# HOW CONFLICT MANAGEMENT STYLES PREDICT THE ORGANIZATIONAL TRUST AND JOB SATISFACTION? A CROSS SECTIONAL STUDY

Mehmet BİÇER[1]

## ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study is to explore the effects of conflict management styles such as integrating, compromising, avoiding, dominating, obliging on organizational trust and job satisfaction of white-collar workers. In accordance with this purpose, data were collected from 171 participants working in 11 companies which are mainly operating in finance, manufacturing, logistics, iron and steel, food sectors in İskenderun and Adana in Turkey. The correlation analysis results of the research revealed that conflict management styles have statistically significant relationships with organizational trust and job satisfaction. Results indicated that integrating, obliging, compromising have statistically significant and positive relations with organizational trust. Furthermore, regression analysis results revealed that integrating, obliging and avoiding have positive effects on job satisfaction whereas compromising and dominating have negative effects. Another important finding of the research is that organizational trust has a positive effect on job satisfaction.

**Keywords:** Conflict Management Styles, Organizational Trust, Job Satisfaction

# ÇATIŞMA YÖNETİM TARZLARI, ÖRGÜTSEL GÜVENİ VE İŞ TATMİNİNİ NASIL AÇIKLAR? KESİTSEL BİR ÇALIŞMA

## ÖZ

Bu çalışmanın temel amacı, tümleştirme, ödün verme, kaçınma, hükmetme ve uzlaştırma gibi çatışma yönetimi tarzlarının beyaz yakalı çalışanların örgütsel güvenleri ve iş tatminleri üzerindeki etkilerini araştırmaktır. Bu amaç doğrultusunda, İskenderun ve Adana'da ağırlıklı olarak finans, imalat, lojistik, demir-çelik, gıda sektörlerinde faaliyet gösteren 11 şirkette çalışan 171 katılımcıdan veri toplanmıştır. Araştırmanın korelasyon analizi sonuçları çatışma yönetimi stillerinin örgütsel güven ve iş tatmini ile istatistiksel olarak anlamlı ilişkileri olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Sonuçlar, tümleştirici, uzlaştırıcı ve ödün verme tarzlarının örgütsel güven ile istatistiksel olarak anlamlı ve pozitif ilişkilere sahip olduklarını göstermiştir. Bununla birlikte, regresyon analizi sonuçları, tümleştiren, uzlaştıran ve kaçınma tarzlarının iş tatmini üzerinde olumlu etkileri olduğunu gösterirken ödün verme ve hükmetmenin de olumsuz etkileri olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Örgütsel güvenin iş tatmini üzerinde olumlu etkiye sahip olması araştırmanın diğer bir önemli bulgusudur.

**Keywords:** Çatışma Yönetim Tarzları, Örgütsel Güven, İş Tatmini

## Introduction

Employees who spend considerable section of their time at work are involved in various relationships with their colleagues, subordinates, superiors and other people outside the

organization during the day. In every organization where the human factor is the input of socialization, it is inevitable that there are inter-individual conflicts due to individual differences (Sims, 2002). These conflicts have the ability to reduce or increase the efficiency, effectiveness, change and development levels of organizations.

The notion of conflict is an important issue in management science as it can have favourable or unfavourable effects according to the applied management styles. Conflict can cause stress, resentment, insecurity and disturbance within the organization. Disruptive consequences that may harm both the individual and the organization may arise during the conflict. All of these negativities can lower the motivation level of the employees and give rise to decrease the efficiency and productivity of the organization. However, when the conflicts are well managed it is possible to create creativity, change, development, a peaceful and safe organization climate in many organizations.

The emergence of conflict is directly related to the mutual confidence of employees with other members of organization. Although conflict originates from different ideas and approaches, the insecurity among employees is the most important reason that triggers the interpersonal conflict basically. Therefore, trust between employees within the organization is also an important factor affecting organizational activities such as conflict elements positively and negatively. The effectiveness of an organization depends on its ability of consistently improving its performance and to have qualified employees who adopt the objectives of the organization. The most important factor in the formation of organizational productivity and organizational affiliation is the perception of trust among employees, managers and organization itself (Halis et al., 2007).

Inter-individual relationships and organizational conflicts are the factors that influence the job success and job satisfaction of employees. Job satisfaction and conflict are important concepts for the organization and affect each other, since there are always grounds for the existence of conflict in situations where individuals do not enjoy the work, do not get satisfied (Altıntaş, 2007). Employees often demand flawlessly in their working environment, about their business, their colleagues, their managers, and the job that they provide opportunities for themselves. If they feel the lack of one of these, they can not enjoy their work. In this case, individuals can not stay away from conflict with themselves and with the organization (Elma, 1998). The source of the contributions (more than expected) that the employee makes to the business and operation without any compulsion is often the perceived confidence and job satisfaction (Yoon and Suh, 2003). We can say that the formation or increase of feelings of satisfaction is also influenced by the trust of employees. Increases in job satisfaction are observed according to the level of satisfaction of trust and security within the organization.

The objective of this article is to develop a framework to examine the dual relationship between conflict management styles, organizational trust and job satisfaction. Literature information and theoretical approaches about conflict management styles, organizational trust and job satisfaction processes were also presented in this study.

It is considered that this study will contribute to the literature by its results as it is one of the few studies on the relationships between conflict management styles, organizational trust and job satisfaction. Due to time and cost constraints, this study has some limitations. In other studies, interview and observation procedures may be preferred

as data collection techniques instead of survey techniques. The use of different research methods may lead to different results. However, different and comprehensive results can be obtained with the data provided from more companies in different sectors.

In the further studies, it is thought that examining the relationship between conflict management styles and organizational trust and job satisfaction sub-dimensions will contribute more to the related field.

**Conceptual Framework**
**Conflict Management Styles**
Conflict is defined as "an interactive process manifested in incompatibility, disagreement, or dissonance within or between social entities" (Rahim, 1992, p. 16). According to Thomas (1992, p. 653) conflict is "the process that begins when one party perceives that the other party has negatively affected, or is about to negatively affect, something that he or she cares about" and he commentates conflict as an unpleasant occurrence that causes adverse effects.

However, the conflict should not be considered as merely dysfunctional. On the contrary, it can be constructive and transformative for new ideas, advancement and development (Rahim, 1986; White, 1998). Fritchie (1995) distinguishes conflicts as 'hot' and 'cold'. The author stated that hot clashing gives rise to innovativeness between the parties, while in the cold clash communication is prohibited because conflict is refused. For this reason, it is consequential to know the nature of the conflict and how it will be efficiently managed.

According to definition of Kuhn and Poole (2000) conflict management style is a widespread and coherent processing to the others and to conflict problems that revealed by noticeable behaviors that together form common characteristics and patterns in course of time. Conflict management style was measured with various taxonomies and continued to be measured. One of the first conceptive design to categorize conflict styles refers to the conflict that revolves around a simple collaboration and rivalry (Deutsch, 1949). However, some suspicions have arisen as to the ability of the division into two to mirror the intricacy of cognizance of conflict behavior (Ruble and Thomas, 1976; Smith, 1987) and developed a new two-dimensional framework to classify conflict styles (Blake and Mouton, 1964). There are many approaches to explain and classify forms of conflict, but the five-style conflict management model based on two dimensions has the precedence and more widely accepted dimensions (Blake and Mouton, 1964; Rahim, 1983, 1992; Thomas and Kilmann, 1974). The most popular one among the suggested and preferred models is the conceptualization of Rahim and Bonoma (1979). They have examined the ways of solving interpersonal conflict on two main dimensions: concern for self and concern for others. The first dimension expresses the degree (high or low) of the efforts to compensate one's own anxieties, while the second dimension (high or low) expresses the degree of the efforts of the person to supply the needs or worries of others. Those who show a high degree of anxiety on their behalf show strong concerns to meet their needs while those who are highly concerned about others show a high level of interest in meeting the requirements of others (Rahim and Bonoma, 1979). As a result of unifying these two dimensions, five different styles consist that explain the managing of interpersonal conflicts: *integrating* (high concern for himself and others), *obliging* (show moderate behavior for the two sides' concerns), *dominating* (high concern for their own

interests, low concern for others' interests and values), *compromising* (low for their own concerns, high interest for others) and *avoiding* (low concerned and interest for both self and others). These five styles cover the scale of conflict management approaches (Rahim, 1983, p.373).

**Organizational Trust**

Depending on the daily living conditions in business and social life, we can point out that the concept of trust has been a topic of discussion and research recently on the agenda both at the individual and organizational standards. We can state that trust is an important part of our lives in terms of permanent relationships and achievements in the individual and organizational spheres. Although it is regarded as important for all facets of social and organizational life according to scientists and practitioners, the concept of trust maintains its complexity and uncertainty. In general, experts acknowledge that organizational trust has communication-based, dynamic, multi-facetedness and lack of understanding. The issue of trust often arises when there is something at risk in any of the parties involved (McAllister, 1995; Wicks and Berman, 2004). Mayer, et al., (1995, p. 712) specify the concept of trust as "the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party".

Organizational trust is expressed as an employee's perception of support that organization provides and the belief that the leader will be the right speaker and will stand behind his word. In this sense, trust is the foundation of all internal relations both horizontally and vertically (Mishra and Morrissey, 1990). Bromiley and Cummings argue that if the organization does not have sufficient trust, the individuals will have to waste more time and power to control others' behavior in order to preserve their own benefits. In addition, authors stated that, in the reverse case, the high level of trust between the members of the organization would generally improve performance and ultimately it would contribute to profitability (Bromiley and Cummings, 1996). Along with that, when there is little or no organizational trust, employees show less job satisfaction (Driscoll, 1978) and as a consequence employees start to act in an attitude like "us against them" that can affect their performance (Gilbert and Tang, 1998). According to Matthai (1989), organizational trust refers to the belief that employees are consistent in their commitment and behavior when confronted with an uncertain or risky situation. Shockley-Zalabak et. al., (2000, p. 37) describe organizational trust as "the expectations individuals have about networks of organizational relationships and behaviors". Gilbert and Tang (1998, p. 322) expressed organizational trust as "a feeling of confidence and support in an employer… organizational trust refers to employee faith in corporate goal attainment and organizational leaders, and to the belief that ultimately, organizational action will prove beneficial for employees". In addition researchers have argued that the determinants of organizational trust are: work group loyalty, friendship centrality, obtaining information (Gilbert and Tang, 1998).

**Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction, which is usually described as a rebound to the emotions of employees' work, was first put out in the 1920s and its importance was understood in 1930-40. Job satisfaction is a variable that is at the center of empirical and theoretical research of organizational facts ranging from work design to audit (Spector, 1997). The concept has

been included in the literature for the first time by investigated systematically in motivation theories. Maslow's (1943) Hierarchy of Needs Theory, Herzberg's (1966) Two Factor Theory, Vroom's (1964) Expectancy Theory are the main motivation theories that first examine job satisfaction (Koçel, 2001; Eren, 2000).

Porter and Steers (1973) asserted that job satisfaction reflects the cumulative level of expected contentment of employees. Depending on this, employees hope that their work will satisfy their preferences such as paying, promoting and autonomy. The extent and stature of these predilections varies between individuals, but when the accumulation of unfulfilled expectations is big enough, less job satisfaction and the withdrawal behavior will be higher (Pearson, 1991). Herzberg and Mausner (1959) developed a two-factor theory of job satisfaction. They assumed "satisfaction" and "dissatisfaction" as the factors of their theory and also stated that these factors are separated and sometimes even unbound. The factors based on the nature and the experience of the work was separated as intrinsic factors (motivators) and identified as job satisfiers by the researchers. The factors such as accomplishment, recognition, work itself and accountability were classified as the intrinsic factors which motivate the job satisfaction. However, the extrinsic factors which are company strategy, management, auditing, salary, interpersonal relations and working conditions were identified as job 'dissatisfiers' and named 'hygiene' factors. The Motivation-Hygiene theory of Herzberg and Mausner contributed to the evaluation and development of job satisfaction by influencing the studies on this concept. According to Locke (1969, p. 317) job satisfaction is ''the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as achieving or facilitating one's job values''. Cranny, Smith, and Stone (1992, p. 1) express job satisfaction as ''an affective (that is, emotional) reaction to one's job, resulting from the incumbent's comparison of actual outcomes with those that are desired (expected, deserved, and so on.)'' in another definition. The factors that constitute the job satisfaction according to the definitions and researches that have been accepted in the literature are divided into the factors which are the personal and work-related factors. Personal factors are: age, gender, character, social identity, education level, marital status, prospect, work experience, duration of service; factors originating from work are specified as: general frame of work and difficulty grade of it, wages, working conditions and job security, work stress, promotion prospects, reward policy, participation rate of managers and employees in decisions (King, et al., 1982; Simon, 1996).

**Material and Methods**
An applied research was conducted to determine the effect of conflict management styles on organizational trust and job satisfaction within the scope of this study. For this purpose, data were collected from 171 participants working in 11 companies mainly operating in finance, manufacturing, logistics, iron and steel and food sectors in İskenderun and Adana by means of convenience sampling method and survey technique. A cross-sectional research was conducted in this study, which was designed with quantitative research pattern and correlational research design. Descriptive findings were obtained as a result of the research.

**Population and Sampling**
White-collar workers working in companies operating in various sectors in İskenderun and Adana constitute the sample of this study. Simple random sampling method was used

to collect data for analysis. Questionnaires were sent to a total of 11 firms operating in finance, manufacturing, logistics, iron and steel, food sectors. The white-collar population working at the middle or upper levels in the companies where the research data was collected was determined as 296 people. Therefore, 296 surveys were sent to the firms totally. 174 of them were returned and eventually 171 questionnaires were found proper for the analysis of the research. Demographic characteristics of the sample are shown in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Sampling Descriptive Statistics (n=171)

|  |  | **%** | **Quantity** |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Gender** | Female | 43.9 | 75 |
|  | Male | 56.1 | 96 |
| **Age** | 20-29 | 21.1 | 36 |
|  | 30-39 | 46.2 | 79 |
|  | 40-49 | 25.7 | 44 |
|  | 50-59 | 7 | 12 |
| **Education Status** | College | 18.7 | 32 |
|  | University | 62 | 106 |
|  | Master's/Doctorate | 19.3 | 33 |
| **Department** | Finance | 14.6 | 25 |
|  | Human Resources | 5.8 | 10 |
|  | Production | 16.4 | 28 |
|  | Sales&Marketing | 30.5 | 52 |
|  | Public Relations | 7.6 | 13 |
|  | Account | 8.2 | 14 |
|  | Administration | 2.9 | 5 |
|  | Quality Control | 7 | 12 |
|  | R&D | 7 | 12 |

As it shown in Table 1, 43.9% of the participants who answered the survey questionnaire were female (n=75) and the remaining 56.1%1 were male (n=96). The majority of participants were in the age range of 30-39 (46.2%; n=79). 62% of respondents have university degree (n=106) and %19.3 have master's/doctorate degree (n=33). Participants in 9 different departments contributed to the study by responding the research questionnaire. Participation was mostly from sales&marketing (30.5%; n=52), production (16.4%; n=28) and finance (14.6%; n=25) departments.

**Scales**

**Conflict Management Styles Questionnaire:** ROCI II (The Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory II) developed by Rahim (1983) was used to measure the conflict management styles. The scale was designed to measure five independent dimensions of conflict management styles: Integrating (IN), Obliging (OB), Dominating (DO), Avoiding (AV), and Compromising (CO). The scale consists of 28 items and was arranged according to 5-point Likert scale (1-strongly disagree, 5-strongly agree).

**Organizational Trust Questionnaire:** A four-item scale advanced by Tyler and Bies (1990) was used to evaluate the organizational trust perceptions of employees. The results

of confirmatory factor analysis carried out by Polat (2009) showed that the scale had a good fit in terms of the strength of measuring organizational trust of employees (Polat, 2009, p. 164). Scale created in 5-point Likert style (1- strongly disagree, 5-strongly agree).

**Job Satisfaction Questionnaire:** The scale developed by Brayfield and Rothe (1951) was preferred to determine the job satisfaction levels of the participants. The scale has one factor structure including five items. Scale designed in 5-point Likert style (1-strongly disagree, 5-strongly agree).

Organizational trust (Tyler and Bies, 1990) and job satisfaction (Brayfield and Rothe, 1951) variables were tested in one dimension in the research model. On the other hand, factor analysis was used to test the structural validity of the conflict management styles scale. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test showed that the sample size was sufficient for factor analysis (KMO=.808; > .50). The Barlett's Test results are meaningful on account of indicating whether the data for conflict management styles are normally distributed (4693.574, p< .01). The conflict management styles variant which has five independent dimensions (integrating, compromising, dominating, avoiding, obliging) originally (Rahim, 1983) has been tested in four independent dimensions. The results of the factor analysis revealed the integrating and obliging dimensions as the only one factor (in&ob) depending on the responses given by the participants. From here, we can argue that participants perceive integrating and obliging expressions in the same way in the research questionnaire. Because the factor loading of integrating expressions is higher the first dimension will be partly referred to as integrating in other analysis of the study.

**Table 2.** Reliability Statistics

| Variables | Dimensions | N of Items | Cronbach Alpha (α) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Integrating | 6 | 0.896 |
| | Compromising | 6 | 0.864 |
| *Conflict* | Dominating | 5 | 0.886 |
| *Management* | Avoiding | 6 | 0.867 |
| *Styles* | Obliging | 5 | 0.891 |
| | *Conflict Management Style Scale* | *28* | *0.880* |
| *Organizational Trust* | *Organizational Trust Scale* | *4* | *0.894* |
| *Job Satisfaction* | *Job Satisfaction Scale* | *5* | *0.900* |

(α > 0,70) value is taken as the criterion to accept scale reliabilities in this study. The general Cronbach's Alpha (α) value of the scales was found to be 0.892. The reliability coefficients was calculated 0.880 for the conflict management style scale; 0.894 for the organizational trust scale and 0.901 for the job satisfaction scale. Cronbach's alpha (α) values for variables are shown in Table 2. As it can be seen in the table

Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficients for the variables and subscales of the study were found to be above the acceptable level of reliability ($\alpha > 0.70$).

**Findings**
**Correlation Analysis**
Correlation coefficients, means and standard deviations for the variables of the research model are shown in Table 3.

**Table 3.** Means, Standart Deviations and Correlations

|  | Means | St. Dev. | OT | JS |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Integrating (In&Ob)** | 4.015 | .728 | .282** | .472** |
| **Compromising** | 3.193 | .846 | .344** | .096 |
| **Avoiding** | 3.270 | 1.082 | .111 | .242** |
| **Dominating** | 3.323 | .962 | .142 | -.176* |
| **Organizational Trust** | 3.570 | .876 | 1 | .000 |
| **Job Satisfaction** | 3.085 | .988 |  | 1 |

\** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

It has been determined that there are statistically significant and positive relations between integrating (in&ob) (r=.282, p<0.01), compromising (r=.344, p<0.01) and organizational trust. However, there were no statistically significant relationships between avoiding, dominating and organizational trust. Statistically significant relationships were tested between all subscales of conflict management styles and job satisfaction, except compromising. Also, as it is shown in Table 3, dominating (r=-.176, p<0.05) were significantly but negatively related to job satisfaction. On the other hand, job satisfaction has statistically significant and positive relations between integrating (in&ob) (r=.472, p<0.01) and avoiding (r=.242, p<0.01).

**Conflict Management Styles and Organizational Trust**
The relationship between employees' conflict management styles and their organizational trust levels has been tested within conceptual model of the research. The results of the analysis are shown in Table 4.

**Table 4.** Conflict Management Styles and Organizational Trust Regression Analysis

| **Coefficients** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Model* | *Unstandardized Coefficients* | | *Standardized Coefficients* | *t* | *p.* |
|  | *B* | *Std. Error* | *Beta* |  |  |
| *(Constant)* | 1.247 | .068 |  | .000 | 1.000 |
| *In&OB* | .282 | .068 | .282 | 4.139 | .000 |
| *CO* | .344 | .068 | .344 | 5.059 | .000 |
| *AV* | .111 | .068 | .111 | 1.625 | .106 |
| *DO* | .142 | .068 | .142 | 2.091 | .038 |
| **Dependent Variable:** Organizational Trust | | | $R^2 = 0,231$ ; F= 12,434 ; Sig. = 0.000 | | |

As it is shown in the table it is understood that the model is valid (F=12.434) and meaningful at the level of sig. .000. The adjusted $R^2$ value of the model is determined as 0.230. According to this, it can be said that conflict management styles explain 23% of the changes in organizational trust. It was identified that there was no statistically significant relationship between the avoiding (p= .106, p >.05) and organizational trust. It has been found that other sub-dimensions have positive effects (integrating, B= .282; compromising, B=.344; dominating, B=.142) on organizational trust and have statistically significant (p< .05) relationship between organizational trust. It has been determined that organizational trust is most affected by compromising (.344) style of conflict management.

**Conflict Management Styles and Job Satisfaction**

Within the conceptual model of the research, the relationship between conflict management styles and job satisfaction is also examined. The results of regression analysis for the relationship between the variables are shown in Table 5.

**Table 5.** Conflict Management Styles and Job satisfaction Regression Analysis

| | Coefficients | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Model* | *Unstandardized Coefficients* | | *Standardized Coefficients* | *t* | *p.* |
| | *B* | *Std. Error* | *Beta* | | |
| *(Constant)* | 1.482 | .064 | | .000 | 1.000 |
| *In&OB* | .472 | .064 | .472 | 7.379 | .000 |
| *CO* | -.127 | .064 | -.127 | 1.506 | .034 |
| *AV* | .242 | .064 | .242 | 3.788 | .000 |
| *DO* | -.176 | .064 | -.176 | -2.758 | .006 |
| **Dependent Variable:** Job Satisfaction | | | | | |
| $R^2$ = 0,322 ; F= 19,669 ; Sig. = 0.000 | | | | | |

The value of F (19.669) is valid at the level of 0.000 (sig.) indicates the validity and significance of the research model. Besides this, the findings of the analysis reveal conflict management styles express 32.2% (adjusted $R^2$) of job satisfaction. Statistically significant relationships (p< .05) were found between all sub-dimensions of conflict management styles and job satisfaction. Integrating (B=.472, p=.000) and avoiding (B= .242, p= .000) have positive and significant effects on job satisfaction however compromising (B=-.127, p=.034) and dominating (B=-.176, p= .006) have negative effects on job satisfaction.

**Organizational Trust and Job Satisfaction**

The consequences of the regression analysis revealing the relationship between organizational trust and job satisfaction are given in Table 6. Concepts within the scope of the research model have been studied in this study in one dimension.

**Table 6.** Organizational Trust and Job satisfaction Regression Analysis

**Coefficients[a]**

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| *(Constant)* | 1.312 | .112 | | .000 | .000 |
| *JS* | .647 | .036 | .647 | 3.648 | .000 |
| **Dependent Variable:** Job Satisfaction | | | $R^2 = 0,489$ ; F= 23,257 ; Sig. = 0.000 | | |

The results indicate that there is a statistically significant relationship (F=23.257, p=.000) between organizational trust and job satisfaction and also the research model is valid and significant. The findings present organizational trust accounts for 48.9% (adjusted $R^2$) of variance on job satisfaction. Also as it shown in the table, it was stated that organizational trust have a statistically significant positive effect (B=.647, p=.000) on job satisfaction of employees.

**Conclusion and Discussion**

It was previously pointed out that the main objective of this study is to determine impacts of the conflict management styles on organizational trust and job satisfaction of white-collar workers. In the previous sections of the study, literature information was first presented about the concepts covered by the research model. Then, correlation and regression analysis were also conducted to determine relationships between the concepts. According to the results of the factor analysis, conflict management styles were considered as 4 dimensions in this study depending on the answers given to the participants' survey questionnaire. Integrating and obliging are considered as one dimension. Because the factor loading of integrating expressions is higher, the first dimension was referred to as integrating in the analysis.

The correlation coefficients showed that conflict management styles were generally positively correlated with organizational trust and job satisfaction at the levels of significance of 0.01 and 0.05. There are statistically significant and positive relations between integrating (in&ob) (r=.282, p<0.01), compromising (r=.344, p<0.01) and organizational trust. These results have similarities with the findings obtained from earlier empirical studies; Rahim and Buntzman (1989), Özgan (2011), Chan, et al. (2008) and Toprak et. al. (2017). Although managers' conflict management styles relations were tested in these studies, the results of this study are supported. Chan and others (2007) noted that the conflict management styles of superiors affect the behaviors of the subordinates. Researchers argue that effective conflict management styles in the organization further the social exchange process of the workers and so on employees' positive job attitudes will be encouraged. Supporting this, according to the findings of this study, it can be said that the level of organizational trust increases in the same way when employees exhibit compromising and benevolent behaviors that are sensitive, fair and responsive to their own and others' interests. For all that, there were no statistically significant relationships between avoiding, compromising and organizational trust.

Statistically significant relationships were tested between conflict management styles and job satisfaction. This finding is consistent with similar studies (Altıntaş, 2007; Özdemir, 2008; Üngüren, et al., 2009; Demireli and Munzur, 2012; Choi, 2013). In contrast, dominating were significantly but negatively (r=-.176, p<0.05) related to job satisfaction. This finding shows that ascendent, oppressive and dominant behaviors, attitudes of the individuals to each other in the working environment negatively affect the job satisfaction levels of the employees. Depending on this, it can be stated that as these behaviors increase, the level of job satisfaction of employees will decrease. Integrating (in&ob) (r=.472, p<0.01) and avoiding (r=.242, p<0.01) have statistically significant and positive relations between job satisfaction. In work environment where individual exhibits high concern for himself and others and also shows moderate behavior for the two sides' concerns positive increases in job satisfaction will be observed. The same results have also shown that job satisfaction levels of employees are partially and positively influenced in environments in which behaviors are exposed to problems, which are insensitive and indifferent to events. Furthermore, according to the correlation analysis results a statistically significant relationships between compromising and job satisfaction was not identified.

According to regression analysis results, conflict management styles have significant and positive effects on organizational trust ($R^2$=0,231; p<0.000) and job satisfaction ($R^2$=0,322; p<0.000) of employees. Integrating (.282), compromising (.344) and dominating (.142) have positive effects on organizational trust. It has been recognized that compromising styles of the individuals have the most positive influence on organizational trust of employees. Another findings of regression analysis revealed that conflict management styles signifies 33% (adjusted $R^2$) of job satisfaction. Statistically significant relationships (p< .05) were found between all sub-dimensions of conflict management styles and job satisfaction. Integrating (.472) and avoiding (.242) have positive and significant effects on job satisfaction, however compromising (-.127) and dominating (-.176) have negative effects on job satisfaction. Meaningful and positive relationships were determined between organizational trust and job satisfaction which were examined in one dimension in this study. Within the context of bilateral relationships between concepts, organizational trust explains about 49% (adjusted $R^2$) of the changes on job satisfaction. Analysis results also showed that organizational trust (.647) positively affects job satisfaction of employees. Similar results can be seen in various earlier empirical studies examining these concepts. For example, Oldham, (1975); Robinson, (1996), Cunningham and MacGregor, (2000); Arnold, et al., (2001); Lee et al. (2013); Güçer and Demirağ (2014); Perry and Mankin (2007) also identified that organizational trust has positive effects on the job satisfaction and positive trust perceptions of employees across the organization increase job satisfaction levels of the employees.

**References**

Altıntaş, T. (2007). İş doyumu ve çatışma çözme stillerini etkileyen faktörlerin incelenmesi. Master's Thesis, Ankara University Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.

Arnold, K.A., Barling, J., Kelloway, E.K. (2001). Transformational leadership or the iron cage: Which predicts trust, commitment and team efficacy? *Leadership & Organizational Development*, *Vol 22; No.7,* ss. 315-20.

Blake, R.R., Mouton, J.S. (1964). *The Managerial Grid: Key Orientations For Achieving Production Through People*. Houston, TX: Gulf

Bromiley, P., Cummings, L. (1996). *Transaction Costs In Organizations With Trust*. In: Bies R., Lewicki R., & Sheppard B., eds. Research on Negotiation in Organizations. Greenwich.

Brayfield, A.H., Rothe, H.F. (1951). An index of Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Vol 35; No.5,* ss. 307-311.

Chan, K.W., Huang, X., Ng, P.M. (2008). Managers' conflict management styles and employee attitudinal outcomes: The mediating role of trust. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, Vol *25; No.2,* ss. 277-295.

Choi, Y. (2013). The influence of conflict management culture on job satisfaction. *Social Behavior And Personality*, *Vol 41, No.4,* ss. 687-692.

Cranny, C.J., Smith, P. C., Stone, E.F. (1992). *Job Satisfaction: How People Feel About Their Jobs And How It Affects Their Performance*. New York: Lexington Press.

Cunningham, J.B., Macgregor, J.N. (2000). Trust and the design of work complementary constructs in satisfaction and performance. *Human Relations*, *Vol 53; No.12,* ss. 1575-1591.

Demireli, C., Munzur, Ç. (2012). Personelin çatışma yönetimi algıları ve iş doyumu düzeylerinin incelenmesi: Mersin Gençlik Hizmetleri Ve Spor İl Müdürlüğü Örneği. *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *Vol 34*, 295-309.

Deutsch, M. (1949). A theory of cooperation and competition. *Human Relations*, *Vol 2; No.2*, ss. 129-151.

Driscoll, J.W. (1978). Trust and participation in organizational decision making as a predictor of satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, *Vol 21*, ss. 44-56.

Elma, C. (1998). İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin çatışmayı yönetme yeterlikleri. Master's Thesis, Ankara University Social Sciences Institute, Ankara.

Eren, E. (2000). *Örgütsel Davraniş ve Yönetim Psikolojisi*. Beta Yayınları, İstanbul.

Fritchie R., (1995). Conflict and its management. *British Journal of Hospital Medicine*, *Vol 53; No.9, ss.* 471-473.

Gilbert, J.A., Tang, T.L. (1998). An examination of organization trust antecedents. *Public Personnel Management*, *Vol 27*, ss. 321-338.

Güçer, E., Demirdağ, Ş.A. (2014). Organizational trust and job satisfaction: A study on hotels. *Business Management Dynamics*, *Vol 4; Sayı: 1,* 12-28.

Halis, M., Gökgöz, G.S., Yaşar, Ö. (2007). Örgütsel güvenin belirleyici faktörleri ve bankacılık sektöründe bir uygulama. *Manas University Journal of Social Sciences*, *Vol 17*, 187-205.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B. (1959). *The Motivation to Work*, second ed. Wiley, New York.

King, M., Murray, M.A., Atkinson, T. (1982). Background, personality, job characteristics, and satisfaction with work in a national sample. *Human Relation*, *Vol 35; No. 2,* ss. 119-133.

Koçel, T. (2001). *İşletme yöneticiliği, yönetim ve organizasyon, organizasyonlarda davranış klasik-modern-çağdaş ve güncel yaklaşımlar*. 8. Baskı, Beta Yayınları, İstanbul.

Kuhn, T., Poole, M.S. (2000). Do conflict management styles affect group decision making? *Human Communication Research*, *Vol 26; No.4,* ss. 558-590.

Landy, F.J., Conte, J.M. (2010). *Work In The 21st Century An Introduction To Industrial And Organizational Psychology*. California: Wiley-Blackwell.

Lee, C., Song, H., Lee, H., Lee, S., Bernhard, B.J. (2013).The impact of CSR on casino employees' organizational trust, job satisfaction, and customer orientation: An empirical examination of responsible gambling strategies. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, Vol 33; No.1,* ss. 406-415.

Locke, E.A. (1969). What is job satisfaction? *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *Vol 4; No.4*, ss. 309-336.

McAllister, D.J. (1995). Affect -and cognition- based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, *Vol 38; No.1,* ss. 24-59.

Matthai, J.M. (1989). Employee perceptions of trust, satisfaction, and commitment as predictors of turnover intentions in a mental health setting. Doctoral Dissertation, *Peabody College of Vanderbilt University*. Dissertation Abstracts International, DAI-B 51/02.

Mayer, R. C, Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy Management Review*, *Vol 20; No.3,* ss.709-734.

Mishra, J., Morrissey, M.A. (1990). Trust in employee/employer relationships: A survey of West Michigan Managers. *Public Personnel Management*, *Vol 19; No.4,* ss. 443-486.

Oldham, G. (1975). The impact of supervisory characteristics on goal acceptance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *Vol 18; No.3,* ss. 461-475.

Olson, B.J., Nelson, D.L., Parayitam, S. (2006). Managing aggression in organizations: What leaders must know? *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *Vol 27; No.5,* ss. 384-398.

Özdemir, M. (2008). Kurum içi çatışmaların yönetilmesi ve eğitim kurumlarında çatışma yönetiminin iş tatminine etkisi. Master's Thesis, Beykent University Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul.

Özgan, H. (2011). The relationships between organizational justice, confidence, commitment, and evaluating the manager and the perceptions of conflict management at the context of organizational behavior. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, *Vol 11; No.1,* ss. 241-247.

Pearson, C.A. (1991). An assessment of extrinsic feedback on participation, role, perceptions, motivation, and job satisfaction in a self-managed system for monitoring group achievement. *Human Relations*, *Vol 44; No.5,* ss. 517-537.

Perry, R.W., Mankin, L.D (2007). Organizational trust, trust in the chief executive and work satisfaction. *Public Personnel Management, Vol 36; No.2*, ss.165-179.

Polat, M. (2009).Örgütsel özdeşleşmenin öncülleri ve ardılları üzerine bir saha çalışması. Doctoral Dissertation. Uludağ University Social Sciences Institute, Bursa.

Porter, L.W., Steers, R.M. (1973). Organizational, work and personal factors in employee turnover and absenteeism. Psychological Bulletin, *Vol 80; No.2,* ss.151-176.

Rahim, M.A. (1983). A measure of styles of handling interpersonal conflict. *Academy of Management Journal*, *Vol 26; No.2,* ss. 368-376.

Rahim M.A. (1986). Managing Conflict in Organizations. Praeger Publishers, New York, USA.

Rahim, M.A. (1992). Managing Conflict In Organizations (2nd ed.). Westport, CT: Praeger

Rahim, M.A., Bonoma, T.V. (1979). Managing organizational conflict: A model for diagnosis and intervention. *Psychological Reports*, *Vol 44; No.3c*, ss.1323-1344.

Rahim, M.A., Buntzman, G.F. (1989). Supervisory power bases, styles of handling conflict with subordinates, and subordinate compliance and satisfaction. *The Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied, Vol 123;No.2,* ss.195-210.

Robinson, S. (1996). Trust and the breach of the psychological contract. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *Vol 41; No.4,* ss. 574-599.

Ruble, T.L., Thomas, K.W. (1976). Support for a two-dimensional model of conflict behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *Vol 16; No.1*, ss. 143-155.

Shockley-Zalabak, P., Ellis, K., Winograd, G. (2000). Organizational trust: What it means, why it matters. *Organization Development Journal*, *Vol 18; No.4, ss.35-48.*

Simon, S.K. (1996). Total quality management and its impact on middle managers and front-line workers. *Journal of Management Development*, *Vol 15; No.7,* ss.41-43.

Sims, R.R. (2002). Managing Organizational Behavior. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Smith, W.P. (1987). Conflict and negotiation: Trends and emerging issues. *Journal of Applied Social Psycholog*y, *Vol 17; No.7,* ss. 641-677.

Smyth T. (1985). Confronting conflict. *Nursing Mirror*, *Vol 160; Np.10,* ss. 23-25.

Spector, P.E., (1997). Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, And Consequences. SAGE Publications, London.

Thomas, K.W. (1992). Conflict And Negotiation Processes In Organizations. In M. Dunette (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology (2nd ed., Vol. 3, pp. 651-717). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Thomas, K.W., Kilmann, R.H. (1974). Thomas-Kilmann conflict MODE instrument. New York: XICOM, Tuxedo.

Toprak, L.S., Şentürk, F.K., Kılıç, G. (2017). Yöneticilerin çatışma yönetme yöntemleri ile yöneticiye duyulan güven arasındaki ilişki: Afyonkarahisar'daki beş yıldızlı otel işletmelerinde bir araştırma. *İşletme Bilimi Dergisi, Vol 5; Sayı:2,* 105-133.

Tyler, T.R., Bies, R.J. (1990). Interpersonal aspects of procedural justice. Applied Social Psychology in Business Settings, ed. J. Carroll, Hilldale, NJ: Erlbaum, ss. 77-98.

Wicks, A.C., Berman, S.L. (2004). The effects of context on trust in firm-stakeholder relationships: The institutional environment, trust creation, and firm performance. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, *Vol 14; No.1,* ss. 141-160.

Üngüren, E., Cengiz, F., Algür, S, (2009). İş tatmini ve örgütsel çatışma yönetimi arasındaki ilişkinin belirlenmesi: Konaklama işletmeleri üzerinde bir araştırma. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences*, *Vol 8; Sayı: 27,* 36-56.

White, P. (1998). Fighting fit. *Nursing Management*, *Vol 4; No.8*, 7.

Yoon, M.H., Suh, J. (2003). Organizational citizenship behaviors and service quality as external effectiveness of contact employees. *Journal of Business Research*, *Vol 56; No.8,* ss. 597-611.