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**Introduction**

One of the most important tasks that have to be performed by the manager is to make sure that conflicts in the team are resolved efficiently. Whenever the team is working in a competitive schedule, there would always be a chance of conflict to evolve. So in these sort of circumstances, how one should handle the conflicts when two people disagree vehemently? Should the boss have to be involved in these sorts of circumstances or allow the two parties to settle their problem themselves? In this article, most of the part that is discussed is related to the disputes that originated as the consequence of misreading other points of view. While in many cases whenever there is competition in the team, the politics is played by either side that makes the main cause of the conflict. In this whole article, this piece is missing in entirety.

**Discussion**

Whenever there is a conflict that arises between two parties because of the miscommunication in the ideas, the first role of the manager or the boss is to lead them to resolve their conflict without his involvement. The manager should make clear to them that their conflict is not in the interest of the company. Although the suggestion given in this article is that to resolve the conflict you should not act as a boss and play the role as the mediator. It is assumed by the manager to act in neutrality, taking the stakes of the organization into the mind. Some of the methods are described in the article to resolve the conflict is by listening to them combined or asking their perspective in an individual setting. Both these methods have some advantages and some disadvantages that are associated with it. For example in the individual setting, parties would be more communicative and tell you their part of the story that will ease and vent their anger. But on the other side, it has the disadvantage that is associated with it is that it would have an impact on your neutrality because it is often seen that in such settings one shows the empathy with the grief one. While on the other hand if you use the combined setting approach, there is a possibility that you might lose the control of the meeting and it would have a more detrimental effect on the process of conflict resolution.

Although there is no restriction imposed on the use of both the mechanism of individual settings and as well as combined sitting. For example, one can vent the anger in the individual sitting and then use the combined sitting in order to come to the point of resolution. At the first meeting, either the combined or individual, if the role of the mediator is played, one should only listen and make sure that an initial meeting you should show the empathy rather than sympathy. It is suggested by different researchers that using the method of meeting the two parties separately and then call the joint meeting to ask for their concerns is much better to approach conflict resolution.

Also in this article, the way of handling each party is discussed when you are resolving the conflict as a mediator. The main goal of the initial meeting is to make sure that the emotions that are related to the conflict are abated and the two parties would feel respected. Also the method of asking the parties what is the reason behind the conflict so that they can tell you their position and their interest. In my point of view, most of the cases if one party is guilty, it would make the false connotation towards the issue and the process of your investigation would be left flawed.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, it is said that if the settlement is still not reached, then the role of the mediator that is played by you should be shed and you should act like a boss. As for the last you have to handle the conflict is to use your authority to settle the dispute.