of dialectical inquiry, devil's advocacy and consensus. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29, 51-71
- Smith, K.G., Smith, K.A., Olian, J.D., Sims, H.P., O'Bannon, D.P. & Scully, J.A. (1994). Top management team demography and process: The role of social integration and communication. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39, 412-438

Tjosvold, D. & Deemer, D.K. (1980). Effects of controversy within a cooperative or competitive context on organizational decision-making. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65, 590-595

Tjosvold, D. (1991). *The conflict-positive organization*. Boston: Addison-Wesley

Tjosvold, D., Dann, V. & Wong, C. (1992). Managing conflict between departments to serve customers. *Human Relations*, 45, 1135-1054

Wilmot, W.W. & Hocker, J.L. (2001). *Interpersonal conflict* (6th ed.). US: McGraw-Hill

Wong, A, Tjosvold, D, Wong, W.Y.L & Liu, C.K. (1999). Cooperative and competitive conflict for quality supply partnership between China and Hong Kong. *International Journal of Physical Distribution and Logistics Management*, 29, 7-