



Conflict resolution strategies and their effects on organizational growth and productivity in Nigerian service firms: An empirical discourse

Dr. Onyeledo Ijeoma Peace¹, Dr. Olachi Chuks Ronnie²

¹ Department of Human Resource Management, Charisma University, Montana State, USA

² Department of Business Administration and Management, Charisma University, Montana State, USA

Abstract

Conflict is inevitable in service organizations because of task interdependence, customer expectations, workload pressures, role ambiguity and competition for organizational resources. This study examined the effects of conflict resolution strategies on organizational growth and productivity in Nigerian service firms, with particular attention to employee satisfaction, team cohesion and innovation climate as organizational process mechanisms. Anchored on the Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode framework and the Resource-Based View, the study adopted a quantitative cross-sectional design and analysed 210 observations from HR managers, supervisors and team leads in banking, telecommunications, hospitality, healthcare and logistics firms located in Lagos, Abuja, Port Harcourt, Kano and Enugu. Conflict resolution was operationalized through collaborating, compromising, avoiding, competing and accommodating strategies. PLS-SEM results showed that collaboration significantly predicted organizational growth ($\beta=.42$, $t=6.87$, $p<.001$, $f^2=.21$), while compromise also had a positive effect ($\beta=.28$, $t=4.31$, $p<.001$, $f^2=.09$). Avoidance ($\beta=-.35$, $t=5.92$, $p<.001$, $f^2=.15$) and competition ($\beta=-.22$, $t=3.84$, $p<.001$, $f^2=.06$) negatively predicted productivity. Organizational growth and productivity recorded R^2 values of .48 and .51 respectively, with Q^2 values of .42 and .45. PROCESS mediation results indicated significant indirect effects through team cohesion, employee satisfaction and innovation climate, while sector significantly conditioned selected strategy-outcome relationships. The study concludes that constructive conflict management is an organizational capability associated with stronger human processes, growth and productivity. Managers should institutionalize collaborative problem-solving, strengthen conflict-management competencies and adapt interventions to sector conditions.

Keywords: Conflict resolution strategies, organizational growth, productivity, employee satisfaction, team cohesion, service firms, Nigeria

Introduction

Conflict is a persistent feature of organizational life because employees and organizational units differ in goals, values, professional identities, information, authority, resource requirements and preferred methods of accomplishing work. Contemporary organizations increasingly rely on interdependent teams, knowledge sharing, cross-functional coordination and rapid decision making; these arrangements improve adaptability but also create opportunities for disagreement. In service firms, the consequences are especially important because employee interactions are closely connected with customer experience, service speed and organizational reputation. Conflict therefore cannot be treated simply as an abnormal event to be eliminated. Its organizational consequences depend substantially on its source, intensity and, particularly, the strategy used to manage it.

Recent organizational research distinguishes between destructive relationship conflict and forms of task disagreement that can contribute to learning when managed constructively. Cai and Ali (2024) ^[6] show that workplace conflict is closely connected with employee commitment and innovative behaviour, while team-effectiveness research emphasizes the importance of trust, psychological safety and constructive conflict processes. The managerial challenge is consequently not to suppress all disagreement but to prevent conflict from becoming relationally destructive and to create mechanisms through which competing interests and ideas can be processed productively.

Conflict-resolution strategies commonly include collaborating, compromising, avoiding, competing and accommodating. The Thomas-Kilmann tradition conceptualizes these modes through the dimensions of assertiveness and cooperativeness (Thomas, 1976; Kilmann & Thomas, 1977) ^[13, 18]. Collaboration reflects high concern for both one's own interests and those of others and seeks integrative, problem-solving outcomes. Compromise seeks mutually acceptable middle-ground solutions. Avoidance involves withdrawal or postponement, competition relies primarily on power or assertiveness, while accommodation gives priority to the other party's concerns. No strategy is universally appropriate, but persistent reliance on avoidance or coercive competition can allow unresolved problems, silence employee voice and weaken cooperation.

Collaboration is particularly relevant to service organizations because service delivery frequently depends on reciprocal coordination. Collaborative conflict management encourages information exchange, clarification of interests and joint solution development. It may therefore improve decision quality while preserving working relationships. Nigerian evidence increasingly associates collaborative conflict management with better work relationships, goal attainment and organizational performance. Chukwujama, Ihim, and Nwangwu (2024) ^[7], for example, reported favourable relationships between collaboration, compromise and performance outcomes in a Nigerian deposit money bank. Iyamabhor and Ubogu (2025) ^[12] similarly found positive relationships between conflict-

management strategies and employee performance in the Nigerian banking sector.

Compromise also has practical value where parties possess legitimate but incompatible interests and where a fully integrative solution is costly or time-sensitive. It may reduce the duration and operational cost of disputes by enabling reciprocal concessions. However, compromise may be less transformative than collaboration because it can settle positions without fully resolving underlying interests. The distinction matters for organizational growth: short-term settlement can restore operations, whereas collaborative learning may create stronger long-term relational and knowledge resources.

Avoidance and competition are more context dependent. Temporary avoidance may be useful when emotions are intense, the issue is trivial, or additional information is required. Competition may be appropriate during emergencies, regulatory breaches or situations requiring rapid authoritative decisions. Yet habitual avoidance can postpone unresolved disagreements and allow them to manifest through poor communication, resentment, absenteeism or service delays. Persistent competition may generate compliance without commitment and can reduce psychological safety. Nigerian studies have reported mixed but generally cautionary evidence regarding dysfunctional conflict and productivity, underscoring the need to examine individual strategies rather than treating conflict management as a single undifferentiated construct.

The present study also recognizes that conflict strategies may affect organizational outcomes through employee and team processes. Employee satisfaction represents an important attitudinal mechanism because perceptions of fairness, voice and respectful treatment shape employees' willingness to contribute. Team cohesion reflects the strength of interpersonal attachment and collective commitment within work groups. Innovation climate captures whether the work environment supports idea sharing, experimentation and constructive challenge. These mechanisms are especially relevant in knowledge-intensive and customer-facing service sectors, where growth and productivity depend on discretionary effort, coordinated problem solving and continuous adaptation.

Organizational growth in this study refers to perceived improvements in dimensions such as market expansion, revenue development and organizational expansion, while productivity captures service delivery efficiency, customer satisfaction and output-related performance. Employee retention is considered an additional outcome because unresolved conflict can impose substantial replacement and knowledge-loss costs. These outcomes are analytically distinct: a firm can increase output in the short run without creating sustainable growth, and it can grow while experiencing human-capital instability.

The Resource-Based View provides a complementary theoretical explanation. Barney (1991) ^[2] argues that sustained competitive advantage can emerge from valuable organizational resources and capabilities that are difficult to imitate or substitute. Conflict-management capability can be interpreted as such an intangible organizational capability when it is embedded in leadership routines, relational norms, employee trust and problem-solving practices. Constructive conflict resolution can preserve knowledge, relational capital and commitment, while dysfunctional conflict can erode these resources.

Nigeria's service economy provides a useful setting for this inquiry. Banking, telecommunications, hospitality, healthcare and logistics differ in regulatory intensity, technology dependence, customer contact, professional structure and workflow interdependence. These differences imply that the performance consequences of conflict strategies may not be identical across sectors. Recent Nigerian studies have examined conflict management in individual banks, public agencies and selected organizations, but much of the evidence remains organization-specific or sector-specific (Chukwujama *et al.*, 2024; Igbaji, 2025; Adeyefa *et al.*, 2025) ^[1, 7, 11].

A further gap concerns explanatory mechanisms. Many studies estimate direct relationships between conflict management and broad measures of organizational performance without examining how employee satisfaction, team cohesion or innovation climate transmit those relationships. Sectoral contingency is also underexplored. This limits understanding of why a particular strategy is associated with performance and whether its effectiveness changes across service industries.

Accordingly, this study examines conflict resolution strategies and their effects on organizational growth and productivity in Nigerian service firms. Specifically, it assesses the effects of collaboration and compromise on organizational growth; evaluates the effects of avoidance and competition on productivity; investigates employee satisfaction, team cohesion and innovation climate as organizational process mechanisms; and examines sector as a moderator of selected conflict strategy-performance relationships. By integrating the Thomas-Kilmann framework with the Resource-Based View, the study contributes a multi-sector explanation of conflict management as both a behavioural process and a strategic organizational capability.

Review of Related Literature

1. Concept of Conflict Resolution Strategies

Organizational conflict refers to perceived incompatibility in goals, interests, values, expectations or courses of action among individuals or groups. Conflict resolution concerns the behavioural and managerial processes used to address such incompatibilities. Rahim (2002, 2011) ^[15, 16] emphasizes that effective conflict management does not necessarily eliminate conflict; rather, it seeks to minimize dysfunctional conflict while maintaining forms of disagreement that can stimulate learning and adaptation.

The five-strategy framework used in this study captures collaboration, compromise, avoidance, competition and accommodation. These strategies differ in the extent to which actors pursue their own interests and cooperate with others. Their consequences depend on issue importance, power distribution, time pressure, relationship quality and organizational context.

2. Collaborating Strategy

Collaboration seeks an integrative solution that addresses the substantive concerns of all parties. It depends on open communication, information sharing and joint problem solving. Because it encourages employees to surface underlying interests rather than defend fixed positions, collaboration can improve decision quality and preserve relationships. Nigerian banking evidence has associated

collaboration with stronger work relationships and organizational outcomes (Chukwujama *et al.*, 2024)^[7].

3. Compromising Strategy

Compromise involves reciprocal concessions and the search for a mutually acceptable middle position. It is useful where parties possess comparable power or where time and resource constraints make full integration impractical. Evidence from Nigerian organizations suggests that compromise can support goal attainment and employee performance, although its effects may be smaller than those of deep collaborative problem solving.

4. Avoiding Strategy

Avoidance involves postponement, withdrawal or deliberate non-engagement with a disagreement. It can be functional where the issue is minor or where temporary disengagement prevents escalation. Persistent avoidance, however, can leave structural and interpersonal problems unresolved and can undermine communication, employee satisfaction and service delivery.

5. Competing Strategy

Competition or forcing emphasizes assertiveness and the use of authority to secure a preferred outcome. It may be necessary in emergencies or matters involving compliance, but repeated use can suppress employee voice and generate resistance. In customer-facing service environments, excessive power-based conflict management may impair coordination and discretionary effort.

6. Accommodating Strategy

Accommodation reflects a willingness to yield to another party in order to preserve harmony or address an issue that is more important to the other party. It can protect relationships, but excessive accommodation may prevent legitimate concerns from being addressed and may not independently generate organizational growth.

7. Employee Satisfaction

Employee satisfaction captures employees' favourable evaluation of their work and organizational experience. Conflict-management processes can affect satisfaction through perceived fairness, respect, participation and resolution quality. Collaborative approaches can enhance voice and procedural justice, while unresolved conflict may reduce satisfaction and commitment.

8. Team Cohesion

Team cohesion reflects interpersonal attachment, unity and commitment to collective objectives. Constructive conflict management can strengthen cohesion by enabling members to disagree without damaging relationships. Research on team effectiveness shows that conflict processes interact with trust and psychological safety in shaping team outcomes.

9. Innovation Climate

Innovation climate describes the extent to which an organization supports idea generation, experimentation and constructive challenge. Cai and Ali (2024)^[6] demonstrate the relevance of workplace conflict processes for innovative behaviour. Collaborative disagreement may broaden the

information available for problem solving, whereas relationship conflict can inhibit knowledge exchange.

10. Organizational Growth and Productivity

Organizational growth reflects expansion in organizational capacity, market reach and revenue-related outcomes. Productivity concerns the efficiency and effectiveness with which inputs are converted into service outputs. Conflict can affect both outcomes through coordination costs, decision quality, employee motivation and customer service. Nigerian empirical studies generally indicate that well-managed conflict is associated with improved performance, although findings vary by context and measurement approach.

11. Theoretical Framework

The study is anchored on the Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode framework and the Resource-Based View. The Thomas-Kilmann framework explains conflict behaviour through assertiveness and cooperativeness and provides the behavioural logic for collaboration, compromise, avoidance, competition and accommodation (Thomas, 1976; Kilmann & Thomas, 1977)^[13, 18]. The Resource-Based View explains why conflict-management capability may matter strategically: routines that preserve trust, knowledge, commitment and coordinated problem solving can constitute valuable intangible organizational resources (Barney, 1991; Barney & Clark, 2007)^[2, 4].

12. Empirical Review and Research Gap

Empirical evidence from Nigeria has increasingly linked conflict-management practices with employee and organizational performance. Chukwujama *et al.* (2024)^[7] reported positive relationships between collaboration, compromise and organizational outcomes in First Bank, Awka. Iyamabor and Ubogu (2025)^[12] reported significant positive relationships between conflict-management strategies and employee performance in the banking sector. Igbaji (2025)^[11] found significant relationships between several conflict-management strategies and productivity at Ecobank in Cross River State. Adeyefa *et al.* (2025)^[1] similarly examined conflict-management strategies and employee performance in the Nigerian public sector. Other studies indicate that the relationship is not uniformly positive. Ndubuisi and Oko (2023)^[14] reported evidence suggesting that conflict-management-performance relationships may vary with context, while studies of workplace conflict in Nigerian banking emphasize the productivity costs of dysfunctional conflict. This mixed evidence supports strategy-specific and context-sensitive analysis.

Four gaps motivate the present study. First, much Nigerian research is based on a single organization or industry, limiting cross-sector comparison. Second, many studies emphasize direct effects without testing employee satisfaction, team cohesion and innovation climate as intervening organizational processes. Third, organizational growth, productivity and retention are often combined into broad performance indices rather than treated as distinct outcomes. Fourth, sector moderation is rarely examined. The present multi-sector study addresses these gaps.

13. Hypotheses

H1: Collaborating and compromising strategies have significant positive effects on organizational growth.

H2: Avoiding and competing strategies have significant negative effects on productivity.

H3: Employee satisfaction and team cohesion mediate the relationship between conflict resolution strategies and organizational growth.

H4: Sector type moderates the effect of conflict resolution on productivity.

Methodology

1. Research Design

The study adopted a quantitative cross-sectional survey design. The design was appropriate for examining relationships among conflict resolution strategies, organizational process variables and organizational outcomes at a defined point in time. The analytical framework estimated direct, indirect and conditional relationships using PLS-SEM and regression-based PROCESS analysis.

2. Study Area

The study covered service firms located in Lagos, Abuja, Port Harcourt, Kano and Enugu. The sectors represented were banking, telecommunications, hospitality, healthcare and logistics. These locations and sectors provide variation in regulatory conditions, technology intensity, customer contact and organizational structure.

3. Population and Sample

The analytical sample comprised 210 usable observations from HR managers, supervisors and team leads in the selected service sectors. Because the supplied analytical dataset does not contain the original sampling frame or recruitment records, the 210 cases are treated as the realized study sample. No unsupported claim of simple random, stratified or multistage sampling is made.

4. Instrument and Measurement

Primary data were collected through a structured questionnaire. Conflict resolution was represented by collaborating, compromising, avoiding, competing and accommodating composite scores. Employee satisfaction, team cohesion and innovation climate represented organizational process variables, while organizational growth, productivity and employee retention represented organizational outcomes. The conflict-strategy constructs were conceptually informed by the Rahim and Thomas-Kilmann conflict-management traditions.

5. Control Variables

Firm size, firm age and sector were included as organizational controls. Sector was coded as banking, telecommunications, hospitality, healthcare and logistics. Because these variables are categorical, indicator/dummy coding is required in regression models rather than treating category codes as continuous measurements.

6. Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics and correlation analysis were used for preliminary assessment. PLS-SEM was used to evaluate the structural paths, explanatory power (R^2), effect sizes (f^2) and predictive relevance (Q^2). PROCESS Model 4 with 5,000

bootstrap resamples and 95% confidence intervals was used for mediation analysis, while PROCESS Model 1 was used for moderation analysis. Statistical decisions were evaluated at the .05 significance level.

7. Reliability and Validity Consideration

The analytical dataset supplied for this paper contains aggregate construct scores rather than the original item-level responses. Consequently, Cronbach's alpha, composite reliability, AVE and HTMT cannot be independently reconstructed from the 210 aggregate rows. Any measurement-model coefficients should be retained only where they were computed from the original multi-item questionnaire responses. Single-item aggregate variables should not be presented as independently yielding conventional internal-consistency reliability statistics.

8. Ethical Considerations

Standard survey ethics require voluntary participation, informed explanation of the study purpose, confidentiality of respondents and aggregate reporting of results. No specific institutional ethical approval number is claimed because such documentation was not supplied with the analytical dataset.

9. Analytical Limitation

The cross-sectional design supports statistical association rather than definitive temporal causation. In addition, the supplied dataset contains repeated or near-repeated response profiles and unusually regular covariance patterns. Inferential statistics should therefore be interpreted cautiously and, where possible, verified against the original raw item-level dataset before final publication.

Results and Discussion

1. Structural Model Results

The structural model showed substantial explanatory power. Organizational growth recorded $R^2 = .48$, indicating that 48% of its variance was explained by the specified predictors. Productivity recorded $R^2 = .51$. Predictive relevance was also satisfactory, with $Q^2 = .42$ for organizational growth and $Q^2 = .45$ for productivity; both values exceeded zero.

Structural Path	β	t	p	f^2	Decision
Collaborating → Organizational Growth	.42	6.87	< .001	.21	Supported
Compromising → Organizational Growth	.28	4.31	< .001	.09	Supported
Avoiding → Productivity	-.35	5.92	< .001	.15	Supported
Competing → Productivity	-.22	3.84	< .001	.06	Supported
Accommodating → Organizational Growth	.11	1.92	.055	.02	Not supported

H1 was supported. Collaboration significantly and positively predicted organizational growth ($\beta = .42$, $t = 6.87$, $p < .001$, $f^2 = .21$), while compromise also had a significant positive effect ($\beta = .28$, $t = 4.31$, $p < .001$, $f^2 = .09$). The collaboration coefficient is a standardized effect and should not be interpreted as '42% higher growth.' The result indicates that collaboration had the stronger positive association with growth among the reported strategies.

H2 was also supported. Avoidance significantly and negatively predicted productivity ($\beta = -.35$, $t = 5.92$, $p < .001$, $f^2 = .15$), while competition had a smaller but significant negative effect ($\beta = -.22$, $t = 3.84$, $p < .001$, $f^2 = .06$). Accommodating did not significantly predict

organizational growth at the .05 level ($\beta = .11$, $t = 1.92$, $p = .055$, $f^2 = .02$).

2. Mediation Analysis

Indirect Path	Indirect Effect	BootLLCI	BootULCI	Decision
Collaborating → Team Cohesion → Productivity	.31	.22	.41	Significant
Collaborating → Employee Satisfaction → Organizational Growth	.24	.16	.33	Significant
Avoiding → Employee Satisfaction → Productivity	-.19	-.27	-.12	Significant
Compromising → Innovation Climate → Organizational Growth	.18	.10	.26	Significant

The bootstrap confidence intervals for all four reported indirect effects excluded zero. Team cohesion significantly mediated the collaboration-productivity relationship (indirect effect = .31, 95% CI [.22, .41]); employee satisfaction mediated collaboration-organizational growth (indirect effect = .24, 95% CI [.16, .33]); employee satisfaction transmitted a negative indirect effect from avoidance to productivity (indirect effect = -.19, 95% CI [-.27, -.12]); and innovation climate mediated compromise-organizational growth (indirect effect = .18, 95% CI [.10, .26]). These results support the broader mediation proposition. The claim that exactly 43% of the total effect is mediated should be retained only if a formal proportion-mediated calculation from the complete total and direct effects confirms it.

3. Moderation Analysis

Interaction	β	p	Decision
Collaborating × Sector → Productivity	.17	.003	Significant
Avoiding × Sector → Organizational Growth	-.21	.001	Significant

Sector significantly conditioned selected conflict strategy-outcome relationships. The Collaborating × Sector interaction was significant ($\beta = .17$, $p = .003$), while the Avoiding × Sector interaction was also significant ($\beta = -.21$, $p = .001$). Post-hoc estimates indicated that the positive collaboration effect was strongest in banking ($\beta = .51$) and telecommunications ($\beta = .48$), while avoidance showed its strongest negative associations in hospitality ($\beta = -.44$) and logistics ($\beta = -.39$). Because sector is nominal, these results should be based on dummy-coded sector categories in the final replication analysis.

4. Summary of Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis	Statistical Evidence	Decision
H1	Collaboration $\beta = .42$, $p < .001$; compromise $\beta = .28$, $p < .001$	Supported
H2	Avoidance $\beta = -.35$, $p < .001$; competition $\beta = -.22$, $p < .001$	Supported
H3	Reported bootstrap confidence intervals exclude zero	Supported
H4	Interaction $\beta = .17$, $p = .003$; $\beta = -.21$, $p = .001$	Supported

5. Discussion of Findings

The findings demonstrate that constructive and destructive conflict resolution strategies have materially different implications for Nigerian service firms. Collaboration emerged as the strongest reported positive predictor of organizational growth, with a standardized coefficient of .42 and a moderate effect size of .21. This supports the proposition that joint problem solving and integrative

dialogue can function as an organizational capability rather than merely a dispute-settlement technique.

The positive effect of compromise indicates that reciprocal concessions can also support organizational growth. However, collaboration showed a stronger relationship than compromise, suggesting that solutions which integrate the substantive interests of parties may offer greater organizational value than settlements based primarily on mutual concessions. This is consistent with Nigerian evidence from banking and other organizational settings (Chukwujama *et al.*, 2024; Iyamabhor & Ubogu, 2025) [7, 12].

The negative coefficient for avoidance is particularly important. In service organizations, unresolved conflict can affect customer-facing processes, information exchange and coordinated service delivery. The finding that avoidance was more strongly negative than competition suggests that non-resolution itself may constitute a major operational risk. Competition also reduced productivity, consistent with the argument that excessive power-based conflict management can weaken voice and commitment.

The mediation findings deepen the explanation of these direct effects. Collaboration was associated with productivity partly through team cohesion and with organizational growth partly through employee satisfaction. Compromise was associated with growth through innovation climate, while avoidance reduced productivity partly through lower employee satisfaction. These results indicate that conflict-management strategies operate through human and relational processes rather than affecting organizational outcomes in isolation.

The moderation results further indicate that conflict-management effects are not homogeneous across sectors. Banking and telecommunications displayed stronger collaboration-productivity relationships, while hospitality and logistics showed stronger adverse avoidance relationships. This supports a contingency perspective: organizations can adopt common principles of constructive conflict management, but their implementation should reflect sector-specific workflow, regulatory and customer-service conditions.

Overall, the empirical results are consistent with the Thomas-Kilmann and Resource-Based View perspectives. Constructive conflict resolution can preserve and strengthen employee satisfaction, cohesive working relationships and innovation-supporting conditions, thereby contributing to growth and productivity. The repeated response profiles in the supplied dataset nevertheless require caution; extremely strong statistical relationships should be verified against the original item-level dataset before publication.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Conclusion

This study examined conflict resolution strategies and their effects on organizational growth and productivity in Nigerian service firms. The evidence indicates that collaboration and compromise are positively associated with organizational growth, while avoidance and competition are negatively associated with productivity. Collaboration was the strongest reported positive predictor of growth, whereas avoidance showed the strongest reported negative relationship with productivity.

The findings also demonstrate the importance of organizational processes. Employee satisfaction, team cohesion and innovation climate transmitted significant indirect effects between selected conflict strategies and organizational outcomes. Sector significantly conditioned selected relationships, indicating that conflict-management effectiveness depends partly on the operational environment in which it is applied.

From the Resource-Based View, conflict-management competence can be understood as an intangible organizational capability that protects relational capital, knowledge, trust and employee commitment. The study therefore concludes that conflict management should be integrated into strategic human-resource and organizational-development systems rather than treated only as a reactive mechanism for settling disputes.

The conclusions remain subject to the cross-sectional design and the highly patterned structure of the supplied dataset. Accordingly, the results establish statistically reported associations consistent with the theoretical model but should not be interpreted as definitive causal effects without longitudinal and independently verified data.

Recommendations

1. Service firms should institutionalize collaborative problem-solving as the preferred approach for substantive workplace disagreements and provide mechanisms for joint identification of interests and solutions.
2. Human-resource departments should train managers, supervisors and team leaders in negotiation, active listening, mediation, emotional intelligence and collaborative conflict resolution.
3. Compromise should be used strategically where full collaboration is impractical, while ensuring that recurring structural problems are not merely settled temporarily.
4. Organizations should reduce persistent avoidance by establishing accessible grievance channels, regular team dialogue, confidential reporting and early mediation procedures.
5. Excessive use of forcing or competitive approaches should be limited to situations where authority, emergency response, compliance or ethical requirements make decisive action necessary.
6. Employee satisfaction and team cohesion should be incorporated into post-conflict evaluation so that management assesses not only whether a dispute ended but whether productive working relationships were restored.
7. Organizations should cultivate innovation climates in which employees can challenge ideas respectfully and

raise alternative solutions without interpersonal retaliation.

8. Conflict-management systems should be adapted to sector conditions, particularly the regulatory and coordination requirements of banking and telecommunications and the customer-facing pressures of hospitality and logistics.
9. Human-resource analytics should connect conflict indicators with productivity, turnover, service time, customer complaints, absenteeism and employee-engagement measures.
10. Future research should use longitudinal designs, independently sampled respondents, item-level measurement data and objective performance indicators to validate the reported relationships.

References

1. Adeyefa P, Yomi-Daramola OM, Aina DE. Conflict management strategies and employee performance in the Nigerian public sector: An empirical study of Ondo State Water Corporation. *Journal of Economics, Management and Trade*,2025;31(4):36–50. <https://doi.org/10.9734/jemt/2025/v31i41282>
2. Barney JB. Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*,1991;17(1):99–120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108>
3. Barney JB. Resource-based theories of competitive advantage: A ten-year retrospective on the resource-based view. *Journal of Management*,2001;27(6):643–650.
4. Barney JB, Clark DN. *Resource-based theory: Creating and sustaining competitive advantage*. Oxford University Press, 2007.
5. Barney JB, Wright M, Ketchen DJ, Jr. The resource-based view of the firm: Ten years after 1991. *Journal of Management*,2001;27(6):625–641. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630102700601>
6. Cai X, Ali A. Navigating workplace conflicts and fostering innovative behaviors: The role of job commitment and socio-instrumental ESM utilization. *BMC Psychology*,2024;12:587. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-024-02089-7>
7. Chukwujama NC, Ihim MC, Nwangwu JC. Conflict management and organisational performance of deposit money banks in Nigeria: A study of First Bank of Nigeria, Awka, Anambra State. *Journal of the Management Sciences*,2024;61(6):66–80.
8. Grant RM. The resource-based theory of competitive advantage: Implications for strategy formulation. *California Management Review*,1991;33(3):114–135. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41166664>
9. Hair JF, Jr, Hult GTM, Ringle CM, Sarstedt M. *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)*. 3rd ed. SAGE Publications, 2022.
10. Hayes AF. *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*. 3rd ed. Guilford Press, 2022.
11. Igbaji PM. Conflict management strategies and organizational productivity of Ecobank Plc, Cross River State, Nigeria. *Frontiers in Management Science*, 2025, 4(5). <https://doi.org/10.63593/FMS.2788-8592.2025.09.007>

12. Iyamabhor MI, Ubogu GT. Conflict management strategies and employee performance in the banking sector of Nigeria. *DOU Journal of Management Sciences*,2025;1(1):191–202.
13. Kilmann RH, Thomas KW. Developing a forced-choice measure of conflict-handling behavior: The MODE instrument. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*,1977;37(2):309–325.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447703700204>
14. Ndubuisi UM, Oko AEN. Assessment on the effects of effective conflict management on productivity in private sector organizations in Abia State, Nigeria. *Jalingo Journal of Social and Management Sciences*, 2023, 4(4).
15. Rahim MA. Toward a theory of managing organizational conflict. *The International Journal of Conflict Management*,2002;13(3):206–235.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/eb022874>
16. Rahim MA. *Managing conflict in organizations*. 4th ed. Transaction Publishers, 2011.
17. Salami CGE, Ososukpor F. Conflict management and organizational performance in Nigeria. *International Journal of Research in Social Science and Humanities*, 2022, 3(10).
<https://doi.org/10.47505/IJRSS.2022.V3.10.1>
18. Thomas KW. Conflict and conflict management. In: Dunnette MD, editor. *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. Rand McNally, 1976, 889–935.
19. Thomas KW, Kilmann RH. *Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument*. Xicom, 1974.
20. Tunji IC, Joseph OC. Effect of dispute resolution strategies on employee performance in the Nigerian banking industry. *International Research Journal of Management, IT and Social Sciences*, 2022, 9(6).
<https://doi.org/10.21744/irjmis.v9n6>, 2213