

Conflict Management in Interpersonal Communication

*Gohar Harutyunyan, Susanna Baldryan
Yerevan State University*

If we stop for a moment and look around we will see diversity in age, race, gender, nationality, religion, personality, education, skills, communication style, ability and disability, goals and interests, values and beliefs, to name only a few. On a daily basis we constantly interact with other people. However, interactions are not neutral. While some reinforce social support, others can create conflict, and with respect to all the factors that distinguish us from one another, we are not likely to be successful in life without having a few conflicts with others. Moreover, the potential of being engaged in conflict situation is present whenever two people relate to each other. Thus, the question of conflict and conflict management has become very actual.

No doubt, peace is desirable, but conflict is a natural and inevitable part of our life. It can arise between friends, within our families, at work, on national or international levels.

So far there has been not a single view on how this term should be defined. There exist a significant number of definitions depending on from what perspective this or that scholar considers it. Generally speaking on the basis of most definitions lies the idea, that “conflict is two or more competing responses to a single event, or differences between and among individuals, or mutual hostility between and among groups, or a problem to be solved.” (Lulofs, Cahn 2000:3).

Throughout the development of conflict studies scientists have attempted to come up with a general classification of conflict. For instance, conflicts may be classified on the basis of their sources, antecedent conditions or organizational levels they originate from (Rahim 2011). However, the traditional classification of conflict is the one based on the level of its origin and thus four main conflict types are distinguished (2011:22):

Intrapersonal – a conflict that an individual experiences within himself or herself.

Interpersonal – a conflict experienced between two or more individuals.

Intragroup – conflicts among members of a group, between subordinates and superiors, or between two or more subgroups within a group.

Intergroup – a conflict between two or more groups.

It is important to understand and acknowledge the type of conflict we are engaged in, because different types of conflicts require different methods of management. Since the field of study of conflict is broad, in this article we will narrow down our scope of inquiry and concentrate chiefly on interpersonal conflicts and particularly on conflicts in the so-called “intimate relationships”. An intimate relationship is perhaps the most important type of interpersonal relationships for us. The reason is that they involve higher level of attachment, commitment or affection.

Researchers have spent years studying conflict that can occur within a romantic relationship and more specifically the reasons why these conflicts occur. The potential topics of conflict between relational partners are virtually infinite. These can include issues related to jealousy, sex, trust, betrayal, household chores, finances and the like.

Given the emotional aspect of this relationships conflict takes a different meaning or value in close relationships. Relationship between the conflict participants affects the way they perceive, respond and most importantly manage a conflict.

The traditional five-style model of conflict management was suggested by K.W. Thomas, and R.H. Kilmann. The model is based on two dimensions (Rout; Omiko 2007):

- **assertiveness** – the extent to which an individual is willing to satisfy his or her own needs and concerns,
- **cooperativeness** – the extent to which the individual is prone to satisfy others' needs and concerns.

The five conflict management styles are: *avoidance, collaboration, accommodation, competition and compromise* (Rout; Omiko 2007:83).

As the name implies, avoidance is a preference for not addressing conflict at all. Individuals prefer to stay away from the conflict by keeping the disagreements to themselves or refusing to acknowledge their existence. However, avoidance is not always effective, because it does not lead to a resolution of the conflict. Conflicts need to be resolved; otherwise they can heat up and grow into a larger problem. Avoidance is mainly appropriate when the conflict issue is trivial (Wilmot; Hocker 2010).

Collaboration requires both assertiveness and cooperativeness. It can produce a resolution that fully satisfies all parties. The individuals have personal interests, but also respect those of others'. It can generate new ideas, as the parties will collaborate and confront the conflict until they find a mutually satisfying resolution to the problem. Collaboration is the most difficult style to achieve, yet it affirms the importance of the relationship.

Accommodation is one of the most common conflict handling styles. It is an unassertive, but definitely a cooperative conflict handling style, since the individuals strive to preserve the relational harmony. Sometimes the accommodator may not be aware that he or she is employing it. However, it is not completely positive. This style is productive when the issue is more important to one party than the other or if harmony in the relationship is the most important goal. No doubt, this can help to minimize losses. Nevertheless, the disadvantage of this style is that accommodation is, in effect, a lose-win strategy.

As for the competition, the style indicates high concern for self and low concern for others. It involves participants who refuse to acknowledge the needs and wishes of the other party. People using this style are highly uncooperative; they try to gain power by direct confrontation. This type of conflict management affects the relationship quality; as it creates a kind of emotional and psychological tension in the relationship.

Compromise involves both a degree of assertiveness and a degree of cooperativeness. Individuals involved give up something and make concessions in an attempt to find a solution that partially satisfies both of the parties.

None of these strategies is wrong to use, but there are right and wrong times to use each. Individuals select different conflict management styles depending on the type of interpersonal conflict they are engaged in and on the intensity of the conflict. It is not

conflict that endangers relationships, rather the way in which it is managed.

As we study conflicts in romantic relationships, which normally includes relationships between a male and a female, it is also important to pay attention to gender differences in conflict situations. Some scholars consider that gender differences in conflicts are sometimes exaggerated. While others support the idea that “men and women have biologically different brains that create startlingly different behaviour” (Lulofs, Cahn 2000:48).

One of the primary views is that gender differences in conflict interaction are in charge of the communication differences tradition. The point is that men and women in general have different styles of communication and therefore they respond to conflict in different ways. Namely, women tend to be concerned with the emotional aspect of the relationship. In conflict women talk more about their feelings and concerns. Women usually have the “listening” role rather than “lecturing”. Women are better at expressing themselves non-verbally. Men are more likely to be dominant in conversation, take control of it and lead in the direction they want.

Gender also affects conflict handling mechanisms. Men and women in intimate relationships tend to favour different conflict management styles. Women learn how to prevent conflict and try to avoid conflict situations, but when in conflict they are more confrontative, while men are more avoidant, they are more likely to withdraw from conflict when women try to talk about the problem.

Conflict and conflict management styles are also highly sensitive to culture. Different cultures have different attitudes towards conflicts and different conflict management preferences. In conflict situations cultural background does influence its process and outcome. When people engage in conflict, they bring to the encounter not only their personalities, but also their cultural identities.

The present article therefore aims to compare conflict management style preferences of American and Armenian cultures based on the cultural dimension of individualism vs. collectivism. This pair of dimensions is considered to be the major dimension of cultural variability that best displays differences in conflict negotiation process. Even though no culture can be described as exclusively individualistic or collectivistic, still, each culture tends to be more disposed to either of them. Hofstede’s study (2001), conducted across 40 countries, brought him to the conclusion that American culture is highly individualistic. Considerable research has been devoted to the study of cultures of West, Middle East and Asia. To our regret, all of them have sidestepped Armenian culture. In this connection, for Armenian culture, we are guided by the general assumption that it incorporates more collectivistic values. Our hypothesis is accounted for by historic, more precisely social and political developments, since individual values are considered to be strongly influenced by sociopolitical systems. For over 70 years of period Armenia has been a part of the Soviet Union. Surveys conducted by Umpleby in 1985 (Shafiro, Himelein, Best 2003) suggested that it belonged to collectivistic cultures. The collapse of the Soviet Union did not fundamentally change our collectivistic mentality, its evidences still can be found in different aspects of our culture.

It is also striking to observe that in Armenian there is no one-to-one equivalent for the

English word “privacy”, which is an underlying component of individualism. In the English-Armenian dictionary by H. Asmangulian and M. Hovhannisian for the word privacy we can find such Armenian words as «մենութիւն», «մեկուսացվածութիւն» (1991:731), however they do not fully express the essence, the real meaning of that concept. Besides, in Armenian those words have a negative connotation, being associated more with loneliness or isolation.

Thus, in accordance with these, we consider Armenia to be mainly a collectivistic culture.

In collectivistic cultures there is a high value for relationships. People dislike assertiveness, disagreements or conflicts, which disrupt the social harmony. Collectivists show high concern for the other party. Hence collectivism is usually associated with cooperation. However, this does not mean that people more frequently use collaborating style of conflict management. Individuals from collectivistic cultures are more likely to use avoiding or accommodating styles to manage conflicts, since they are primarily concerned for maintaining their relationship. Competing style is more preferred by the representatives of individualistic cultures. Individuals are likely to value their own perspective, placing their own goals above those of others’.

To see how the theories about individualistic and collectivistic cultures and their culturally specific ways of perceiving and responding to conflicts work in practice, let us consider examples of interpersonal conflict from American and Armenian films¹.

A conflict situation from the film “Why did I Get Married, too?” will serve as an example of American conflict management style.

Lawyer 1: All the bank accounts divided down the middle, we’re showing that between investments, savings, IRA retirements and 401Ks. You two will be splitting \$970000.

Patricia: Yeah, that sounds about right. Yeah,

Gavin: Don’t forget about the other account,

Lawyer 2: Gavin was telling me that there was another account that’s not listed here. It has about \$800000 in it.

Patricia: Yeah, that’s the money from my book,

Lawyer 2: That’s not included?

Lawyer 1: We’re not offering that.

Gavin: Well, I didn’t know that.

Patricia: But why would I Gavin?

Gavin: It’s ours.

Patricia: Ours? Gavin, that’s the money I made from my book sales, why would I include that in the settlement?

Gavin: It’s what we built together. Patricia,

Patricia: We?

Gavin: We

Patricia: “We”? What page did you write, Gavin? What boot tour lecture were you on?

Gavin: Patricia, how many nights did I stay up all nights listening to you and your ideas and giving you some of mine?
 Patricia: Yeah, but, Gavin, I didn't use not one of your ideas.
 Gavin: Yes, you have. You always do, I've always been your case study.
 Patricia: Are you serious?
 Gavin: Are you serious?
 Patricia: All right, Gavin, let's be reasonable about this. It's my money. I earned it. So, can we move on, please?
 Gavin: No, we're not just gonna move on. Okay? You wanna be reasonable? (To the lawyer) You include that.
 Patricia: Are you really trying to do this?
 Gavin: Absolutely.
 Patricia: All right, fine
 Lawyer 1: (to Patricia) - So, you wanna include it?
 Patricia: No, I'm not including it, Dianne.
 Gavin: No?
 Patricia: You know what? Gavin? This ain't about the money. This is about greed. Your greed.
 Gavin: You're right. Yeah.
 Patricia: Thank you.
 Gavin: I should be greedy, 'cause I've been starving in this relationship.

(“Why did I Get Married too?”², 2010)

After years of marriage Gavin and Patricia decide to divorce. The conflict arises when the couple divides their joint property. Patricia is a psychologist and an author of a profitable book. Gavin and Patricia have different views on Patricia's book and the money made on it. Gavin demands the income to be divided, while Patricia is against it. In the given situation both of the partners use competition as a conflict handling strategy. Verbal aggression and insults, which are typical of competing style, are also present. Being representatives of individualistic cultural heritage they put the focus on the “self”, they emphasize their success or achievements - Patricia mentions that the book is only her achievement, attained through her hard work, self-reliance and self-determination. Her sense of individualism is too high to let her acknowledge her husband's help. It is striking to observe that they don't avoid open confrontation; they easily voice their opinions and their indignation. Both Patricia and Gavin strive to fulfill their own goal, even at the expense of their relationship. For them their inner harmony is more important than the relational harmony. This conflict is more about self-assertion and individualization than money or greed.

Let us consider another example from the film “The Break-Up”.

Brooke: I'm going to do the dishes.
 Gary: Cool.

Brooke: *It'd be nice if you helped me.*
 Gary: *(playing a video game) No problem. I'll get them a little bit later. I'm just gonna hit the streets here for a little bit.*
 Brooke: *Gary, come on, I don't want to do them later. Let's just do them now. It'll take 15 minutes.*
 Gary: *(lying on the sofa) Honey, I am so exhausted. I just honestly want to relax for a little bit. (sighs) If I could just sit here, let my food digest, and just try to enjoy the quiet for a little bit. [...] And well... You know, we can clean the dishes tomorrow.*
 Brooke: *(frowns and talks in reproaching tone walking in the room) Gary, you know I don't like waking up to a dirty kitchen.*
 Gary: *Who cares?*
 Brooke: *(getting irritated) I care! All right? I care! I busted my ass all day cleaning this house and then cooking that meal. And I worked today. It would be nice if you said thank you and helped me with the dishes.*
 Gary: *(looking annoyed and reluctant) Fine. (gets up) I'll help you do the damn dishes.*

(“The Break-Up”³, 2006)

Here we have a conflict between a married couple – Gary and Brooke concerning household chores. Brooke wants her husband to help her with the dishes, while Gary tries to shirk it in every possible way. But as Brooke continues standing on her ground and the situation gets heated he finally adopts an accommodating style – setting aside his priorities and preferences. On the one hand accommodation style is productive in this situation as the issue is more important to Brooke than to Gary and it may resolve conflict faster. On the other hand, it is not completely positive. The drawback is that Gary sacrifices his own interests and wishes in order to maintain smooth relationships. Moreover, taking into account his non-verbal cues, which show his dissatisfaction and resentment, we can say that it is actually a seeming resolution and the negative aspect here is that later on, in case of unfavourable conditions, it can transform into something more serious or complicated.

Here is an example from the Armenian film «Ռշինչ չի մնա».

Arsen: *(addressing his wife) Է՞ղ չի ձեր ընտանիքը: Դեյվիդ և Էլիս: Նրանց ընդհանուր հասկանիչներն են՝ պորտաբուծություն, հուլուժյուն և արուլիս: Գիտե՞ս ինչ ա նշանակում արուլիս: Ասա՛... Չորս տարի ա ամուսնացած եմ քո հետ, վերջը գրա քո խկական անունը: (Elisa frowns) Է՛յ, դո՛ւ, արուլիս ես, բլբուլիս ես...*

Elisa: *(speaking in a low voice) Ես հիմա կգժվեմ:*

Arsen: *(shouting) Չեւ էլ գժվում, գոնե մի բան արած կլինես: Հա, բայց ես քեզ հլը չեմ ասել ինչ ա նշանակում արուլիս, հլը մի բուլե: Միս՛, խնդրե՛մ: (he takes the dictionary and looks it up) «Հունական «ա» ժխական մասնիկից և «բուլե» կամք բառից՝ «կամազրկուր»*

յուն, փոքրոգություն, մտախիտ սահմանափակ ընդունակություններ»:
Ահա՛ իմ կիներ, չեք առջև «Տիկին Արուլիան» է:
(Elisa continues working quietly)

(«Ոչինչ չի մնա»⁴, 2008)

This is a marital conflict between Arsen and Elisa. The conflict is actually quite inane and senseless. The initiator is the husband – Arsen, who also escalates it by deviating from the actual topic, insulting Elisa and her family members. In spite of this she prefers to keep quiet and not confront the conflict, she feels less confident with the situation. Elisa does not voice her resentment; instead, she expresses it non-verbally – by means of facial expression. In this particular example the culture also plays a certain role. Avoidance can also be interpreted as lack of power. Being a masculine⁵ culture, it is expected of Armenian women to be obedient to their husbands and avoid any conflict or disagreement. Usually in man-woman relationships women are not encouraged to express their objections and protests. The wife's avoidance of conflict is a determinant factor. In fact, it is a classic example of a destructive conflict. The conflict might not be so destructive if the parties involved dealt with it appropriately.

The example discussed below considers conflict handled by another management style. The example is from an Armenian film «Անմեղ մեղավորները».

Mike: Շատ պարզ հարց ա: Չորջը քո ի՞նչն ա:

Mariam: Ընկերս ա: (sarcastically) Կարծեմ քո ընկերն էլ ա, չ՞է:

Mike: Իսկ քո դուրը կգա՞ր, որ ես ընկերուի ունենայի:

Mariam: Ինչի չունե՞ս:

Mike: Ու՞մ ունեմ:

Mariam: Դե ստենք Էնջին...

Mike: Էնջին ընկերոջս քուրն ա, Մարիամ: Էդ լրիվ տարբեր քաներ են:

Mariam: Դե Չորջն էլ ընկերոջս ընկերն ա: Ի՞նչ տարբերություն:

Mike: (shouting at her) Մե՛ծ տարբերություն: Չորջը տղայա, դու՛ աղջիկ:

Mariam: Հեղո՞:

Mike: Ես քեզ վաքշե չեմ հասկանում:

Mariam: Ես դա վաղուց եմ նկատել, բայց էդ քո պրոբլեմն ա:

Mike: (shouting in a threatening tone) Չափերդ անցնում ես, աղջի՛կ:

Mariam: (stands-still for a minute and then speaks in a scolding tone)

Ուզում եմ հիշեցնել Պարոն Հակոբյան, որ դու իմ սեփականատերեր չես: Ու ոչ էլ ես քո խաղալիքն եմ, որ երբ ուզես, ոնց ուզես իմ վրա գոռաս: Պարզ ա՞:

Mike: (still shouting) Ուրեմն մի նեռվայնացրա...

Mariam: (speaks angrily with raised voice) Ու ընդհանրապես, ես ոչ մեկին իրավունք չեմ տվել իմ հետ քեզ քոնով խոսա: (gets up and leaves)

(«Անմեղ մեղավորները»⁶, 2012)

We have a conflict between a dating couple - Mike and Mariam. In this case both of the conflicting sides have adopted a competing strategy and adhere to it, as none of them wants to give in. Mike is guided by jealousy and hence he is not able to judge the situation reasonably. Instead, he escalates the situation by his stubbornness. Mariam, in her turn, is confident in her innocence in the situation and does not want to give in, even for smoothing over the conflict for the sake of their relationship. They act highly uncooperatively and aggressively. These types of conflicts affect the relationship quality. In this situation conflict creates a kind of emotional and psychological tension in the relationship. This can be noticed in Mariam's speech, as she addresses Mike with «Պարոն Հակոբյան» (Mr. Hakobyan) rather than with his first name. The formal address implies a distance in the relationship. In fact it is the most destructive conflict management style.

As the theory suggests the resolution to this conflict cannot be considered typical of collectivistic cultures.

Our observations have shown some deviations from the theory. People usually act according to their cultural values, but cultural values do not predict individual behaviour all the time. No doubt, the impact of cultural differences in conflict situations is significant in both positive and negative ways, but we cannot consider it as an unequivocal factor for predicting the process and the outcome of conflicts. In such situations the role of personality traits of an individual cannot be underestimated.

Another important achievement of this article concerns conflict perception and conflict management in Armenian culture. Most of the research concerning conflict management styles was originated in the West, with regard to American culture or popular European cultures, leaving out Armenian culture. For this purpose, a research was conducted with the aim to find out how Armenians view conflict, what they associate it with, what more probably can cause a conflict, what their preferred styles of dealing with conflict are and how prone they are to admit their guilt.

Responses from a total of 200 participants, all of Armenian nationality (without age or gender limitation), were included in the analysis. The participants completed a questionnaire consisting of 15 questions altogether. After providing demographic information they answered questions about conflict and their own experiences with it.

It is important to mention that some of the results were quite unexpected. For instance, 16.5% of all respondents considered themselves contentious, while the majority mentioned that they prefer not to get involved in conflicts. Even though the number of people who feel comfortable with conflicts greatly yields to that of those who don't, it was still surprising for us to get affirmative answers in such quantity, taking into account Armenians' cultural membership to collectivistic cultures, where harmony between individuals or group members is an essential part of life. That's why it is not surprising that most of the respondents have mainly negative connotations about conflict, viewing it mainly as destructive.

Armenian culture can be characterized by the fear of disagreement and a preference for repression of any situation or behaviour that can threaten the relationship or disrupt the normal pace of life. For Armenians public opinion holds an important place and living according to social norms and public morals is a natural phenomenon. Accordingly,

any deviation from accepted norms, including a conflict, is considered negative and undesirable.

It is interesting to mention that irrespective of age and gender factors, many of the participants have the same associations with the concept of conflict, as they have chosen the same words for describing it. The majority of the respondents often associated it with *chaos, problem, quarrel, tension, hostility, clash, raised voices, crying, headache, fighting, stress, mutual insults, intolerance, negative emotions*. The fact that people describe conflict using negative terms indicates that it is what they usually experience. Only a few of the respondents described it in neutral terms and even fewer in positive terms. Thus, we can say that conflict is viewed more as a problem which is beyond our control, than as an opportunity.

The causes and motives of interpersonal conflicts among Armenians are numerous; however, some of them appear to be more frequent and serious than the others. According to the data collected, the top of the hierarchy includes lies, injustice, misunderstandings, misbehaviour, disagreements on various issues, abuse, insults, false accusations, aggression, distrust and others. As it can be seen, these are conflicts regarding specific actions or behaviours. Most of them, in fact, are self-oriented.

Unlike the representatives of collectivistic cultures, Armenians showed a stronger preference for collaborative style of conflict management. Collaboration is a problem-solving approach. This is a more direct and confrontational style, which requires a great amount of self-confidence. Even though collaboration is not the most typical conflict management style for individualistic cultures, still it is more characteristic of individualistic cultures than collectivistic ones.

This contradicted our initial hypothesis, since we expected a greater inclination towards the avoiding or accommodating style, given by the fact that they are more characteristic of collectivistic cultures. Meanwhile the latter were the least preferred options among the respondents.

It is rather interesting to note that 63% of the participants agreed that all conflicts are resolvable. The high index points to the fact that the individuals are open for discussions, they have the willingness to collaborate and solve the problem, which is also important for individualistic cultures.

Another important point is that not all of the respondents are disposed to admit their guilt in conflict situations. This can also be accounted for by the presence of individualistic qualities, where the individual's goals and dignity are more important than peace in the relationship and it is not that easy to give in. Besides, according to the data collected, qualities such as pride and dignity may prevent them from falling back on someone's help. However, this question is a bit controversial, as it can also be interpreted from another angle – showing the collectivist nature of Armenian nation. Turning to someone for help or attending mediation sessions can be viewed as a tacit admission that a dispute exists. Given their view of conflict as a natural phenomenon, individualists generally are able to acknowledge conflict and participate in mediation without experiencing shame. For collectivists, however, even a tacit acknowledgement of conflict can cause loss of face.

The findings have revealed that although the theory and the discussed examples indicate that Armenian culture is closer to collectivistic cultures our research results are quite different. The similarities of Armenian culture with individualistic cultures in terms of approaches to conflict and conflict management styles outweighed our expectations. As research shows, Armenians are mostly engaged in characteristically “individualistic way” of resolving conflicts.

Previously Armenian culture has been classified as collectivistic. However, because of political and economic changes, alterations in our values and mentality, we can observe a switch from a collectivistic culture to an individualistic one. Thus, it may well be concluded that conceptualization of the Armenian culture as purely collectivistic may be oversimplified. Armenian culture may be viewed as a mixture of both collectivistic and individualistic values.

Notes:

1. All the examples discussed in this article are taken from American and Armenian modern feature films, owing to the fact that speech in films differs in its expressive-emotional-evaluative overtones. It is closer to everyday conversations, the actions and emotions are more expressive. Four movies are chosen as context of study: “Anmegh Meghavornery” (2012); “Vochinch chi mna” (2008); “Why did I Get Married too?” (2010); The “Break-Up” (2012).
2. Four couples find themselves struggling to save their marriages once again on their annual marriage retreat, while each of them battle through financial, physical, mental, and emotional issues.
3. A once-loving Chicago couple finds their romance complicated when both parties refuse to move out of the pair’s recently purchased an apartment. Their confrontation is endlessly fueled by mean-spirited suggestions of revenge tactics from friends and family and their stubbornness. As the competition to drive one another out grows increasingly intense and outrageous, Brooke eventually realizes that she is not fighting for possession of the apartment as much as she is fighting to salvage her relationship with the man she once viewed as the love of her life.
4. Arsen and Elisa have been married for 4 years. Arsen is a journalist, while Elisa is a housewife. Before the marriage Elisa moved from the USA to live in Armenia. They rent a flat together with Narek – Arsen’s friend. Everything changes after the arrival of Elisa’s best friend – Helen. Helen betrays their friendship, destroys their family and starts going out with Arsen.
5. Masculinity-femininity is a pair of cultural dimensions proposed by Hofstede (2001). It refers to the division of emotional roles between men and women. A masculine society expects men to be aggressive, competitive, ambitious, and to strive for material success while women care for children, the weak, and strive for a nonmaterial quality of life.
6. Real stories taken from life: love, hatred, luxury and difficulties overcoming of which

becomes a lifestyle on the other side of the ocean. Human characters that change because of some situations in this life or accommodate themselves to the demands of life.

References:

1. Canary, D.; Cupach, W.; Messman, S. (1995) *Relationship Conflict: Conflict in Parent-Child, Friendship and Romantic Relationships*. California: SAGE.
2. Hofstede, G. (2001) *Culture's Consequences*. California: SAGE Publications.
3. Lulofs, R.; Cahn, D. (2000) *Conflict from Theory to Action*. Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.
4. Rahim, M. (2011) *Managing Conflict in Organization*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
5. Rout, E.; Omiko, N. (2007) *Corporate Conflict Management. Concepts and Skills*. New Delhi: PHI learning Pvt: Ltd.
6. Shafiro, M.; Himelein, M.; Best, D. (2003) *Ukrainian and U.S. American Females: Differences in Individualism/Collectivism and Gender Attitudes*. / *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*. Vol. 34. N. 3, 297-303. California: Sage Publications.
7. Wilmot, W.; Hocker, J. (2010) *Interpersonal Conflict*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
8. (1991) *English-Armenian Dictionary*. Yerevan.

Միջանձնյա կոնֆլիկտի հաղթահարումը (մշակութային մոտեցում)

Մույն հոդվածում քննության են առնվում միջանձնյա կոնֆլիկտների արտահայտման և դրանց հաղթահարման մարտավարությունների տարբերությունները այնպիսի միմյանցից տարբեր մշակույթներում, ինչպիսիք են ամերիկյանը և հայկականը: Հոդվածի շրջանակներում նաև փորձ է արվում հարցման միջոցով դիտարկել տվյալ երևույթի դերն ու նշանակությունը հայկական մշակույթում: