




# Links and Demographic Comparisons to Conflict Management and Counterproductive Work Behavior

Mustafa Fedai Çavuş , Alptekin Develi , and Seda Güğerçin 

**Abstract** According to contemporary theory in Management Science, conflicts are inevitable and necessary for organizations, indeed. Managing conflicts shows clearly differences between good and perfect managers and entrepreneurs. In this respect, conflict management styles are emerging as a meaningful tool for dealing with the counterproductive work behaviors which are anti-innovative behaviors. The purpose of the present study is to determine the effects of conflict management on counterproductive work behavior and also make demographic comparisons to these variables. The sample is composed of 200 white-collar employees. Data were collected through survey technique with convenience sampling method and analyzed via statistical package programs. Results show that conflict management styles, integrating, dominating, and compromising, have significant effect on counterproductive work behavior dimensions. Integrating reduces organizational deviance, dominating increases interpersonal deviance, and compromising reduces both interpersonal and organizational deviance. Besides, perceptions about conflict management and counterproductive work behavior vary depending on demographic characteristics. Integrating is perceived mostly by female participants in comparison with males. Dominating is perceived mostly by private sector employees in

---

This study is the final version of the extended abstract that was published in proceeding book that belong to “IV. Orgutsel Davranis Kongresi” on Nov 4–5, 2016, Adana, Turkey. ISBN: 978–975–487–213–2.

---

M. F. Çavuş (✉)

Department of Management Information Systems, Osmaniye Korkut Ata University, Osmaniye, Turkey

e-mail: [mfcavus@osmaniye.edu.tr](mailto:mfcavus@osmaniye.edu.tr)

A. Develi

Department of The Bureau’s Services and The Secretariat, Resadiye Vocational School, Tokat Gaziosmanpasa University, Tokat, Turkey

e-mail: [alptekin.develi@gop.edu.tr](mailto:alptekin.develi@gop.edu.tr)

S. Güğerçin

Institute of Social Science, Osmaniye Korkut Ata University, Osmaniye, Turkey

e-mail: [1621501301@ogr.oku.edu.tr](mailto:1621501301@ogr.oku.edu.tr)

© Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2020

J. Leitão et al. (eds.), *Intrapreneurship and Sustainable Human Capital*, Studies on Entrepreneurship, Structural Change and Industrial Dynamics,

[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-49410-0\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-49410-0_7)

comparison with public ones. Younger employees perceive conflict management and its two dimensions, obliging and compromising, more than their elders. Males are in tendency to behave counterproductive in comparison with females. Counterproductive work behavior and its one-dimensional, organizational deviance are performed less by younger employees and more by employees educated at post-graduate degree.

**Keywords** Conflict management · Counterproductive work behavior · Deviant behavior

## 1 Introduction

Although every individual in any organization come together to achieve a common goal, problems may arise from differences in personal characteristics, status, values, and perceptions. Along with the communication problems, scarce resources and management style may be a source of conflict in intraindividual, interindividual, intragroup, and intergroup levels (Riggio 2003; Graham 2009). These conflicts have an effect on the attitudes and behaviors of the employees and may cause counterproductive work behavior, which are defined as “behaviors intended to hurt the organization or other members of the organization” (Spector and Fox 2002: 271). In this context, the rationale behind carrying out this study is to determine the relationship between conflict management—defined as “directing the disagreements and unrests in order to create positive outcomes for the organization (Akkirman 1998: 2)” —and counterproductive work behavior.

According to the contemporary theory in Management Science, conflicts are considered as one of the inevitable aspects within the organizations, and it is impossible to totally eliminate them. Thus, the role of a manager is to manage conflicts in order to add value to the organization (Kocel 2013). Managing conflicts effectively manifests the difference between good and perfect managers and entrepreneurs (Graham 2009). Since the counterproductive work behavior are anti-innovative behaviors, therefore, counterproductive work behaviors need to be directed effectively. In order to achieve this, it is important to determine the suitable conflict management style. In this study, the relationship between conflict management and counterproductive work behavior and also demographic differences towards these variables was analyzed through empirical methods.

In the following parts of the study, the concepts of conflict management and counterproductive work behavior are primarily explained with their dimensions. Afterwards, information about the method of the study and the obtained findings are given. Finally, the results and conclusions of the study were discussed in the last section, and recommendations were provided to the managers, entrepreneurs, and future researches.

## 2 Conceptual Framework

### 2.1 Conflict Management

Conflict management benefits from the differences that create disagreements among people or groups. The benefits of the conflict management should support the productivity of the organization. Conflict management approach involves planning and executing effective strategies to minimize the dysfunctional consequences of conflict and maximize the functional ones to encourage learning, creativity, and organizational productivity (Rahim 2002). In the literature, conflict management has five dimensions. They are also called *conflict management styles*. The dimensions are integrating, obliging, dominating, avoiding, and compromising.

#### 2.1.1 Integrating

Integrating focuses on collaboration between different parties. While using integrating as a conflict management style, the aim is to reach a reasonable solution for all parties. Making promises to be honest to the other party, to ensure continuity to exchange of information, and discussing opposite thoughts frankly are the examples of this dimension (Rahim and Magner 1995). Besides, this style is called *problem-solving* (Chang and Zelihic 2013).

#### 2.1.2 Obliging

When using obliging, it is crucial to ignore disagreements and bring common views into the forefront to please the other party (Rahim and Magner 1995). Generally, this method is used when power distance is high between the groups. A conflict between a manager and an employee is an example of this dimension. A depiction of obliging may be seen if a subordinate experience a conflict with his/her manager and accept what the manager wants (Karcioglu and Aliogullari 2012; Karip 1999).

#### 2.1.3 Dominating

Dominating can be defined as a win-lose approach or forcing behaviors to gain benefit (Rahim and Magner 1995). While using this method, the needs and wants of the other party are ignored (Rahim 2002).

### **2.1.4 Avoiding**

Withdrawal and pass the buck are the keywords of avoiding. As a short-term-oriented method, it is based on staying away from the disagreements (Kocel 2013).

### **2.1.5 Compromising**

Compromising is about sacrificing to reach a solution that is reasonable for both parties (Rahim and Magner 1995). When the parties have an equal level of power or when the negotiation process reach deadlock, compromising can be used as a useful method (Rahim 2002).

## **2.2 Counterproductive Work Behavior**

Counterproductive work behavior can be described as hurting the organization or a member of the organization intendedly (Spector and Fox 2002; Gokcen-Kapusuz and Cavus 2017). In other words, counterproductive work behavior is defined as conscious behaviors which create a threat to the well-being of the organization or its members and violate the organizational norms or values (Robinson and Bennett 1995). Counterproductive work behavior has two dimensions: interpersonal deviance and organizational deviance (Bennett and Robinson 2000). If the damage is on the member or members of the organization, it is named as interpersonal deviance; and if the organization is damaged, it is called organizational deviance.

### **2.2.1 Interpersonal Deviance**

Interpersonal deviance can be defined as deviances that directed or targeted at members of the organization. At work, spreading rumors and physical violence, making fun of someone, saying hurtful things to someone, and acting rudely towards someone are some of the examples of interpersonal deviance (Bennett and Robinson 2000).

### **2.2.2 Organizational Deviance**

Organizational deviance is explained by taking a property without permission, spending too much time fantasizing or daydreaming instead of working, absenteeism, intentionally work slower than you could do, falsifying a receipt to get reimbursed for more money than you spend on business expenses, sharing confidential

information, and using an illegal drug or consuming alcohol on the job (Robinson and Bennett 1995).

### 3 Materials and Methods

The research was conducted within the scope of quantitative research pattern and correlational research design. In this context, convenience sampling method and survey technique were used. Surveys were submitted to 212 white-collar employees in Adana/Turkey, working in various businesses for public and private sector organizations. Due to the missing value, 12 of the surveys were excluded, and 200 of the surveys were analyzed via statistical package programs ( $n = 200$ ).

Reliability analysis was used to test the internal consistency of scales. In order to understand how the respondents' perceptions of conflict management and counterproductive work behavior differ depending on demographical characteristics, Independent Samples *t* Test and one-way ANOVA analysis were applied. Pearson correlation analysis was used to understand the relationships among the dimensions of conflict management and counterproductive work behavior. Finally, multiple linear regression analysis was applied to measure the variance of the counterproductive work behavior that is explained by conflict management, the independent variable in this research.

#### 3.1 Sample

The demographic characteristics of the 200 participants are as follows: 110 (55%) respondents are female and 90 (45%) respondents are male. 121 (60.5%) respondents are between 26 and 35 years old, 45 (22.5%) are between 36 and 45 years old, 18 (9.0%) respondents are between 46 and over years old, and 16 (8.0%) respondents are between 18 and 25 years old. 91 (45.5%) respondents have bachelor's degree, 54 (27.0%) respondents have post-graduate degree, 29 (14.5%) respondents have high school degree, 15 (7.5%) respondents have associate degree, and 11 (5.5%) respondents have primary school degree. 137 (68.5%) respondents work in private sector organizations and 63 (31.5%) respondents work in public sector organizations. The majority of the respondents' current job tenure is between 2 and 8 years (87/43.5%), and total job tenure is between 2 and 8 years (89/44.5%).

#### 3.2 Measures

Conflict management is measured by Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory-II (ROCI-II) by Rahim and Magner (1995). It consists of 5 dimensions and 28 items.

The dimensions are as follows: integrating (7 items), obliging (6 items), dominating (5 items), avoiding (6 items), and compromising (4 items). Participants responded these items using the 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree).

Workplace Deviance Scale, developed by Bennett and Robinson (2000), was used to measure counterproductive work behavior. It consists of 2 dimensions and 19 items. The dimensions are as follows: interpersonal deviance (7 items) and organizational deviance (12 items). Participants responded these items using the 5-point Likert scale (1 = never, 5 = every day).

The first section of the survey contains demographical questions (i.e., gender, age, level of education, organization type, current job tenure, and total job tenure). In a great many studies, Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory-II (ROCI-II) scale and Workplace Deviance Scale were applied to samples in Turkey (Karcioglu and Aliogullari 2012; Gümüşeli 1994; Kanten et al. 2015; Dirican 2013), and these studies support factorial validity of the scales.

## 4 Findings

### 4.1 Reliability Analysis

Cronbach's alpha values of the scales were calculated to assess the internal consistency reliability (Cronbach 1951). The overall Cronbach's alpha values of conflict management scale and counterproductive work behavior scale are  $\alpha = 0.87$  and  $\alpha = 0.85$ , respectively. Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the dimensions of conflict management are  $\alpha = 0.84$  for integrating,  $\alpha = 0.72$  for obliging,  $\alpha = 0.72$  for dominating,  $\alpha = 0.74$  for avoiding, and  $\alpha = 0.72$  for compromising. For the dimensions of counterproductive work behavior, the coefficients are  $\alpha = 0.73$  for interpersonal deviance and  $\alpha = 0.81$  for organizational deviance. According to these coefficients, on the basis of generally accepted Cronbach's alpha coefficients standard ( $\alpha \geq 0.70$ ), it can be stated that the scales are reliable (Nunnally 1978).

### 4.2 Pearson Correlation Analysis and Descriptive Statistics

Five dimensions of conflict management and two dimensions of counterproductive work behavior are taken into the Pearson correlation analysis. Also, descriptive statistics of all variables are calculated. The results are given in Table 1.

According to the results, there is significant and negative relationship between integrating and organizational deviance ( $r = -0.26, p < 0.01$ ), compromising and interpersonal deviance ( $r = -0.21, p < 0.01$ ), and compromising and organizational deviance ( $r = -0.26, p < 0.01$ ). Besides, no significant relationship is found between both integrating and interpersonal deviance and the other conflict

**Table 1** Pearson correlation analysis and descriptive statistics

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Integrating	1						
2. Obliging	0.308**	1					
3. Dominating	0.402**	0.075	1				
4. Avoiding	0.179*	0.344**	0.112	1			
5. Compromising	0.552**	0.550**	0.271**	0.175	1		
6. Interpersonal dev.	-0.101	-0.064	0.103	-0.091	-0.217**	1	
7. Organizational dev.	-0.260**	-0.088	-0.053	-0.003	-0.266**	0.543**	1
Mean	4.05	3.49	3.60	2.90	4.05	1.38	1.45
Standard deviation	0.62	1.07	0.72	0.77	0.79	0.36	0.40

\*Shows the  $p < 0.05$  statistical significance level, \*\* shows the  $p < 0.01$  statistical significance level

**Table 2** Multiple linear regression analysis

Models		1	2			
Dependent variables		Interpersonal deviance	Organizational deviance			
Model summary	$r$	0.303	0.317			
	$R^2$	0.092	0.101			
	$F$	3.935	4.347			
	$p$	<b>0.002</b>	<b>0.001</b>			
	D-W	1.38	0.89			
Coefficients		$\beta$	$p$	$\beta$	$p$	VIF
Independent variables	Integrating	-0.036	0.681	-0.196	<b>0.024</b>	1.60
	Obliging	0.136	0.116	0.080	0.354	1.59
	Dominating	0.202	<b>0.008</b>	0.078	0.299	1.21
	Avoiding	-0.100	0.176	0.036	0.626	1.15
	Compromising	-0.310	<b>0.001</b>	-0.230	<b>0.015</b>	1.89

Note:  $r$  correlation coefficient,  $R^2$  determination coefficient,  $F$  the  $F$ -statistic,  $p$  statistical significance level,  $D-W$  Durbin-Watson statistic,  $\beta$  standardized beta coefficient,  $VIF$  variance inflation factor value

management dimensions (obliging, dominating, avoiding) and interpersonal or organizational deviance.

### 4.3 Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

To find the predictor status of conflict management dimensions on the dimensions of counterproductive work behavior, perform the multiple linear regression analysis. The results are given in Table 2.

Above all, in order to achieve the correct results in the models, we firstly checked whether there were multicollinearity and serial correlation problems. According to the variance inflation factor (VIF) values and Durbin-Watson (D-W) statistics, there weren't multicollinearity problem ( $VIF < 5$ ) and serial correlation problem ( $D-W < 2$ ) in the models (O'Brien 2007; Durbin and Watson 1971).

In the first regression model, dependent variable is the interpersonal deviance, and independent variables are the dimensions of conflict management, which are integrating, obliging, dominating, avoiding, and compromising. Results showed that it is possible to estimate the interpersonal deviance by the dimensions of conflict management [ $F_{(5,194)} = 3.935, p < 0.01$ ]. The correlation coefficient is  $r = 0.30$ , and the determination coefficient, which states how much of the variability of the dependent variable is explained by the independent variables, is  $R^2 = 0.09$ . Thus, it can be said that dimensions of conflict management explain 9% of this model. Beta values, which show the effects magnitude of independent variables on dependent variable, are the highest for compromising ( $\beta = -0.31, p < 0.01$ ) and dominating ( $\beta = 0.20, p < 0.01$ ) in a row. Other beta values are not statistically significant ( $p > 0.05$ ). According to all findings, while compromising decreases the interpersonal deviance, dominating increases it, respectively.

In the second regression model, dependent variable is the organizational deviance, and the independent variables are the dimensions of conflict management, which are integrating, obliging, dominating, avoiding, and compromising. Results showed that it is possible to estimate the organizational deviance by the dimensions of conflict management [ $F_{(5,194)} = 4.347, p < 0.01$ ]. The correlation coefficient is  $r = 0.31$ , and the determination coefficient, which states how much of the variability of the dependent variable is explained by the independent variables, is  $R^2 = 0.10$ . Thus, it can be said that dimensions of conflict management explain 10% of this model. Beta values, which show the effects magnitude of independent variables on dependent variable, are the highest for compromising ( $\beta = -0.23, p < 0.05$ ) and integrating ( $\beta = -0.19, p < 0.05$ ) in a row. Other beta values are not statistically significant ( $p > 0.05$ ). According to all findings, the organizational deviance decreased by compromising and integrating, respectively.

#### **4.4 Difference Analysis**

In order to understand how respondents' demographic variables (gender, age, education, and organization type) differ in conflict management, counterproductive work behavior and their dimensions, Independent Samples *t* Test, one-way ANOVA, and post hoc Scheffe test were used.



#### 4.4.1 Differences in Perception of Conflict Management

*T* test was used to test whether there is a statistical difference in perception of conflict management and its dimensions according to gender groups. Results showed that integrating is the only dimension that is perceived differently by male and female participants [ $F = 1.850$ ,  $p_{(\text{Levene})} > 0.05$ ,  $p_{(2\text{-tailed})} < 0.05$ ]. The mean values of integrating are  $\bar{x} = 3.94$  for males and  $\bar{x} = 4.14$  for females. Although there is not a huge difference between mean values, it is clearly seen that integrating perceptions of female participants are statistically different from (more than) the male ones.

One-way ANOVA was used to test whether there is a statistical difference in perception of conflict management and its dimensions according to age groups. Results showed that conflict management ( $F = 3.036$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), obliging ( $F = 3.173$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), and compromising ( $F = 3.202$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) differ statistically in terms of age groups. However, there is no statistically difference in integrating, dominating, and avoiding dimensions ( $p > 0.05$ ). Conflict management differs only between two groups ( $p < 0.05$ ). The age groups are 18–25 and 46 and over. Mean values of the groups for conflict management are highest for 18–25 ages ( $\bar{x} = 3.79$ ) and then 46 and over ages ( $\bar{x} = 3.32$ ). Obliging differ only between two groups ( $p < 0.05$ ). The age groups are 18–25 and 26–35. Mean values of the groups for obliging are highest for 18–25 ages ( $\bar{x} = 4.26$ ) and then 26–35 ages ( $\bar{x} = 3.45$ ). Similarly, compromising differ only between two groups ( $p < 0.05$ ). The age groups are 18–25 and 26–35. Mean values of the groups for compromising are the highest for 18–25 ages ( $\bar{x} = 4.62$ ) and then 26–35 ages ( $\bar{x} = 4.00$ ). It can be understood from the results that although the difference in the mean scores is not huge on looking at the statistics, younger employees perceive conflict management and its two dimensions, obliging and compromising, more than their elders.

One-way ANOVA was used to test whether there is a statistical difference in perception of conflict management and its dimensions in terms of education level. According to results, no significant difference is found among education level in conflict management and all dimensions ( $p > 0.05$ ).

*T* test was used to test whether there is a statistical difference in perception of conflict management and its dimensions according to organization type. Results show that perception of dominating is higher for private sector employees [ $F = 0.453$ ,  $p_{(\text{Levene})} > 0.05$ ,  $p_{(2\text{-tailed})} < 0.01$ ]. While the mean value for dominating is  $\bar{x} = 3.74$ , for private sector employees,  $\bar{x} = 3.30$  for public sector ones. There is no significant difference in conflict management and its other dimensions ( $p > 0.05$ ). Even though there is not a huge difference between the mean values, it is seen that dominating perceptions of private sector employees are statistically different from (more than) the public sector ones.

#### 4.4.2 Differences in Counterproductive Work Behavior

T test was used to test whether there is a difference in counterproductive work behavior and its dimensions according to gender groups. According to results, gender makes a difference in counterproductive work behavior [ $F = 2.827$ ,  $p_{(\text{Levene})} > 0.05$ ,  $p_{(2\text{-tailed})} < 0.01$ ], interpersonal deviance [ $F = 2.839$ ,  $p_{(\text{Levene})} > 0.05$ ,  $p_{(2\text{-tailed})} < 0.01$ ], and organizational deviance [ $F = 3.106$ ,  $p_{(\text{Levene})} > 0.05$ ,  $p_{(2\text{-tailed})} < 0.05$ ]. Mean values of counterproductive work behavior are highest for male ( $\bar{x} = 1.50$ ) and then female ( $\bar{x} = 1.35$ ). Mean values of interpersonal deviance are highest for male ( $\bar{x} = 1.47$ ) and then female ( $\bar{x} = 1.30$ ). Mean values of organizational deviance are highest for male ( $\bar{x} = 1.52$ ) and then female ( $\bar{x} = 1.38$ ). It can be understood from the results that even so the difference in the means is not huge, in terms of statistics, males are in tendency to behave counterproductive work behaviors in comparison with females.

One-way ANOVA was used to test whether there is a difference in counterproductive work behavior and its dimensions according to age groups. The results showed that age groups make a difference in counterproductive work behavior ( $F = 4.640$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), interpersonal deviance ( $F = 4.300$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), and organizational deviance ( $F = 3.354$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). Counterproductive work behavior differs only between two groups ( $p < 0.05$ ). The age groups are 18–25 and 26–35. Mean values of the groups for counterproductive work behavior are highest for 26–35 ages ( $\bar{x} = 1.48$ ) and lowest for 18–25 ages ( $\bar{x} = 1.23$ ). Interpersonal deviance differs only between two groups ( $p < 0.05$ ). The age groups are 18–25 and 26–35. Mean values of the groups for interpersonal deviance are the highest for 26–35 ages ( $\bar{x} = 1.44$ ) and lowest for 18–25 ages ( $\bar{x} = 1.16$ ). And according to post hoc test, organizational deviance makes no significant differences among the age groups ( $p > 0.05$ ). It can be understood from the results that even so the difference in the means is not huge, in terms of statistics, counterproductive work behavior and its one-dimensional, organizational deviance are performed less by younger employees.

One-way ANOVA was used to test whether there is a statistical difference in counterproductive work behavior and its dimensions in terms of education level. The results showed that education level makes a difference in counterproductive work behavior ( $F = 4.276$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) and organizational deviance ( $F = 4.793$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). Education level makes no significant differences in interpersonal deviance ( $p > 0.05$ ). Counterproductive work behavior differs only between two education levels ( $p < 0.05$ ). The education level is post-graduate degree and high school degree. Mean values of the education level for counterproductive work behavior are the highest for post-graduate degree ( $\bar{x} = 1.52$ ) and then high school degree ( $\bar{x} = 1.27$ ). Organizational deviance differs only between three education levels ( $p < 0.05$ ). The education level is post-graduate degree, associate degree, and high school degree. Mean values of the education level for organizational deviance are highest for post-graduate degree ( $\bar{x} = 1.57$ ), high school degree ( $\bar{x} = 1.26$ ), and then associate degree ( $\bar{x} = 1.22$ ). It can be understood from the results that even so the difference in the means is not huge, in terms of statistics, counterproductive work

behavior and its one-dimensional, organizational deviance are performed mostly by employees who have post-graduate degree.

T test was used to test whether there is a difference in counterproductive work behavior and its dimensions in terms of organization type. According to the results, no significant difference is found between organization type in counterproductive work behavior and all dimensions ( $p > 0.05$ ).

## 5 Discussion

This study focuses on the effect of employees' perceptions of conflict management on counterproductive work behavior. Besides, differences in employees' perceptions of conflict management and counterproductive work behavior based on demographic variables are discussed.

The findings of this study showed that there are significant relations among some dimensions of conflict management and counterproductive work behavior. These are the relationships between integrating-organizational deviance, dominating-interpersonal deviance, compromising-interpersonal deviance, and compromising-organizational deviance. Obliging and avoiding do not have any significant relation with either interpersonal or organizational deviance. These relations show that which conflict management styles have an effect on which counterproductive work behavior dimensions. In this context, integrating decreases organizational deviance, whereas dominating increases interpersonal deviance. On the other hand, compromising is a suggested conflict management tool to prevent both interpersonal and organizational deviance. The findings may be used as a guideline both for managers and entrepreneurs.

Researchers in the conflict management field found that an effective conflict management will have a positive impact on development creativity, innovation, and efficiency, which ensure organizational commitment and job satisfaction (De-Dreu 1997; Pelled et al. 1999; Chan et al. 2008; Graham 2009; Tjosvold and Chia 1989; Ahmed and Ahmed 2015). On the other hand, in situations which conflict management is poorly managed, adaptation, communication, and motivation decrease, and this leads to alienation and turnover (Sotile and Sotile 1999; Graham 2009; Robbins 1978). And as for this study, each dimension of conflict management is discussed according to its positive or negative effect on counterproductive work behavior dimensions.

In the related literature, Kessler et al. (2013) analyzed the relationship between leadership, conflict, and counterproductive work behavior. Their findings showed that interindividual conflicts are among the source of counterproductive work behavior. In another study by Boddy (2014), it is analyzed that how conflicts and employees who have mental disorders have an effect on emotional well-being and counterproductive work behavior. His findings suggested that employees who have mental disorders create conflicts which cause counterproductive work behavior.

On the other hand, in this study, how can be handle the counterproductive work behavior via conflict management styles in an organization is discussed. This research has an original value and important contributions to the literature. In this context, this is the first study which investigates the relationship between the perception of conflict management and counterproductive work behavior within the framework of white-collar employees.

Rahim's five dimensions of conflict management are classified into cooperative and uncooperative conflict management methods. According to this classification, integrating, obliging, and compromising are the elements of the cooperative side. Dominating and avoiding are on the uncooperative side (Rahim et al. 2000; Song et al. 2000). With regard to employee behaviors, cooperative conflict management methods create positive outcomes, and uncooperative conflict management methods cause negative outcomes (Meyer 2004; Rahim and Buntzman 1989; Weider-Hatfield and Hatfield 1996; Ohbuchi and Kitanaka 1991; Pruitt and Carnevale 1993). If there is a decrease in counterproductive work behavior, it is a positive output, whereas an increase in these behaviors is a negative one. Taking this view into account, the findings of this study are partially parallel with the cooperative-uncooperative classification, because the effects of integrating, compromising, and dominating match the classification, while the effects of obliging and avoiding unmatched it.

## 6 Conclusions

At first, conflicts were considered as a damaging element that needs to be eliminated. Eventually, conflicts—in a reasonable level—started to be welcomed due to its positive effects on organizational productivity, problem-solving ability, performance, and creativity (Simsek et al. 1998; Akova 2015).

Conflicts, *sometimes openly, subtly*, or in an obscure way, hurt organizations. Counterproductive work behavior shows up as conscious behaviors which create a threat to the well-being of the organization or its members and violate the organizational norms or values (Robinson and Bennett 1995). In this context, counterproductive work behavior resembles conflicts, and the importance of this study lies in the fact that it provides solutions to destructive consequences of counterproductive work behavior by conflict management styles.

Taking the findings of the study into account, it can be concluded that if a manager or an entrepreneur uses dominating as a conflict management styles to deal with conscious and harmful behaviors of employees, he/she can increase deviance behaviors towards employees. Besides, it is meaningful to benefit from compromising for transforming conflict for the benefit of organization and its members. If organizational deviance occurs, a manager/an entrepreneur should focus on compromising and integrating styles to stop these deviance behaviors. However, it is also clear that it is vain for the managers/entrepreneurs to use obliging and avoiding managing interpersonal or organizational deviance behaviors.

As mentioned before, it is possible to manage organizational deviance by integrating, which is defined as seeking alternative solutions mutually to reach an effective solution (Rahim 2002). Another style, dominating, has increasing effects on interpersonal deviance. If this method is frequently used, it decreases employees' motivation. Even though it is not useful to use permanently, dominating is appropriate for conflicts that need to be resolved quickly (Akova 2015). By compromising, managers/entrepreneurs can deal with both interpersonal and organizational deviances. In the cases of hard-to-reach agreements or when it is aimed to get temporary solutions, compromising is a quite functional tool (Rahim 2002). It converts destructive behaviors for the members of the organization or the organization itself to contributors to the effectiveness of the organization. However, it is invalid to try to use and expect benefit from obliging or avoiding styles.

Eventually, according to difference analysis, integrating is perceived mostly by female participants in comparison with males. Dominating is perceived mostly by private sector employees in comparison with public ones. Younger employees perceive conflict management and its two dimensions, obliging and compromising, more than their elders. Besides, males are in tendency to behave counterproductive work behavior in comparison with females. Counterproductive work behavior and its one-dimensional, organizational deviance are performed less by younger employees and more by employees educated at post-graduate degree.

For further researches, it should be taken into account that Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory-II (ROCI-II) scale enables to be classified as *concern for others* and *concern for self*. Similarly, a classification for dimensions of Bennett and Robinson's Workplace Deviance scale is available. According to this, interpersonal deviance consists of *political deviance and personal aggression*, and organizational deviance consists of *property deviance and production deviance*.

## References

- Ahmed, K., & Ahmed, G. (2015). The relationships between conflict management styles, job satisfaction and organizational commitment among workers in public and private sectors. *Universal Journal of Psychology*, 3(2), 41–50. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujp.2015.030203>.
- Akkirman, A. D. (1998). Etkin çatışma yönetimi ve müdahale stratejileri. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi*, 13(2), 1–11.
- Akova, O. (2015). Yonetsel ve örgütsel etkinliği geliştirme yöntemleri. In K. O. Ozer, M. Hiziroglu, & M. Saldamli (Eds.), *Catisma yönetimi* (pp. 516–541). Istanbul: Adra Yayıncılık.
- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(3), 349–360. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.3.349>.
- Boddy, C. R. (2014). Corporate psychopaths, conflict, employee affective Well-being and counterproductive work behaviour. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 121(1), 107–121. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1688-0>.
- Chan, K. W., Huang, X., & Ng, P. M. (2008). Managers' conflict management styles and employee attitudinal outcomes: The mediating role of trust. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 25(2), 277–295. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-007-9037-4>.

- Chang, L. C., & Zelihic, M. (2013). The study of conflict management among taiwanese adolescents. *Life Science Journal*, *10*(3), 1231–1241.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, *16*(3), 297–334.
- De-Dreu, C. K. W. (1997). Productive conflict: The importance of conflict management and conflict issue. In C. K. W. De-Dreu & E. Van De Vliert (Eds.), *Using conflict in organizations* (pp. 9–52). New Delhi, Thousand oaks, London: SAGE. isbn:0-7619-5091.
- Dirican, A. H. (2013). *Duygusal zekanin orgutsel vatandaslik davranisi ve uretkenlik karsiti davranislar uzerine etkisi*. Master Thesis, Gebze High Technology Institute, Gebze. Institute of Social Science, Turkey
- Durbin, J., & Watson, G. S. (1971). Testing for serial correlation in least squares regression, III. *Biometrika*, *58*(1), 1–19.
- Gokcen-Kapusuz, A., & Cavus, M. F. (2017). Relationship between counterproductive behaviors and islamic work ethics. *European Journal of Business and Management*, *9*(12), 153–156.
- Graham, S. (2009). The effects of different conflict management styles on job satisfaction in rural healthcare settings. *Economics & Business Journal: Inquiries & Perspectives*, *2*(1), 71–85.
- Gümüşeli, A. İ. (1994). *Izmir ilkogretim okullari yoneticilerinin ogretmenler ile aralarındaki catismalari yonetme bicimleri*. PhD Thesis, Ankara University, Ankara. Institute of Social Science, Turkey.
- Kanten, P., Yesiltas, M., & Arslan, R. (2015). Kişiliğin karanlık yönünün üretkenlik karsiti is davranislarina etkisinde psikolojik sozlesmenin duzenleyici rolu. *Ataturk Universitesi IIBF Dergisi*, *29*(2), 365–391.
- Karcioglu, F., & Aliogullari, Z. D. (2012). Catismanin nedenleri ve catisma yonetim tarzları iliskisi. *Ataturk Universitesi IIBF Dergisi*, *26*(3–4), 215–237.
- Karip, E. (1999). *Catisma Yonetimi*. Ankara: PegemA Yayıncılık. isbn:975-6802-03-0.
- Kessler, S. R., Bruursema, K., Rodopman, B., & Spector, P. E. (2013). Leadership, interpersonal conflict, and counterproductive work behavior: An examination of the stressor–strain process. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, *6*(3), 180–190. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ncmr.12009>.
- Kocel, T. (2013). *İsletme yoneticiligi (Yonetim ve organizasyon, organizasyonlarda davranis, klasik-modern-cagdas ve guncel yaklasimlar)*. Istanbul: Beta Yayınevi. isbn: 978-605-377-573-3.
- Meyer, S. (2004). Organizational response to conflict: Future conflict and work outcomes. *Social Work Research*, *28*(3), 183–190.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- O'Brien, R. M. (2007). A caution regarding rules of thumb for variance inflation factors. *Quality and Quantity*, *41*(5), 673–690. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-006-9018-6>.
- Ohbuchi, K. I., & Kitanaka, T. (1991). Effectiveness of power strategies in interpersonal conflict among Japanese students. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *131*(6), 791–805. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0022454.1991.9924666>.
- Pelled, L. H., Eisenhardt, K. M., & Xin, K. R. (1999). Exploring the black box: An analysis of work group diversity, conflict and performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *44*(1), 1–28.
- Pruitt, D. G., & Carnevale, P. J. (1993). *Negotiation in social conflict*. Europe, Middle East and Africa: Thomson Brooks/Cole Publishing. isbn:0-335-09865-7.
- Rahim, M. A. (2002). Toward a theory of managing organizational conflict. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, *13*(3), 206–235. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb022874>.
- Rahim, M. A., & Buntzman, G. F. (1989). Supervisory power bases, styles of handling conflict with subordinates, and subordinate compliance and satisfaction. *The Journal of Psychology*, *123*(2), 195–210. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.1989.10542976>.
- Rahim, M. A., & Magner, N. R. (1995). Confirmatory factor analysis of the styles of handling interpersonal conflict: First-order factor model and its invariance across groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *80*(1), 122–132. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.80.1.122>.

- Rahim, M. A., Magner, N. R., & Shapiro, D. L. (2000). Do justice perceptions influence styles of handling conflict with supervisors?: What justice perceptions, precisely? *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 11(1), 9–31. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb022833>.
- Riggio, R. E. (2003). *Introduction to industrial/organizational psychology*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall. isbn:978-1429242295.
- Robbins, S. P. (1978). “Conflict management” and “conflict resolution” are not synonymous terms. *California Management Review*, 21(2), 67–75. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41164809>.
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(2), 555–572. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256693>.
- Simsek, M. S., Akgemci, T., & Celik, A. (1998). *Davranis bilimlerine giris ve orgutlerde davranis*. Ankara: Nobel Yayin Dagitim. isbn:975-591-034-4.
- Song, X. M., Xie, J., & Dyer, B. (2000). Antecedents and consequences of marketing managers’ conflict-handling behaviors. *Journal of Marketing*, 64(1), 50–66. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.64.1.50.17989>.
- Sotile, W. M., & Sotile, M. O. (1999). How to shape positive relationships in medical practices and hospitals. (part 1: Conflict management). *Physician Executive*, 25(4), 57–61.
- Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002). An emotion-centered model of voluntary work behavior: Some parallels between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12(2), 269–292. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822\(02\)00049-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(02)00049-9).
- Tjosvold, D., & Chia, L. C. (1989). Conflict between managers and workers: The role of cooperation and competition. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 129(2), 235–247. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1989.9711724>.
- Weider-Hatfield, D., & Hatfield, J. D. (1996). Superiors’ conflict management strategies and subordinate outcomes. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 10(2), 189–208. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318996010002003>.