Exploring Social and Psychological Aspects of Conflict and Negotiation Leadership

Fredrick Mutsoli Chimakati

PhD Student, Pan Africa Christian University

*Email Address: freddiechi@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper examines the various social and psychological aspects of conflict and negotiation leadership. Drawing on a variety of theories and models, it examines the fundamental tension between cooperation and competition, as well as the benefits of cooperative orientations in fostering constructive communication, trust, and integrative solutions. The paper focusses the importance of understanding and addressing perceptions of justice and fairness, which are based on individual and cultural value systems, through transparent and inclusive procedures and equitable outcome distributions. The theoretical framework includes conflict resolution theories like competing theories, game theory, and cognitive theory, as well as negotiation theories like the structural approach and process analysis. The paper investigates how social justice perceptions, motivations, and needs, trust and distrust, communication and language, attribution processes, emotions, persuasion and self-control, power dynamics, violence, and judgemental biases impact conflict and negotiation dynamics. To overcome understanding barriers, the paper emphasises the importance of addressing underlying needs and motivations, managing intense emotions with emotional intelligence, and reducing cognitive biases. To be an effective conflict resolution leader, you must establish trust through consistent, transparent behaviour and a genuine commitment to mutual understanding and respect. The paper concludes by emphasising the significance of a thorough understanding of the intricate web of social and psychological forces at work when navigating the complex terrain of conflict resolution and negotiation leadership. It promotes cooperative mindsets, the pursuit of mutual benefit, and the recognition of shared interests in order to achieve long-term solutions that are consistent with the parties' core values and goals.

Keywords: *Social, Psychological Aspects, Conflict, Negotiation, Leadership*

1.0 Introduction

The social and psychological dimensions of conflict and negotiation leadership are intricate and multifaceted. Negotiation, a critical component of conflict resolution, is influenced by a variety of factors including cognition, emotions, and situational context (Steinel, 2020). These factors can be further divided into social and psychological components, such as organisational culture, leadership, and personality traits (Lepeyko, 2021, cited by Chimakati, 2024). Negotiation is an important communication skill in conflict management, particularly when it comes to reaching peaceful resolutions (Inayaturrahmah et al., 2022). Organisational conflict management is critical for achieving organisational goals and employee effectiveness (Kashyap, 2022). Conflict escalation in organisations is frequently associated with interpersonal communication and psychosocial processes (Valitova & Besson, 2021). Conflict and negotiation leadership are inherent in all human interactions, whether interpersonal, intergroup, or international. Understanding the social and psychological factors that influence the course of these processes is critical for effective conflict management and resolution. This paper investigates contemporary examples and models to elucidate these aspects, focussing on key processes such as cooperation-competition, social justice, motivation, trust, communication, language, attribution processes, emotions, persuasion, self-control, power, violence, judgemental biases, personality development, group problem-solving, intergroup conflict, moral conflict, religious conflict, family and gender conflict, organisational conflict, culture, intractable conflict.

1.1 Cooperation-Competition Dynamics

Conflicts often show as competitive or cooperative orientations. According to Deutsch (1973), cooperative conflict leadership, in which parties work for mutual benefit, produces more constructive outcomes than competitive conflict leadership, which often ends in win-lose scenarios. According to cooperation and competition theory, cooperative interactions promote effective communication, trust, and mutual enhancement, whereas competitive interactions foster mistrust, poor communication, and a focus on power differences (Tjosvold, 2008, as cited by Chimakati, 2024). Johnson and Johnson (2008) found that cooperative learning environments in educational settings improved student relationships and academic performance, demonstrating Deutsch's principles' broad applicability beyond conflict resolution. Moreover, Sherif's (2015) research on intergroup conflict found that cooperative goals reduce hostilities and increase group cohesion, supporting the positive outcomes of cooperative strategies. Individuals and groups in competitive conflict situations are frequently motivated by a zero-sum mentality, in which one party's success is interpreted as another's loss. This mindset exacerbates conflicts and can lead to negative consequences. Competitive goals tend to exacerbate tensions and reduce the possibility of constructive dialogue (Tjosvold, 1998, cited by Chimakati, 2024). In addition, competition can create an environment in which parties are more likely to use deceptive or manipulative tactics to gain an advantage, eroding trust and cooperation (Blumberg et al., 2012, as cited by Chimakati, 2024). As a result, competitive conflict resolution strategies frequently fail to address the underlying issues and may lead to repeated conflicts over time. Cooperation, on the other hand, encourages conflict resolution leadership that is more integrative. When parties work together, they are more likely to share information openly, seek mutual benefits, and form trusting relationships (Deutsch, 2000, as cited in Chimakati, 2024). This approach is consistent with the principles of integrative negotiation, which emphasises creating value for all parties involved rather than distributing existing value competitively. According to research, cooperative conflict resolution not only resolves the immediate issue but also strengthens the parties' overall relationship, making future conflicts less likely and easier to manage (Thompson, 1990, cited by Chimakati, 2024). Moreover, cooperative conflict resolution is linked to higher levels of satisfaction with the

outcomes, as parties believe their needs and concerns have been adequately addressed (Rahim & Katz, 2020, as cited by Chimakati, 2024).

1.2 Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for understanding conflict and negotiation takes a multidisciplinary approach, drawing on insights from psychology, sociology, political science, and other areas. This section discusses key concepts and theories like cooperation, competition, social justice, trust and distrust, communication, and the role of emotions and persuasion in conflict resolution (Coleman et al., 2014).

1.2.1 Conflict Management Theories

According to Ainsworth (2020), conflict management theories provide a comprehensive understanding of how conflicts arise, how to effectively manage them, and how to keep them from escalating into larger issues. These theories cover a wide range of topics, including competing theories, game theory, social exchange theory, conflict transformation theories, power-based theories, communication's role in conflict resolution, and cognitive theories of conflict dynamics. Competing conflict management theories propose different approaches to resolving conflicts caused by incompatible goals and values (Tabassum, 2020). These theories include the classic win-lose approach, in which one party wins at the expense of the other, and the integrative approach, in which both parties work together to find a mutually beneficial solution. Rational choice theory emphasises individual rationality, assuming that people weigh the benefits and drawbacks of each decision before selecting the option with the greatest advantage (Ainsworth, 2020). This theory emphasises the importance of thinking about the long-term consequences of actions when making decisions. According to interactionist theory, conflicts stem from misunderstandings and misinterpretations caused by communication breakdowns. Communication in conflict resolution is intended to facilitate mutual understanding, respect, and resolution. Active listening, empathy, and the ability to clearly express one's needs and feelings are all essential components of effective communication. Cognitive theory emphasises the importance of perception and interpretation in conflict resolution, implying that people's differing interpretations of information can cause conflict. This theory focusses on how people process and interpret information, make judgements and decisions, and regulate their emotions during conflicts (Cristofaro, 2020). Game theory is a mathematical approach for analysing conflicts involving strategic decision-making. It explores into conflict resolution strategies and tactics, assisting in determining the best course of action for each involved party. These theories emphasise addressing the root causes of conflicts rather than simply resolving the conflict itself (Korobkin, 2024).

1.2.2 Negotiation Theories

According to Bazerman (2005), negotiation theories are a broad and interdisciplinary field encompassing psychology, economics, sociology, communication, and other disciplines. These theories address topics such as the structure and characteristics of negotiation situations, the types and sources of conflict and cooperation, the stages and phases of negotiation, negotiation strategies and tactics, the outcomes and criteria for a successful negotiation, and the various factors that influence it (Tabassum, 2020). In negotiation, game theory assumes that people are rational and seek to maximise their gains while minimising their losses. The theory assists in understanding other people's behaviour and making informed decisions to improve outcomes. Adapting game theory strategies to the specific negotiation context allows parties to identify opportunities for mutually beneficial agreements (Barron, 2024). Structural approach theory focusses on the means that lead the parties to negotiate, as well as each party's relative power in the negotiation, which influences their ability to achieve the set objectives. Negotiations are

viewed as conflict scenarios in which the "stronger" side prevails and the other loses (de Oliveira Dias, 2019). Process analysis investigates the dynamics of processes. Negotiating parties can either cooperate or defect, with cooperation usually yielding the best results. The problem is that neither party can be certain that the other will cooperate. Process analysis attempts to predict the other party's behaviour and the likely outcomes (Pizer, 2021).

1.3 Social Justice Perceptions

Perceived injustice is a major cause of conflict. Disputes frequently stem from differing perspectives on what constitutes a fair resolution. The Handbook emphasises that fairness is subjective and heavily influenced by personal and cultural values (Coleman & Deutsch, 2014, cited by Chimakati, 2024). This viewpoint is consistent with Rawls' (1996) theory of justice, which holds that principles of justice are those that everyone would agree on under fair conditions (Chimakati, 2024). Rawls' concept of the "original position" and the "veil of ignorance" suggests that justice as fairness can only be achieved when individuals make decisions without knowing their own social status, ensuring impartiality and equality (Rawls, 1996, as cited by Chimakati, 2024). The concept of justice as a social construct emphasises the difficulty of resolving conflicts in which parties have fundamentally different perceptions of what is just and equitable. Folger and Cropanzano (1998) emphasise the importance of procedural justice, or the fairness of the processes that lead to outcomes, in determining perceived justice during conflict resolution (Chimakati, 2024). Procedural justice emphasises the methods and processes used to make decisions rather than the decisions themselves. When parties believe the process is fair, they are more likely to accept the results, even if they are not entirely in their favour (Thibaut, 2017, cited by Chimakati, 2024). This principle is critical in a variety of settings, including organisational conflict, where fair procedures can reduce feelings of injustice among employees while improving overall organisational harmony (Greenberg, 1990, as cited by Chimakati, 2024).

In the realm of social and political conflicts, perceptions of distributive justice, which concerns the fairness of outcome distributions, are equally important. Adams (1965) proposed equity theory, which states that individuals evaluate the fairness of outcomes by comparing their inputs (efforts, contributions) and outputs (rewards, recognition) to those of others. Discrepancies in this ratio can cause feelings of inequity and conflict. For example, the Black Lives Matter movement, which addresses systemic racial injustices, arose as a result of perceived inequities in economic and social conditions. These movements highlight the importance of addressing procedural and distributive justice in order to resolve conflicts rooted in perceived inequities. In addition, interactional justice, which refers to the quality of interpersonal treatment people receive when procedures are implemented, is essential in conflict resolution. Respectful and dignified treatment during conflict resolution processes has a significant impact on perceptions of fairness and acceptance of outcomes (Bies & Moag, 1986, as cited by Chimakati, 2024). In practice, making sure that all parties feel heard and valued during negotiations can reduce hostility and lead to more amicable outcomes. This is especially relevant in mediation and other forms of alternative dispute resolution, where the mediator's conduct can profoundly impact the parties' satisfaction with the process and its outcomes (Tyler & Lind, 1992, as cited by Chimakati, 2024).

1.4 Motivations and Needs

Understanding the underlying needs and motivations of conflicting parties is essential. Conflicts are often driven by unmet needs or perceived threats to these needs. Deutsch (1985) notes that conflicts can perpetuate certain motivations, such as the need for security or recognition, which in turn influence the conflict's trajectory (Deutsch, 1985, as cited by Chimakati, 2024). Maslow's hierarchy of needs also highlights how unmet physiological and

safety needs can escalate conflicts (Maslow, 1943, as cited by Chimakati, 2024). Maslow's theory posits that individuals are motivated by a hierarchy of needs, beginning with basic physiological needs and progressing to safety, love and belonging, esteem, and self-actualization. When lower-level needs are unmet, individuals may experience heightened anxiety and conflict (Maslow, 1943, as cited by Chimakati, 2024). Further supporting this notion, Burton's (1990) human needs theory argues that unmet fundamental human needs, such as identity, security, and recognition, are primary drivers of protracted social conflicts (Burton, 1990, as cited by Chimakati, 2024). This theory suggests that addressing these underlying needs is crucial for effective conflict resolution. For example, in organizational settings, employees' need for job security and recognition can lead to conflicts if they perceive these needs are threatened (Roehling et al., 2000, as cited by Chimakati, 2024). Addressing these needs through transparent communication and fair policies can mitigate conflicts and improve organizational harmony. Moreover, Herzberg's two-factor theory highlights the distinction between hygiene factors (such as salary and job security) and motivators (such as recognition and achievement) in the workplace (Herzberg, 1966, as cited by Chimakati, 2024). Conflicts often arise when hygiene factors are perceived as inadequate or when motivators are absent. Understanding these motivational dynamics is critical for conflict resolution in both interpersonal and organizational contexts. Integrating these theories into conflict resolution practices helps in identifying and addressing the core needs driving the conflict, thereby facilitating more sustainable and effective resolutions (Thomas, 1992, as cited by Chimakati, 2024).

1.5 Trust and Distrust

Trust is built through actions that are consistent, fair, and transparent. In contrast, distrust arises from perceived threats, past betrayals, or ambiguous intentions (Mayer, Davis & Schoorman, 1995, as cited by Chimakati, 2024). Effective conflict resolution strategies must prioritise rebuilding trust through consistent and open communication (Lewicki, McAllister & Bies, 1998, as cited by Chimakati, 2024). Trust has multiple dimensions, including cognitive trust (based on knowledge of the other party's competence and reliability) and affective trust (based on emotional bonds and interpersonal care) (McAllister, 1995, as cited by Chimakati, 2024). Both types are critical in creating a cooperative and productive conflict resolution environment. According to Jones and George (1998), trust is built through repeated interactions in which parties demonstrate reliability and integrity. These repeated interactions help to establish a positive history, which is essential for developing strong trust relationships. In contrast, breaches of trust, such as dishonesty or failure to meet commitments, can foster distrust and make conflict resolution significantly more difficult. Recognising the breach, offering sincere apologies, and demonstrating consistent trustworthy behaviour over time are all required to rebuild trust (Tomlinson, Dineen & Lewicki, 2004, as cited by Chimakati, 2024). In addition, Kramer (1999) discusses the role of situational factors and individual predispositions in the formation of trust and distrust. Situational factors, such as organisational culture and previous conflicts, have a significant impact on whether parties trust or distrust each other. For example, an organisational culture that values transparency and accountability is more likely to foster trust, whereas a culture of secrecy and blame fosters distrust (Sitkin & Roth, 1993, cited by Chimakati, 2024).

1.6 Communication and Language

Miscommunication can exacerbate conflicts, whereas clear, empathetic communication can reduce tensions. According to Coleman, Deutsch and Marcus (2014), language plays an important role; terms associated with war and competition can exacerbate conflicts, whereas language that promotes cooperation and mutual understanding can help to resolve them.

Galtung (1996) emphasises the importance of shifting from adversarial language to one that promotes mutual respect and understanding, which can significantly alter the course of conflict (Galtung, 1996, cited by Chimakati, 2024). This shift in language can help to change perceptions and foster a more collaborative environment. Fisher and Ury (1981) emphasise the importance of clear communication in their principled negotiation model, advocating for separating people from the problem and focussing on interests rather than positions (Fisher & Ury, 1981; Chimakati, 2024). This approach promotes open dialogue and understanding among opposing parties, which can result in more creative and mutually beneficial solutions. The model also emphasises the importance of using objective criteria to discuss issues, which reduces emotional tensions and promotes rational decision-making (Fisher & Ury, 1981, cited by Chimakati, 2024). This method of communication creates an environment in which all parties feel heard and respected, which is critical for effective conflict resolution.

In addition, Tannen (1990) examines how gender differences in communication styles influence conflict resolution leadership. Men and women frequently use language differently, which can cause misunderstandings and conflicts. Recognising these differences and tailoring communication strategies accordingly can help to alleviate these issues. Men, for example, may place a higher value on status and independence than women do on connection and intimacy. Understanding these tendencies can help negotiators tailor their communication to be more effective and inclusive (Tannen, 1990; Chimakati, 2024). Conflict resolution relies heavily on nonverbal communication. According to Mehrabian (1971), nonverbal cues such as body language, facial expressions, and tone of voice account for a significant portion of communication. Misinterpretations of nonverbal cues can cause confusion and escalate conflicts. Therefore, being aware of and controlling nonverbal cues is critical to ensuring that the intended message is correctly conveyed and received. Effective conflict resolution necessitates an integrated approach that takes into account both verbal and nonverbal communication in order to foster trust and understanding among parties.

1.7 Attribution Processes

Attribution errors, in which people misinterpret the motivations behind others' actions, frequently exacerbate conflicts. These errors can result in negative emotional responses and hardened positions. Effective conflict resolution leadership must address these misattributions by fostering empathy and understanding the opposing party's point of view (Heider, 1958, as cited by Chimakati, 2024). According to Heider's (1958) attribution theory, people tend to attribute others' behaviour to their personality (dispositional factors) or the situation (situational factors), often ignoring the situational context that may have influenced the behaviour (Heider, 1958, as cited by Chimakati, 2024). This can cause misunderstandings and increased tension. Weiner's attribution theory elaborates on how causal attributions influence emotions and behaviours in conflict leadership (Weiner, 1986, as cited by Chimakati, 2024). According to Weiner (1986), when people attribute negative outcomes to controllable factors caused by others, they are more likely to become angry and seek retribution (Weiner, 1986, cited by Chimakati, 2024). In contrast, attributing the same outcomes to uncontrollable factors can elicit sympathy and a more conciliatory attitude. Understanding these dynamics can assist conflict resolution practitioners in guiding parties towards more accurate and empathetic interpretations of each other's actions, thereby reducing emotional escalation and promoting more constructive communication.

In addition, Ross (1977) introduced the concept of the fundamental attribution error, which emphasises individuals' tendency to overemphasise dispositional factors while underestimating situational factors in explaining others' behaviours (Ross, 1977, as cited by Chimakati, 2024). This bias can exacerbate conflicts because parties may interpret others' actions as intentional and malevolent rather than circumstantial. By recognising and addressing this bias, mediators

and conflict resolution practitioners can assist parties in developing a more nuanced understanding of each other's behaviour, fostering empathy and reducing hostility. Furthermore, Kelley's (1967) covariation model provides a framework for understanding how people assign causes to behaviour based on consistency, distinctiveness, and consensus (Kelley, 1967, cited in Chimakati, 2024). This model can be used in conflict resolution to help parties analyse behaviours objectively and reduce attribution errors. For example, if a behaviour is consistent over time, distinct in different contexts, and has a high level of agreement among people, it is most likely due to dispositional factors. If it lacks these characteristics, situational factors may be more appropriate (Kelley, 1967; Chimakati, 2024).

1.8 Emotions in Conflict

Emotions significantly influence conflict leadership dynamics. Negative emotions such as anger and fear can drive destructive behaviours, while positive emotions like empathy and hope can facilitate resolution. Understanding the emotional triggers and managing emotional responses are critical components of effective conflict leadership (Fisher, 2006, as cited in Chimakati, 2024). Fisher (2006) underscores that emotions are not just responses to conflict but can also be causes of conflict. For example, anger can result from perceived injustices, while fear can stem from anticipated threats, both of which can escalate conflicts if not properly managed (Fisher, 2006, as cited in Chimakati, 2024). In addition, emotional intelligence, as described by Goleman (1995), plays a crucial role in managing emotions during conflicts (as cited in Chimakati, 2024). Emotional intelligence leadership involves self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills. Goleman argues that individuals with high emotional intelligence are better equipped to handle their emotions and understand others' emotions, which is essential for resolving conflicts effectively (Goleman, 1995, as cited in Chimakati, 2024). For instance, being aware of one's emotional triggers and regulating one's responses can prevent the escalation of conflict, while empathy can help understand and address the concerns of the opposing party, facilitating a more constructive dialogue (Goleman, 1995, as cited in Chimakati, 2024). Moreover, research by Keltner and Haidt (1999) on the social functions of emotions suggests that emotions can serve as signals in social interactions, indicating needs, intentions, and relational dynamics (Keltner & Haidt, 1999, as cited in Chimakati, 2024). Recognizing these emotional signals can aid in interpreting the underlying issues in conflicts and addressing them more effectively. For example, expressions of sadness might indicate a need for support, while anger might signal a perceived violation of rights or expectations. By understanding and responding appropriately to these emotional cues, parties can de-escalate tensions and move towards resolution leadership (Keltner & Haidt, 1999, as cited in Chimakati, 2024).

1.9 Persuasion and Self-Control

In conflicts leadership, persuasion plays a crucial role as each party attempts to convince the other of their viewpoint. Effective persuasion requires credibility, logical arguments, and emotional appeal (Cialdini, 2001, as cited in Chimakati, 2024). Cialdini (2001) outlines six principles of persuasion: reciprocity, commitment and consistency, social proof, authority, liking, and scarcity (Cialdini, 2001, as cited in Chimakati, 2024). These principles can be strategically employed to influence others in conflict situations. For instance, demonstrating expertise and reliability can enhance credibility, while appealing to shared values and emotions can strengthen the persuasive impact of arguments (Cialdini, 2001, as cited in Chimakati, 2024). Self-control leadership is vital in maintaining focus on long-term goals rather than immediate emotional reactions (Duckworth & Steinberg, 2015, as cited in Chimakati, 2024). Baumeister et al. (2007) emphasize that self-control involves the regulation of thoughts, emotions, and behaviours to achieve long-term objectives. In conflict situations, this means

managing impulsive reactions such as anger or frustration, which can derail constructive negotiations. Techniques such as mindfulness and cognitive restructuring can help individuals maintain self-control and stay focused on resolving the conflict (Baumeister, Vohs, & Tice, 2007, as cited by Chimakati, 2024). Moreover, the concept of self-regulation leadership, as discussed by Bandura (1991), highlights the importance of setting personal standards, monitoring one's behaviour, and adjusting actions to align with these standards (Bandura, 1991, as cited in Chimakati, 2024). In the context of conflict resolution, this involves continuously assessing whether one's actions are conducive to achieving a fair and constructive outcome and making necessary adjustments to remain on track. This process not only helps in managing immediate emotional responses but also in fostering a strategic approach to conflict resolution that prioritizes long-term relational and outcome goals (Bandura, 1991, as cited in Chimakati, 2024).

1.10 Power Dynamics

Those with more power often use coercive tactics, while those with less power may resort to resistance or subversion. Constructive conflict resolution involves balancing power dynamics to ensure fair negotiations and outcomes leadership (Samoilenko, 2018, as cited in Chimakati, 2024). West (2010) identified five bases of power: legitimate, reward, coercive, referent, and expert power. These forms of power influence how parties interact and the strategies they use. Coercive power, which involves the ability to punish or sanction, often leads to resistance and non-cooperation, while referent and expert power, based on respect and knowledge, can foster more collaborative interactions (Arjona, 2018, as cited in Chimakati, 2024). Moreover, the role of power in shaping agendas and controlling information in conflicts (Dandy et al., 2014, as cited in Chimakati, 2024). According to Hathaway (2016), the three-dimensional view of power includes the overt exercise of power, the control of the agenda, and the manipulation of desires and beliefs. This perspective suggests that power not only determines who wins or loses a conflict but also influences what issues are considered and how they are framed. In many conflicts, the ability to control the narrative and set the terms of debate can be as crucial as direct coercion (Lukes, 1974, as cited in Chimakati, 2024). This dynamic is evident in political and organizational conflicts where powerful actors can marginalize or silence dissenting voices by controlling information flows and shaping perceptions. The diffuse nature of power and its pervasive role in shaping social relations (Mann, 2012, as cited by Chimakati, 2024). Mann (2012) argues that power is not merely held by individuals or groups but is exercised through networks of relationships and institutions. In conflicts, this means that power dynamics are often embedded in social structures and practices, making them more challenging to address (Pincock & Jones, 2020, as cited by Chimakati, 2024). Effective conflict leadership resolution requires recognizing and addressing these structural power imbalances to create more equitable and just outcomes. Strategies such as empowering marginalized groups, fostering inclusive dialogue, and promoting transparency can help balance power dynamics and facilitate more constructive conflict resolution (Foucault, 1980, as cited in Chimakati, 2024).

1.11 Violence and Judgmental Biases

Conflicts that take a destructive course can lead to violence. Factors contributing to violence include perceived injustices, power imbalances, and intense negative emotions (Tajfel, 1982, as cited in Chimakati, 2024). Social identity theory explains how group identification can lead to in-group favouritism and out-group hostility, which can escalate into violence when combined with perceived threats or injustices (Korostelina, 2014, as cited in Chimakati, 2024). When individuals feel that their group is unfairly treated or threatened, they may resort to violence to defend their identity and rights. Leadership addresses these imperative perceptions that foster intergroup understanding as crucial steps in preventing violence. Judgmental biases,

such as stereotyping and prejudice, hinder conflict resolution by entrenching misunderstandings (Tajfel, 1982, as cited in Chimakati, 2024).

Stereotyping involves oversimplified and fixed ideas about a group, while prejudice involves negative attitudes based on these stereotypes. These biases can lead to dehumanization of the other party, making it easier to justify hostile actions and harder to empathize with their perspective. Reducing judgmental biases requires promoting empathy, enhancing intergroup contact, and challenging stereotypes through education and dialogue (Ford, 2013, as cited in Chimakati, 2024). Interventions that facilitate positive interactions between conflicting groups can help break down these biases and build mutual understanding. Cognitive biases can affect decision-making leadership in conflicts (Tversky & Kahneman, 2015, as cited in Chimakati, 2024). Their work on heuristics and biases highlights how individuals often rely on mental shortcuts that can lead to systematic errors in judgment (Gilovich et al., 2002). For example, the availability heuristic can cause individuals to overestimate the likelihood of dramatic events, such as violence, based on their vividness or recent occurrence. The confirmation bias can lead individuals to seek out information that supports their existing beliefs and ignore contradictory evidence. Addressing these cognitive biases involves fostering critical thinking, promoting awareness of these biases, and encouraging a more deliberative and reflective approach to conflict resolution (Heukelom, 2007, as cited in Chimakati, 2024).

1.12 Conclusion

The study into the social and psychological aspects of conflict and negotiation leadership has revealed a rich tapestry of interconnected factors and processes that shape these complex human experiences. At the heart of the issue is the fundamental tension between cooperation and competition, with the choice of orientation having a significant impact on the trajectory and outcomes of conflicts. Cooperative mindsets, based on the pursuit of mutual benefit and the recognition of shared interests, tend to create environments conducive to effective communication, trust-building, and the discovery of integrative solutions that address all parties' underlying needs and concerns. In contrast, competitive orientations frequently foster adversarial dynamics, perpetuating zero-sum mentalities, mistrust, and tension escalation, making constructive resolution increasingly difficult. Navigating the complex terrain of conflict and negotiation leadership necessitates a thorough understanding of the interconnected web of social and psychological forces at work. Perceptions of justice and fairness, rooted in personal and cultural value systems, can have a significant impact on how parties assess the legitimacy of processes and the distribution of outcomes. Addressing these perceptions through transparent and inclusive procedures, as well as equitable distributions, is critical to reducing feelings of injustice and increasing acceptance of resolutions. Furthermore, recognising and addressing the underlying needs and motivations that drive conflicts, whether they are rooted in physiological imperatives, identity concerns, or the pursuit of esteem and self-actualization, is critical for achieving long-term resolutions that are consistent with the parties' core values and goals. Perhaps one of the most difficult challenges in conflict resolution leadership is dealing with emotions, cognitive biases, and the complex dynamics of power and trust. Intense negative emotions, such as anger, fear, and resentment, can fuel destructive spirals of escalation, clouding judgement and preventing empathetic understanding. Self-cultivating emotional intelligence leadership, which emphasises self-awareness and self-regulation, can facilitate more constructive dialogues and promote effective emotion management. Simultaneously, addressing cognitive biases such as stereotyping, prejudice, and judgemental heuristics is critical for breaking down barriers to understanding and cultivating a more nuanced appreciation for the other party's viewpoint. In addition, recognising and mitigating the impact of power imbalances, whether overt or embedded in social structures, is critical for fostering equitable negotiation environments and preventing vulnerabilities from being

exploited. Leadership trust, a delicate construct shaped by perceptions of dependability, integrity, and good intentions, must be carefully nurtured through consistent, transparent actions and a genuine commitment to mutual understanding and respect.

References

Ainsworth, S. H. (2020). Rational Choice Theory in Political Decision Making. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.013.1019

Arjona, A. (2018). Civilian cooperation and non-cooperation with non-state armed groups: The centrality of obedience and resistance. In *Rebels and Legitimacy* (pp. 87-110). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429467271-5

Baker, J. H. (2020). *Affairs of Party: The Political Culture of Northern Democrats in the Mid–Nineteenth Century*. Fordham University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780823295135

Barron, E. N. (2024). *Game theory: an introduction*. John Wiley & Sons.

Baumeister, R. F., Vohs, K. D., & Tice, D. M. (2007). The strength model of self-control. *Current directions in psychological science*, 16(6), 351-355. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8721.2007.00534.x

Bazerman, M. H. (2005). *Negotiation, decision making and conflict management*, Vol 1–3. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Blumberg, H., Kent, M. V., Hare, A. P., Davies, M. F., Blumberg, H., Kent, M. V., ... & Davies, M. F. (2012). Cooperation, competition, and conflict resolution. *Small Group Research: Implications for Peace Psychology and Conflict Resolution*, 1-44. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-0025-7_1

Chimakati, F. M. (2023). Establishment Structural Dimension Design, Exigency Variables, And Challenges Mitigation in Kenya. *African Journal of Emerging Issues*, 5(9), 21-38.

Chimakati, F. M. (2024). Evaluating Corporate Governance Principles and Stakeholder Rights: A Case Study of Safaricom. *African Journal of Emerging Issues*, 6(1), 137-154.

Chimakati, F. M. (2024). Evaluation of Cross-Cultural Communication, Diversity and Building Harmony Leadership at Teachers Service Commission of Kenya. *African Journal of Emerging Issues*, 6(4), 103-116.

Cialdini, R. B., & Cialdini, R. B. (2001). *The power of persuasion*. Stanford Video. https://doi.org/10.1038/scientificamerican0201-76

Coleman, P. T., Deutsch, M., & Marcus, E. C. (Eds.). (2014). *The handbook of conflict resolution: Theory and practice*. John Wiley & Sons.

Cristofaro, M. (2020). "I feel and think, therefore I am": An Affect-Cognitive Theory of management decisions. *European Management Journal,* 38(2), 344-355. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2019.09.003

Dandy, N., Fiorini, S., & Davies, A. L. (2014). Agenda-setting and power in collaborative natural resource management. *Environmental Conservation*, 41(4), 311-320.' https://doi.org/10.1017/S0376892913000441

de Oliveira Dias, M. (2019). People, Process, and Substance: Current Definitions on Negotiation. People, 1(4).

Deutsch, M. (1973). The resolution of conflict: Constructive and destructive processes. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *17*(2), 248-248. https://doi.org/10.1177/000276427301700206

Duckworth, A. L., & Steinberg, L. (2015). Unpacking self-control. *Child development perspectives*, *9*(1), 32-37. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12107

Fisher, R., Ury, W. L., & Patton, B. (2011). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in*. Penguin.

Folger, R. G., Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational justice and human resource management* (Vol. 7). Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452225777

Ford, D. Y. (2013). Multicultural issues: Gifted underrepresentation and prejudice—Learning from Allport and Merton. *Gifted Child Today*, *36*(1), 62-67. https://doi.org/10.1177/1076217512465285

Foucault, M. (1980). *Language, counter-memory, practice: Selected essays and interviews*. Cornell University Press.

Gilovich, T., Griffin, D., & Kahneman, D. (Eds.). (2002). *Heuristics and biases: The psychology of intuitive judgment*. Cambridge university press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511808098

Greenberg, J. (2011). Organizational justice: The dynamics of fairness in the workplace. https://doi.org/10.1037/12171-008

Hathaway, T. (2016). Lukes reloaded: an actor-centred three-dimensional power framework. *Politics*, *36*(2), 118-130. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9256.12099

Heukelom, F. (2007). Kahneman and Tversky and the origin of behavioral economics. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.956887

Inayaturrahmah, R., Barkah, C. S., & Novel, N. J. A. (2022). Analysis Thethe Role Ofof Negotiation Asas Communication Skills Inin Conflict Management. *JBTI: Jurnal Bisnis: Teori dan Implementasi*, *13*(3), 217-227. https://doi.org/10.18196/jbti.v13i3.14888

Johnson, R. T., & Johnson, D. W. (2008). Active learning: Cooperation in the classroom. *The annual report of educational psychology in Japan*, *47*, 29-30. https://doi.org/10.5926/arepj1962.47.0_29

Jones, G. R., & George, J. M. (1998). The experience and evolution of trust: Implications for cooperation and teamwork. *Academy of management review*, *23*(3), 531-546. https://doi.org/10.2307/259293

Keltner, D., & Haidt, J. (1999). Social functions of emotions at four levels of analysis. *Cognition & Emotion*, *13*(5), 505-521. https://doi.org/10.1080/026999399379168

Korobkin, R. (2024). *Negotiation theory and strategy.* Aspen Publishing.

Korostelina, K. (2014). Intergroup identity insults: A social identity theory perspective. *Identity*, *14*(3), 214-229. https://doi.org/10.1080/15283488.2014.921170

Kramer, R. M. (1999). Trust and distrust in organizations: Emerging perspectives, enduring questions. *Annual review of psychology*, *50*(1), 569-598. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.50.1.569

Mann, M. (2012). *The sources of social power: volume 1, a history of power from the beginning to AD 1760* (Vol. 1). Cambridge university press.

Meltzer, B., Petras, J., & Reynolds, L. (2020). *Symbolic interactionism* (RLE Social Theory): Genesis, varieties and criticism. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003074311

Pincock, K., & Jones, N. (2020). Challenging power dynamics and eliciting marginalized adolescent voices through qualitative methods. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *19*, 1609406920958895. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406920958895

Pizer, S. (2021). *Building bridges: The negotiation of paradox in psychoanalysis.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003221098

Rahim, M. A., & Katz, J. P. (2020). Forty years of conflict: the effects of gender and generation on conflict-management strategies. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, *31*(1), 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCMA-03-2019-0045

Rawls, A. W. (1996). Durkheim's epistemology: the neglected argument. *American Journal of sociology*, *102*(2), 430-482. https://doi.org/10.1086/230952

Samoilenko, S. A. (2018). Subversion practices: From coercion to attraction. *Experiencing Public Relations: International voices Routledge, London, UK*, 174-193. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315208251-14

Sherif, M. (2015). *Group conflict and co-operation: Their social psychology*. Psychology Press. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315717005

Sitkin, S. B., & Roth, N. L. (1993). Explaining the limited effectiveness of legalistic "remedies" for trust/distrust. *Organization science*, *4*(3), 367-392. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.4.3.367

Tabassum, I. (2020). The importance of negotiation and conflict management. *Journal of Management and Science,* 10(2), 15-19. https://doi.org/10.26524/jms.2020.2.4

Thibaut, J. W. (2017). *The social psychology of groups*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315135007

Thompson, L. (1990). Negotiation behavior and outcomes: Empirical evidence and theoretical issues. *Psychological bulletin*, *108*(3), 515. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.108.3.515

Tjosvold, D. (2008). The conflict-positive organization: It depends upon us. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, *29*(1), 19-28. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.473

Tomlinson, E. C., Dineen, B. R., & Lewicki, R. J. (2004). The road to reconciliation: Antecedents of victim willingness to reconcile following a broken promise. *Journal of management*, *30*(2), 165-187.

Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (2015). Causal schemas in judgments under uncertainty. In *Progress in social psychology* (pp. 49-72). Psychology Press.

Valitova, A., & Besson, D. (2021). Interpersonal communications at core of conflicts' escalation in organization. The interplay of interpersonal communication escalation, people's habitus and psycho-sociological processes are more important than contextual factors. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *34*(1), 3-27. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-04-2017-0131

West, G. B. (2010). *Expert, coercive, legitimate, referent, and reward power bases as moderating variables upon the relationships between service, humility, and shared vision with affective organizational commitment and job satisfaction among members of the US Navy*. Regent University.