Social Psychology's Contributions to the Study of Conflict Resolution

Morton Deutsch

This essay presents an indication of the major research questions addressed in the literature of social psychology related to conflict resolution, as well as a historical perspective to see what progress has been made in this area. Highlighted at the conclusion of a section on contemporary themes in conflict studies is the author's consideration of what we know (and need to know) about conflict resolution and overcoming oppression. The author also offers an assessment of the progress thus far in the methodological, conceptual, empirical, and technological domains in the social psychological study of conflict.

The writings of three intellectual giants — Darwin, Marx, and Freud — dominated the intellectual atmosphere during social psychology's infancy. Each of these major theorists significantly influenced the writings of the early social psychologists on conflict as well as in many other areas. All three appeared — on a superficial reading — to emphasize the competitive, destructive aspects of conflict. Darwin stressed "the competitive struggle for existence" and "the survival of the fittest." He wrote (quoted in Hyman 1966: 29): "... all nature is at war, one organism with another, or with external nature. Seeing the contended face of nature, this may at first be well doubted; but reflection will inevitably prove it is too true." Marx emphasized class struggle, and as the struggle proceeds, "the whole society breaks up more and more into two great hostile camps, two great, directly antagonistic
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classes: bourgeoisie and proletariat." He ends The Communist Manifesto with a ringing call to class struggle: "The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Working men of all countries, unite." Freud's view of psychosexual development was largely that of constant struggle between the biologically rooted infantile id and the socially determined, internalized parental surrogate, the superego. As Schachtel (1959: 10) has noted:

The concepts and language used by Freud to describe the great metamorphosis from life in the womb to life in the world abounded with images of war, coercion, reluctant compromise, unwelcome necessities, imposed sacrifices, uneasy truce under pressure, enforced detours and roundabout ways to return to the original peaceful state of absence of consciousness and stimulation. . .

Thus, the intellectual atmosphere prevalent during the period when social psychology began to emerge contributed to viewing conflict from the perspective of "competitive struggle." Social conditions too — the intense competition among businesses and among nations, the devastation of World War I, the economic depression of the 1920s and 1930s, the rise of Nazism and other totalitarian systems — reinforced this perspective.

The vulgarization of Darwin's ideas in the form of "social Darwinism" provided an intellectual rationale for racism, sexism, class superiority, and war. Such ideas as "survival of the fittest," "hereditary determinism," and "stages of evolution" were eagerly misapplied to the relations between different human social groups — classes and nations as well as social races — to rationalize imperialist policies. The influence of evolutionary thinking was so strong that, as a critic suggested, it gave rise to a new imperialist beatitude: "Blessed are the strong, for they shall prey upon the weak" (Banton 1967: 48). The rich and powerful were biologically superior; they had achieved their positions as a result of natural selection. It would be against nature to interfere with the inequality and suffering of the poor and weak.

Social Darwinism and the mode of explaining behavior in terms of innate, evolutionary derived instincts were in retreat by the mid-1920s. The prestige of the empirical methods in the physical sciences, the point of view of social determinism advanced by Karl Marx and various sociological theorists, and the findings of cultural anthropologists all contributed to their decline. Since the decline of the instinctual mode of explaining such conflict phenomena as war, intergroup hostility, and human exploitation, two others have been dominant: the "psychological" and the "socio-political-economic."

The psychological mode attempts to explain such phenomena in terms of "what goes on in the minds of men" (Klineberg 1964) or "tensions that cause war" (Cantril 1950); in other words, in terms of the perceptions, beliefs, values, ideology, motivations, and other psychological states and characteristics that individual men and women have acquired as a result of their experiences and as these characteristics are activated by the particular
situation and role in which people are located. The socio-political-economic mode, in contrast, seeks an explanation in terms of such social, economic, and political factors as levels of armaments, objective conflicts in economic and political interests, and the like.

Although these modes of explanation are not mutually exclusive, there is a tendency for partisans of the psychological mode to consider that the causal arrow points from psychological conditions to socio-political-economic conditions and for partisans of the latter to believe the reverse is true. In any case, much of the social psychological writing in the 1930s, 1940s, and early 1950s on the topics of war, intergroup conflict, and industrial strife was largely nonempirical, and in one vein or the other. The psychologically-trained social psychologists tended to favor the psychological mode; the Marxist-oriented or sociologically-trained social psychologists more often favored the other mode.

The decline of social Darwinism and the instinctivist doctrines was hastened by the development and employment of empirical methods in social psychology. This early empirical orientation to social psychology focused on the socialization of the individual; this focus was, in part, a reaction to the instinctivist doctrine. It led to a great variety of studies, including a number investigating cooperation and competition. These latter studies are, in my view, the precursors to the empirical, social psychological study of conflict.

**Early Studies of Cooperation and Competition**

Two outstanding summaries of the then-existing research on cooperation and competition were published in 1937. One was in the volume of Murphy, Murphy, and Newcomb, *Experimental Social Psychology*; the other was in the monograph "Competition and Cooperation," by May and Doob. It is not my intention here to repeat these summaries but rather to give you my sense of the state of the research and theorizing on cooperation-competition in the 1920s and 1950s.

My impression is that practically none of the earlier research on cooperation and competition would be acceptable in current social psychological journals because of methodological flaws in the studies. Almost all of them suffer from serious deficiencies in their research designs. In addition, there is little conceptual clarity about some of the basic concepts — for example, competition, cooperation, self-orientation — that are used in the studies. As a result, the operational definitions used to create the differing experimental conditions have no consistency from one study to another, or even within a given study.

Further, the early studies of cooperation and competition suffered from a narrowness of scope. They focused almost exclusively on the effects of "competition" versus "cooperation" on individual task output. There was no investigation of social interaction, communication processes, problem-solving methods, interpersonal attitudes, attitudes toward self, attitudes toward work, attitudes toward the group, or the like in these early investigations of
cooperation-competition. The focus was narrowly limited to work output. The simplistic assumption was made that output would be an uncomplicated function of the degree of motivation induced by competition as compared with cooperation. The purposes of most of these early investigations appeared to be to support or reject a thesis inherent in the American ideology; namely, that competition fosters greater motivation to be productive than other forms of social organization.

**Field Theory, Conflict, and Cooperation-Competition**

During the 1920s, 1930s, and 1940s, quite independently of the work being conducted in the United States on cooperation-competition, Kurt Lewin and his students were theorizing and conducting research which profoundly affected later work in many areas of social psychology. Lewin’s field theory — with its dynamic concepts of tension systems, “driving” and “restraining” forces, “own” and “induced” forces, valences, level of aspiration, power fields, interdependence, overlapping situations, and so on — created a new vocabulary for thinking about conflict and cooperation-competition.

As early as 1931, employing his analysis of force fields, Lewin (1931 and 1935) presented a penetrating theoretical discussion of three basic types of psychological conflict: approach-approach — the individual stands between two positive valences of approximately equal strength; avoidance-avoidance — the individual stands between two negative valences of approximately equal strength; and approach-avoidance — the individual is exposed to opposing forces deriving from a positive and a negative valence. Hull (1958) translated Lewin’s analysis into the terminology of the goal gradient, and Miller (1937 and 1944) elaborated and did research upon it. Numerous experimental studies supported the theoretical analysis.

My own initial theorizing and research on cooperation-competition (Deutsch 1949a and 1949b) was influenced by the Lewinian thinking on tension systems which was reflected in a series of brilliant experiments on the recall of interrupted activities, the resumption of interrupted activities, substitutability, and the role of ego in cooperative work. But even more of my thinking was indebted to the ideas which were “in the air” at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology’s Research Center for Group Dynamics. Ways of characterizing and explaining group processes and group functioning, employing the language of Lewinian theorizing, were under constant discussion among the students and faculty at the MIT center. Thus, it was quite natural that when I settled on cooperation-competition as the topic of my doctoral dissertation, I should employ the Lewinian dynamic emphasis on goals and how they are interrelated as my key theoretical wedge into this topic. Even more importantly, the preoccupation with understanding group processes at the Center pressed me to formulate my ideas about cooperation and competition so that they would be relevant to the psychological and interpersonal processes occurring within and between groups. This pressure forced my theory and research (Deutsch 1949a and 1949b) to go consider-
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ably beyond the prior social psychological work on cooperation-competition. My theorizing and research were concerned not only with the individual and group outcomes of cooperation and competition but also with the social psychological processes which would give rise to these outcomes.

My theorizing and research have been published and widely referred to, so there is little need here for more than a brief summary of some of the theory's predictions, which have been validated by extensive research. Assuming that the individual actions in a group are more frequently effective than bungling, among the predictions that follow from the theory are that cooperative relations (those in which the goals of the parties involved are predominantly positively interdependent), as compared with competitive ones, show more of these positive characteristics:

1. Effective communication is exhibited. Ideas are verbalized, and group members are attentive to one another, accepting of the ideas of other members, and influenced by them. They have fewer difficulties in communicating with or understanding others.

2. Friendliness, helpfulness, and less obstructiveness is expressed in the discussions. Members are more satisfied with the group and its solutions and favorably impressed by the contributions of the other group members. In addition, members of the cooperative groups rate themselves high in desire to win the respect of their colleagues and in obligation to the other members as well as high in trust of one another.

3. Coordination of effort, divisions of labor, orientation to task achievement, orderliness in discussion, and high productivity are manifested in the cooperative groups (if the group task requires effective communication, coordination of effort, division of labor, or sharing of resources).

4. Feeling of agreement with the ideas of others and a sense of basic similarity in beliefs and values, as well as confidence in one's own ideas and in the value that other members attach to those ideas, are obtained in the cooperative groups.

5. Willingness to enhance the other's power (for example, the other's knowledge, skills, resources) to accomplish the other's goals increases. As the other's capabilities are strengthened, you are strengthened, they are of value to you as well as to the other. Similarly, the other is enhanced from your enhancement and benefits from your growing capabilities and power.

6. Defining conflicting interests as a mutual problem to be solved by collaborative effort facilitates recognizing the legitimacy of each other's interests and the necessity to search for a solution responsive to the needs of all. It tends to limit rather than expand the scope of conflicting interests. Attempts to influence the other tend to be confined to processes of persuasion.
In contrast, a competitive process has the opposite effects:

1. **Communication is impaired** as the conflicting parties seek to gain advantage by misleading the other through use of false promises, ingratiating tactics, and disinformation. It is reduced and seen as futile as they recognize that they cannot trust one another's communications to be honest or informative.

2. **Obstructiveness and lack of helpfulness** lead to mutual negative attitudes and suspicion of one another's intentions. One's perceptions of the other tend to focus on the person's negative qualities and ignore the positive.

3. **The parties to the process are unable to divide their work**, duplicating one another's efforts such that they become mirror images; if they do divide the work, they feel the need to check what the other is doing continuously.

4. **The repeated experience of disagreement and critical rejection** of ideas reduces confidence in oneself as well as the other.

5. **The conflicting parties seek to enhance their own power** and to reduce the power of the other. Any increase in the power of the other is seen as threatening to oneself.

The competitive process stimulates the view that the solution of a conflict can only be imposed by one side on the other, which in turn, leads to using coercive tactics such as psychological as well as physical threats and violence. It tends to expand the scope of the issues in conflict as each side seeks superiority in power and legitimacy. The conflict becomes a power struggle or a matter of moral principle and is no longer confined to a specific issue at a given time and place. Escalating the conflict increases its motivational significance to the participants and may make a limited defeat less acceptable and more humiliating than a mutual disaster.

As Johnson and Johnson (1989) have detailed, these ideas have given rise to a large number of research studies indicating that a cooperative process (as compared to a competitive one) leads to greater productivity, more favorable interpersonal and intergroup relations, better psychological health and higher self-esteem as well as more constructive resolution of conflict.

**Game Theory and Games**

In 1944, Von Neumann and Morgenstern published their now-classic work, *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*. Game theory has made a major contribution to social scientists by formulating in mathematical terms the problem of conflict of interest. However, it has not been either its mathematics or its normative prescriptions for minimizing losses when facing an intelligent adversary that have made game theory of considerable value to social psychologists. Rather, it has been its core emphasis that the parties in conflict have interdependent interests, that their fates are woven together.
Although the mathematical and normative development of game theory has been most successful in connection with pure competitive conflict ("zero-sum" games), game theory has also recognized that cooperative as well as competitive interests may be intertwined in conflict (as in "coalition" games or "non-zero-sum" games).

The game theory recognition of the intertwining of cooperative and competitive interests in situations of conflict (or in Schelling’s [1960] useful term, the “mixed motive” nature of conflict) has had a productive impact on the social psychological study of conflict, theoretically as well as methodologically. Theoretically, at least for me, it helped buttress a viewpoint that I had developed prior to my acquaintance with game theory — namely, that conflicts were typically mixtures of cooperative and competitive processes and that the course of conflict would be determined by the nature of the mixture. This emphasis on the cooperative elements involved in conflict ran counter to the then dominant view of conflict as a competitive struggle. Methodologically, game theory had an impact on an even larger group of psychologists. The mathematical formulations of game theory had the indirect but extremely valuable consequence of laying bare some fascinating paradoxical situations in such a way that they were highly suggestive of experimental work.

Game matrices as an experimental device are popular because they facilitate a precise definition of the reward structure encountered by the subjects, and hence of the way they are dependent upon one another. Partly stimulated by and partly in reaction to the research using game matrices, other research games for the study of conflict have been developed. Siegel and Fouraker (1960) developed a bilateral monopoly, “buyer-seller” negotiation game; Vinacke and Arkoff (1957) invented a three-person coalition game; Deutsch and Krauss (1960) constructed a “truck game”; Deutsch (1973) employed an “allocation” game; and many other investigators have developed variants of these games or new ones. Pruitt and Kimmel in 1977 estimated that well over 1,000 studies had been published based on experimental games. Much of this research, as is true in other areas of science, was mindless — being done because a convenient experimental format was readily available. I believe, however, that some of it has helped to develop a more systematic understanding of conflict processes and conflict resolution. Fortunately, in recent years, experimental gaming has been supplemented by other experimental procedures and by field studies which have overcome some of the inherent limitations of experimental gaming.

Themes in Contemporary Social Psychological Research on Conflict
Following is a summary of the major questions addressed by social psychological research on conflict during the past 35 years or so, with some references to relevant publications. For a more extensive discussion of these questions and the related literature, see Deutsch (in press).
1. **What are the conditions which give rise to a constructive or destructive process of conflict resolution?** In terms of bargaining and negotiation, the emphasis here is on determining the circumstances which enable the conflicting parties to arrive at a mutually satisfactory agreement which maximizes their joint outcomes. In a sense, this first question arises from a focus on the cooperative potential inherent in conflict (Deutsch 1973; Deutsch and Coleman 2000).

2. **What are the circumstances, strategies, and tactics which lead one party to do better than another in a conflict situation?** The stress here is on how one can wage conflict, or bargain, so as to win or at least do better than one's adversary. This second question emerges from a focus on the competitive features of a conflict situation (Schelling, 1960; Lewicki, Saunders, and Minton 1999; Pruitt and Carnevale 1993).

3. **What determines the nature of the agreement between conflicting parties, if they are able to reach an agreement?** Here the concern is with the cognitive and normative factors that lead people to conceive a possible agreement and to perceive it as a salient possibility for reaching a stable agreement: an agreement which each of the conflicting parties will see as "just" under the circumstances. This third question is a more recent one and has been addressed under the heading of research on the social psychology of equity and justice (Schelling 1960; Adams 1965; Lerner 1975; Leventhal 1976; Walster, Walster, and Berscheid 1978; Deutsch 1985; Tyler, Boechman, Smith, and Gus 1977).

4. **How can third parties be used to prevent conflicts from becoming destructive or to help deadlock or embittered negotiators move toward a more constructive management of their conflicts?** This fourth question has been reflected in studies of mediation and in strategies of de-escalating conflicts (Kressel and Pruitt 1985 and 1989; Moore 1996; Bush and Folger 1994; Kressel 2000).

5. **How can people be educated to manage their conflicts more constructively?** This has been a concern of consultants working with leaders in industry and government and also with those who have responsibility for educating the children in our schools (Deutsch 1993; Johnson and Johnson 2000; Jones and Knitt 2001; Coleman and Lim 2001).

6. **How and when to intervene in prolonged, intractable conflicts?** Much of the literature in conflict resolution has been preventive rather than remedial in its emphasis. It is concerned with understanding the conditions that foster productive rather than destructive conflict (as in question one) or developing knowledge about the circumstances that lead to intractable, destructive conflict, in the hope of preventing such conflict. More recently, the reality that many protracted, destructive conflicts exist in the world has induced some scholars to focus their attention on this problem (Deutsch 1983 and 1988; Zartman 1985 and
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7. How are we to understand why ethnic, religious, and identity conflicts frequently take an intractable, destructive course? With the end of the Cold War, there appears to be a proliferation of such conflicts. In the past ten years, interest in such conflicts has been renewed. Attention has been addressed to what causes such conflict but also what can be done after the typical atrocities of such conflict to bring about reconciliation and reconstruction (Tull 1978 and 1981; Turner 1987; Gurr 1993; Lederach 1997; Minow 1998; Deutsch and Coleman 2000 (Chapter 2); Christie, Wagner, and Winter 2001).

8. How applicable in other cultural contexts are the theories related to conflict that have largely been developed in the United States and Western Europe? In recent years, there has been much discussion in the literature of the differences that exist in how people from varying cultural backgrounds deal with negotiations and, more generally, manage conflict (Kimmel 1988; Cohen 1991; Ross 1993; Faure and Rubin 1993; Rahim and Blum 1994; Lederach 1995; Leung and Tjosvold 1998).

9. How to overcome oppression? This is a recent question, and one that has not been much addressed by our field. Yet, oppression is at the root of many more serious, enduring conflicts in the world today. Oppression is involved in such areas as: ethnic, religious, and racial conflicts; conflicts between autocratic governments and their citizens; the battle between the sexes; and much industrial strife between labor and management. Typically, these conflicts involve individuals or groups who have high power and those with relatively low power. Our field has done little to help those with low power to overcome the oppression they often experience from those in high power. This seems to be an important area for development of new theory and research: theory about the strategy and tactics available to low power groups and systematic research on successful efforts to develop a social transformation which would lead to more equal power sharing.

By oppression, I refer to the experience of repeated, widespread, systemic injustice. It need not take the brutal form of slavery, apartheid or tyranny. It may take the form of "civilized oppression" which is imbedded in the assumptions underlying everyday interactions: in the unquestioned norms, habits, rules, and symbols governing institutions, which compose our communities and broader society.

Oppression takes various forms. It produces gross inequalities in the distribution of the different forms of capital: consumption, investment, social, and skill capital. It leads to procedural injustices in which some individuals and groups are treated with respect and dignity and have much voice in influencing the decision-making processes which affect their life, while others have little voice and little respect.
Oppression appears to be kept in place not only by the superior power of the dominant group but also by the social production of meaning in the service of legitimizing oppression, and distorted relationships between oppressed and oppressor. For “civilized oppression,” the possible use of systematic terror by the dominant group is a last resort and remains in the background. Power is mainly used to control the various institutions of society, including the institutions (the media, religion and education) which socialize and indoctrinate people to accept the power differences as legitimate. As a result of this socialization and indoctrination, not only are most oppressors unaware of their complicity in implementing and perpetuating oppression but this is often the case for many of the oppressed.

This lack of awareness raises the question of how to awaken the sensitivity to oppression not only in the oppressed but also in the oppressors as well as in third parties. In the book, *Distributive Justice* (Yale University Press 1985), I have a theoretical chapter, which addresses this question, and report some preliminary research by some of my students. However, this is only a beginning effort, which needs much further development. Also in an address that I recently gave at the meetings of the International Society of Justice Research (Deutsch 2002), I discuss various strategies and tactics available to those in low power, high power, and third parties who want to bring about a change to a more equal distribution of power.

If I am correct in asserting that oppression is one of the major instigators of destructive conflicts in the world today, it is evident that the field of conflict studies should be doing more to try to understand how to develop constructive processes for overcoming oppression.

**Evaluation of Progress in the Social Psychological Study of Conflict**

I now turn to the important question: What progress, if any, has occurred during the past 70 years or so in the social psychological study of conflict? Of course, I am a biased observer but, even taking that bias into account, I am strongly inclined to believe that significant scientific progress has been made and that important contributions to society are being derived from the scientific study of conflict. Let me briefly characterize the nature of the progress in the methodological, conceptual, empirical, and technological domains.

**Methodological**

There have been major methodological advances during the past sixty years in the study of cooperation-competition, conflict, bargaining, and negotiation. New and better techniques for studying these phenomena in the laboratory and also in the field have emerged. (See, for example, Pruitt and Carnevale 1993; Ross and Rothman 1999; Jones and Knittl 2000; Deutsch and Coleman 2000; Coleman and Lim 2001).
Conceptual
Conceptual developments have taken place in work on cooperation and competition; on understanding the nature and determinants of constructive and destructive processes of conflict resolution; and on understanding some of the determinants and consequences of different systems of distributive justice. We are beginning to have some understanding of the conditions and processes involved in intractable conflict. Some of the psychological issues involved in ethnic conflict have been highlighted by social identity theory. The functions of such third parties as mediators, the determinants of the effectiveness of mediation, and the nature of the processes involved in mediation are being clarified. This represents significant theoretical progress and a more systematic integration of our knowledge of the social psychological aspects of conflict and distributive justice.

Empirical
We know a great deal more, with considerably more certainty, about the empirical regularities associated with conflict. Thus, we know how such psychological processes as “autistic hostility,” “self-fulfilling prophecies,” “unwitting commitments,” and “biased perceptions” operate to produce an escalation of conflict. We know the social psychological correlates of intensifying conflict and of de-escalating conflict. Thus, as conflict escalates there is an increased reliance upon a strategy of power and upon the tactics of threat, coercion, and deception. Also, there is increased pressure for uniformity of opinion and for leadership and control to be taken over by those elements organized for waging conflict. De-escalation of conflict is characterized by graduated reciprocation in tension reduction; tactics of conciliation; accentuation of similarities; and enhancement of mutual understanding and goodwill. We are increasingly aware of the social psychological regularities associated with benign and malevolent conflict. We are reasonably sure of the typical effects of certain forms of bargaining strategies and tactics and can reliably conclude that many commonsense beliefs about bargaining are much too simple part-truths.

Technological
There have been many significant social consequences of the scientific study of conflict; not all of these can be attributed to the work of social psychologists. Social psychologists have been important contributors to some changes in thinking about conflict at the national level — as exemplified in John F. Kennedy’s American University speech and in the Kerner Commission reports. Also, in recent years, many of the ideas generated in the social psychological study of conflict have been employed in training administrators and negotiators, in schools, labor unions, industry, government, and community organizations, on how to deal with conflict more effectively. “Conflict,” “negotiation skills,” and “mediation skills” workshops are now common features of training for work in organizations in the United States, Europe, and Japan. Osgood’s strategy for deescalating conflict — "graduated
and reciprocated initiatives in tension reduction" (GRIT) — has received considerable experimental support, has been widely discussed in international and national meetings, and appears to have been the basis for the "Kennedy experiment" to end the cold war. Key participants in the roundtable negotiations in Poland between the Communist government and Solidarity have told me that our work on conflict resolution was consciously employed to facilitate successful negotiations. Problem-solving workshops, developed by such people as John Burton, Herbert Kelman, Leonard Doob, and Edward Azar have been widely used in international and intercommunal conflict (Fisher 1977).

Concluding Thoughts
I conclude by stating that although there has been significant progress in the study of conflict, the progress does not yet begin to match the social need for understanding conflict. We live in a period of history when the pervasiveness and intensity of competitive conflict over natural resources are likely to increase markedly. And currently ethnic and national conflicts pose great danger to peace in many areas of the world. We also live in a period when hydrogen bombs and other weapons of mass destruction can destroy civilized life.

The social need for better ways of managing conflict is urgent. In relation to this need, it is my view that too few of us are working on the scientific issues likely to provide the knowledge that will lead to more constructive conflict resolution of the many intensive conflicts which await us all.
NOTE
This essay is an adaptation of a longer work that appears in the forthcoming book *International Handbook of Organizational Teamwork and Cooperative Thinking*, edited by M.A. West, D.J. Tjosvold, and K.G. Smith. (New York: John Wiley & Sons).
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