Original article

Specification of social conflicts in democratic society

Agnieszka Araucz-Boruc (ID)

Faculty of Social Sciences, Siedlce University of Natural Sciences and Humanities, Poland,
e-mail: agnieszka.araucz-boruc@uph.edu.pl

INFORMATION	ABSTRACT
	Man is a social being, therefore, he has a group life that results in close and distant contact between diverse individuals. These contacts concern culturally disparate people holding values, desires, views or habits of variable acceptability. Therefore, we are witnessing that what some find good, others consider strange or wrong. Disputes, controversies and conflicts are characteristic of the democratic system, and pluralism is one of the constitutional foundations of democracy. The existence and clashing of differences are often the source of conflicts in democratic societies. Social conflicts have been, are, and will continue to accompany us every day, because their scale is very wide, from ordinary quarrels, even to wars. We just need to learn to deal with them, primarily through recognition, action and elimination of effects.

Introduction

Social conflicts should be considered as one of the permanent elements of collective life, they appear on all levels, both in relations between individuals, social groups and organizations, as well as in wider dimensions. They take on all sorts of forms, from verbal or physical individual interaction, to serious conflicts involving mobilization of the armed forces. Although knowledge about conflicts is growing, it must be admitted that the phenomenon of conflict still remains something not fully understood. The occurrence and course of social conflicts are conditioned to a large extent by the features of the culture in which they occur, and the tensions and contradictions that show up within the social system.

Conflict can be defined as a struggle for values and the pursuit of a better social or physical position, the desire for greater power over others and the desire to control resources in which the intent is to neutralize or eliminate rivals who prevent the individual or group or nation from achieving its values. In broad terms, conflict is any state of contradiction or non-compliance between two or more parties. Conflict between groups exists when there is a basic incompatibility in values, goals, interests, etc., so that one group will get what they want and another group will not get what they want [1] or even lose what they have.

Another way of defining conflict accentuates the states of psychological tension occurring between the parties that can be expressed by hostility or open antagonism. This approach takes full account of the psychological and conscious aspects of parties involved in conflict. Conflict can be defined as a competitive situation in which the parties are aware of the inconsistency of potential future positions and wish to occupy such positions that are inconsistent with the wishes of the other party [1], but which are perceived to be of value to the first party.

Conflict has a social character when its conditioning does not result only from the individual characteristics of the individual or group, but from the properties of its social structure. In fact, beyond internal conflicts, virtually all other conflicts should be considered as social.

Essence and identification of social conflicts

Social conflicts, in brief are conflicts between individuals or social groups (from a sociological point of view), hence can be referred to as external conflicts. In contrast, an internal conflict is a psychic conflict experienced by individuals within themselves or within their group.

Johan Galtung produced a classification of conflict, by comparing two independent criteria: types of conflicts – whether internal and external, and types of entities – individual and collective. As a result, four types of conflicts are obtained: psychic (interpersonal), inter-individual, intra-group and intergroup conflicts [1]. An interpersonal conflict is a tension within a given individual connected with the pursuit of two or more mutually exclusive goals, this form of conflict may take the following forms:

– a zero-sum conflict, that is a situation of tension in a given field in which two individuals strive to achieve the same goal for themselves, and, therefore, the resolution of the conflict results in the total victory of one of the parties and the total defeat of the other,

– conflict of mixed motives, meaning a situation of tension between individuals in which a compromise is beneficial for both parties, but the destruction of the rival's position is even more advantageous for a given party.

A group conflict, in turn, is a situation of tension in which the aspirations or views of two or more social groups or two or more people in a given group are contradictory. Generally, conflict is a process in which three basic stages can be distinguished: contradiction and their realization, attempts to solve them through struggle and resolution of the conflict by compromise, either willing or unwilling, or total victory and total defeat.

For a wider definition, the conflict stages should be presented. The first phase is a conflict situation, it is a phase of contradictions in the group or between groups, the phase of tension that arises on the basis of contradictions, promotes the formation of mental barriers and hinders interactions between individuals. The next phase is a conflict situation, it is a phase of rationalization of contradictions and the appearance of interpersonal divisions and attempts to resolve the conflict through struggle. The third phase is the post-conflict situation, the phase of elimination of the conflict and normalization of the situation, e.g. due to victory, negotiation or exhaustion, the phase of post-conflict tension [2].

Sources of post-conflict tensions arise from the conflict resolution procedure, as rarely do such procedures lead to resolving all disputable problems, most often merely dealing with those that are essential, leaving issues not important as unresolved – although they may in the future be the subject of a new conflict. Such a resolution engenders the emergence of new conflicts. Brookchmann's theory speaks about the behavior of people after the conflict,

where this is shaped by previous experience, good relations before conflict would facilitate cooperation, and bad would make it difficult. Normalization of relations is a long-term process in which it is easier to move from cooperation to conflict rather than the other way around. In the conflict, the mechanisms that intensify aggression are easily generated, while after the conflict it is difficult to create an anti-aggression mechanism. In addition, time has a negative impact on the establishment of peaceful relations and there is a principle that the longer conflict, the more difficult these relationships will be. Moreover, the shorter the time of good relations before the conflict, the more difficult it will be to establish cooperation after the conflict [3].

According to the assumptions of historical materialism, the source of all social conflicts are contradictions, This is mainly about the conflict of interests that occurs between people or between various collections that can be distinguished in any social structure [2]. In general, the following pairs of contradictions are notable:

– internal and external, that is, contradictions between egoistic goals of individual people in a given group and contradiction of goals of particular groups in a given community,

– antagonistic and non-antagonistic – contradictions that can be overcome only through fierce struggle and which occur between people who differ in their goals, but nevertheless have a common overarching objective that unites them and stimulates synergy,

– main and lateral, those which from among many other contradictions at a particular stage of development of a given community are of significant importance for its further transformations, and whose occurrence, does not play a significant role in defining the development of a given community, but can, however, modify in a certain way, its course [2].

Social conflicts have been, are and will continue to accompany us every day, because their scale is very wide, from ordinary personal interaction, whether verbal or physical, to outright intranational, international and pan-national war. We only need to learn to deal with them, primarily through recognition, action and elimination of effects.

The fact that man is a social being results in having a group life that involves contacts between people practicing different types of social systems. These contacts concern culturally differential people and lead to differences of various degrees of acceptability in values, desires, views or habits. Therefore, we are witnesses that what some find good, others consider not good. The fact that people want to pursue the same goals does not mean that they want to implement them in the same way, because every person has his own identity and individuality.

Conflict makes people aware of the existence of different sources of inequality. Indeed, in the history of societies and people, life chances have never been equal. Still, personal freedom has always been a great asset in individual and social life. After 1989, however, while Poland achieved freedom in individual and social dimensions, Poles quickly became convinced that freedom is not devoid of conflicts and crises. There is a justification here in stating that conflict is not only a result of social structure, but is the outcome of cultural processes within society, as well as in the systems of values that are preferred, and this requires an ethical approach to all crisis problems [4].

Disputes, controversies and conflicts are characteristic of the democratic system, and pluralism is one of the constitutional foundations of democracy, which means the possibility of the existence to various degrees of acceptance in a given community of different political

views, ideas, worldview systems, customs and forms of social, political and economic life. Pluralism provides a sense of complete freedom to a person by allowing him to make choices from among the many possibilities.

The existence and clashing of dissimilarities are often the source of conflicts in democratic societies, and this is often emphasized in the literature. These antagonisms, usually resulting from the struggle for interests, occur on various levels and concern almost every sphere of human life and function. Such interests manifest themselves in different forms and strengths in any heterogeneous society. Current literature points to the existence of conflicts in relation to the following types of interests [4]:

- cultural interests (access to symbolic cultural goods, preservation of one's own cultural identity, or the possibility of participating in such cultural values that are considered important and valuable),
- economic interests (access to material goods, to higher incomes, to acquiring or maintaining property),
- ideological interests (group values, goals and life aspirations, possibilities of realizing the ideals of justice, equality, freedom and dignity of the human individual),
- political interests (willingness to maintain or subordinate to a particular center of power).

Referring to the considerations of J. Sztumski [2], I will discuss the most typical or the most common contradictions in the context of which conflicts arise in a democratic society. The first type of contradiction is structural, where conflicts arise from differences between social classes, a faulty organization that causes excessive overloading of one group while at the same time underloading others, disabilities in terms of rights, access to information, etc. It is undoubtedly interesting to note that group conflicts of interest arise particularly from the sociodemographic divisions of society, such as age, sex, occupation and place of residence. It can also be stated that group conflicts of interest often result from structural contradictions that are based on generational differences [4].

The second kind of contradiction results from development disproportions, for example, the contradictions between general and local needs defined by the specific development of a given region, contradictions between technical and economic development and social and cultural development, contradictions between institutions, etc.

Other kinds of contradictions are those resulting from the free market economy. The most visible manifestations of this are the occurrence of professional categories. Strikes, rallies, demonstrations organized by miners, steel workers, railway men, etc. mean that within these categories some interests, usually of an economic nature, are crystallized, and are articulated by trade unions – also often in conflict with each other [2].

The other important issue regarding the contradictions associated with the free market economy is the mutual relation between supply and demand. A disproportionate supply of demand for needed goods or services brings about various tensions between people in connection with competition for the provision of particular goods or services. What is more, accepting for reality what is only a postulate or an intended goal, more or less distant, can become a source of many contradictions. The result of such a voluntary approach to the world are various conflict situations derived from a lack of understanding of existing values, existing social bonds, shaped institutions, etc. social phenomena, especially when undertaking actions aimed at transforming social life [2].

Moreover, simultaneous belonging of a given person to many different social groups may be a source of specific contradictions and collisions of social patterns and roles. This is particularly the case when patterns and social roles resulting from a given membership are divergent. This mainly results in internal conflicts in the people concerned, so-called conflicts of conscience, but may also cause a disruption with the environment, and thus conflicts with other people [2].

Next, there are contradictions between individual power structures in the background of divergent interests, for example, between the central and local authorities. In addition, the existence of contradictions between the various subsystems of structures that may be the source of conflicts should be pointed out, e.g. between professionals and bureaucrats, between pragmatists and ideologists [2]. A special place in the discussion of contradictions in the structures of power is, of course, the question of political pluralism. Political pluralism is not possible without recognition and guaranteeing the subjective role of the opposition in the state, and this means that the majority viewpoints will be constantly questioned or even contested – and this is recognized as having value.

Beginning with the preamble, in which the importance of social dialogue was emphasized, the Constitution of the Republic of Poland contains provisions creating a systemic basis for the differences of views not to be washed away and the contradictions of interests could be revealed. It's all about guaranteeing the freedom to create and operate political parties and other associations, as well as media freedom and the autonomy of higher education. Therefore, antagonisms that appear between different entities may constitute sources of potential conflicts.

In addition, the constitutional division of power creates additional possibilities of reflecting and deepening existing differences. The bicameral parliament and the bipolar executive power create a great opportunity for division in the sphere of authorities, but at the same time make it difficult to maintain a balance, especially if in the practice of the functioning of state organs the fundamental goal of guaranteeing individual freedom is forgotten.

A special situation is when the government and the parliamentary majority represent a different political orientation than the president, then the conflict between them seems inevitable. Unfortunately, current political culture in modern democratic countries is a culture of conflict rather than cooperation. The slow, but visible process of erosion of the common good destroyed by political interests leads to undermining the foundations of the constitutional order. Nevertheless, conflict in any social system is dangerous only when we cannot manage it. However, when we are able to control a conflict, its consequences may be beneficial to the system and people, as they favor change and development [5]. It is enough to recollect that every well-managed social conflict can lead to the growth of motivation, can foster innovation or raise knowledge about people and social systems, cements trust and restores a sense of justice. There are also known negative consequences of conflicts, such as: a sense of threat, increased negative emotions, deterioration of interpersonal relations and interpersonal communication, etc.

Conflict resolution methods

In principle, there are five styles of action in a conflict situation [6]:
- avoidance, that is, the withdrawal from cooperation with a conflict-ridden person, and which usually leads to breaking personal, professional and social contacts. This is a style typical for people for whom the same emotional tension and frustration

caused by conflict is so strong that they prefer to withdraw from the conflict, rather than try to generate a constructive solution,

– indulgence is the most commonly used method of resolving conflicts, involving the use of a stronger position in the organization by its members; surrender, like an exclusion, is not an effective solution, because the party giving up at the first opportunity again will induce conflict. This style, generally speaking, consists in acting in accordance with the interests of the opposite party, those who are focused primarily on maintaining good relations with others, even at the expense of resignation from other needs, rights or interests,

– competition – this takes place when one side of the conflict forces the other side to resign by dragging on his side persons previously uninvolved in the conflict. It is an approach to the conflict deemed "playing the game to win", where winning is a success and prestigous, while loss is perceived as weakness and humiliation. Often this approach is accompanied by the expectation of winning, hence, to achieve this goal, the persons in conflict use many measures (not necessarily honest); the choice of this style is associated with the defense of self-esteem, Still, reacting from a position of strength may be beneficial in critical situations when there is no time for discussions,

– compromise is a procedure that allows partial satisfaction of the interests of both parties; the trade-off should be taken into situations or positions where interests or held notions are less important than restoration or creation of good mutual relations or when a quick solution to the problem is necessary. When the parties in dispute are equally strong and find no allies, they often decide to "get along" with their opponent, hence, everybody involved gains something, but also loses something, but the gain is of greater importance than the loss,

– cooperation is a style resulting from the assumption that a solution can always be found that will satisfy both sides of the conflict; this is one of the most effective conflict resolution styles, and is especially useful in situations where both sides have different goals – it makes it easy to discover the real cause of the dispute. In such scenarios, more often than not, the conflict is the result of poorcommunication or lack of it, and through better communication, the parties find common solutions to resolve the causes of the conflict.

In Polish law, conciliation, mediation and arbitration are distinguished as a means of solving collective disputes.

Conciliation is reconciliation or amicability, it consists in comparing the positions of the parties, often with the participation of a third party, whose task is to confront the parties and help them to come to their own solutions [3]. The following characteristics are individualized by conciliation. First, conciliation is always voluntary and lasts as long as the parties are interested in participating in the conciliation procedure. Secondly, the parties have influence not only on the procedure, but also on the substantive and legal norms that will serve the conciliator in issuing the decision. Thirdly, the essence of conciliation is a conciliatory character, because in its wake each party without exposing itself to the role of the subject defeated in the dispute, finds a satisfactory solution to the conflict not negatively affecting the fate of further cooperation with the other party to the dispute. Fourthly, (a key constitutive feature of conciliation), the third party's decision is legally non-binding and compliance with this decision depends only on the goodwill of the parties. The basic advantages of conciliation include professionalism, speed, confidentiality, lower costs and reconciliation rather than

character antagonism. On the other hand, conciliation, as a method of out-of-court dispute resolution, is not free of a number of disadvantages, its fundamental disadvantage is its voluntary nature, so conciliation may not take place if the other party does not agree to it. Thirdly, since there are no legal guarantees that the conciliation will resolve the contentious dispute, there may be concerns about the two-instance nature of the plaintiff's claim, i.e. at the beginning through conciliation, and later when the latter turns out to be ineffective through arbitration or judicial [3].

Conflict mediation is the second way to resolve conflicts, indicated in the Act. Mediation also means reconciliation and arbitration, but it is an initiative of resolving a dispute belonging to a third party, the so-called mediator, which helps the parties in seeking a solution acceptable to the parties. In mediation, unlike in conciliation, the mediator plays a major role in seeking an agreement between the parties [3]. According to the literature on the subject, mediation is an intervention in ongoing negotiations or conflict taken by an accepted third party who has no authoritative power to make a dispute resolution decision, but helps the parties voluntarily reach a mutually acceptable agreement on contentious issues. This definition clearly defines the role of the mediator as a person who is not directly involved in the dispute, hence, is impartial, fluent in the conflict management workshop, but does not interfere in the subject matter of the contracts. Through conflict mediation, the parties are to make mutual commitments and be responsible for keeping them.

In practice, there are certain rules that the mediator should be guided by when at work. These are [7]:

- voluntary (voluntarily joining mediation),
- confidentiality (mediation is confidential, its process and results are covered by secrecy),
- mediator impartiality (the mediator does not advocate on either side, he equally engages in help for each of them),
- mediator neutrality (the mediator is not a supporter of any particular solution, he is able to accept any that those who use his services deem appropriate),
- independence of the parties in making decisions (the mediator does not make decisions for conflicted parties, does not resolve the dispute, is not a judge or arbitrator, the mediator's role is to encourage active cooperation in the search for solutions).

Considering that the course of mediation may have different character, it usually passes through the following three stages: ground preparation, which consists in establishing clear rules of conduct and gathering the necessary information; solving the problem – this means putting aside contentious issues and seeking solutions; achieving a satisfactory solution – which means that pressure is sometimes required on the participants to make a settlement.

The third form of conflict resolution proposed in the Act is arbitration, i.e. the legal form of arbitration connected with deciding as to the merits of a case. Herein, a third party (arbitrator, arbitrator, arbitrators' council or arbitration tribunal or conciliation commission) settles a collective dispute at the request of the parties or one of the parties, with the parties declaring in advance whether they will respect the issued ruling. Arbitration proceedings include four stages. The first is the contract, the parties to the conflict must give their consent in the form of concluding an agreement called an arbitration clause so that their dispute can be settled by the arbitration court. The second stage is the appointment of an arbitral tribunal, the classical model for the establishment of an arbitration court is that one party to the dispute appoints

one arbitrator, the other party – the other, and the arbitrators so elected elect a super arbiter. The third stage is the appointment of an arbitration court that can be appointed to consider one dispute – the so-called arbitrary ad hoc or permanent court. Permanent arbitration courts usually deal with matters relating to contracts concluded in international trade or for large amounts. An amicable settlement may be reached before an arbitration court and it may be concluded at any stage of the proceedings [8]. The last stage of the arbitration proceedings is the enforceability of the decision. The arbitration award is legally binding from the moment of signing by the arbitrators, but it must have an enforcement clause issued by the state court – only then it is suitable for execution, like the judgment of a state court.

For the effectiveness of arbitration as a method of resolving conflicts, the following features are decisive:

- it is voluntary – non-compulsory parties conclude a civil law contract, negotiating its terms,
- the settlement of disputes is by arbitration courts, which are not state courts,
- one instance of arbitration proceedings, no appeal to a higher instance against an arbitration award; however, Polish law provides for a complaint to a state court to set aside an arbitration award in very specific situations,
- leveling the arbitration award with a verdict of a state court by virtue of a legal provision.

Among the advantages of arbitration are: saving time and money, speed of proceedings, confidentiality of proceedings, competence of the arbitral tribunal and the authority of arbitration (specialists in a given field usually are appointed), single-instance arbitration proceedings and the enforceability of an arbitration award [8]. If the parties do not resolve the conflict by means of the previously described methods, they are left with a court case. In the case of dispute resolution, the legal process should be treated as a final exit, as it is expensive and time-consuming. In entering arbitration, it is always better first try to reach an out-of-court settlement or an amicable settlement.

The term *negotiation* had for some time, been rather unused in our everyday speech, and even when used – it was usually employed in politics and commerce. In today's world, however, it has become very popular. Negotiation skills have always been and are very desirable, because they allow individuals to effectively pursue their interests. Indeed, there is no person who would not like to "get going on their own". Negotiations as a process of reaching an agreement, have one more important feature, namely people lead them on their own behalf, on behalf of other people and on behalf of various organizations [8].

Negotiating means practicing a set of practical activities consisting of presenting viewpoints, intentions and expectations that are aimed at concluding an agreement [3]. A feature of the negotiations is the voluntary involvement of at least two parties in at least a part of it, regardless of the previous experience of these parties. Negotiations concern the division or exchange of one or more goods or resources, or resolution of one or more problems between the parties involved. The negotiation rate is not only a contract, but often a means of articulating one's own view, ambitions, sympathies and defending the self-esteem of the parties involved.

The presentation of the negotiations and their purpose presented above, unfortunately, outweighs the common perception of the one that primarily sees in them a tool for effectively resolving conflicts of interests and maintaining social relations, both in the micro and macro sphere [9]. Negotiations take place when participants of any conflict try to find a way to overcome the situation by direct talks between the parties.

Negotiations are included in the methods of resolving conflicts based on inter-activist attitudes, in other words, in which conflict resolution takes place during social interaction. Thus, the parties must establish communication with each other. In order to talk about negotiations at all, attention should be paid to the following issues: interpersonal communication, partial conflict of interest and agreement.

Negotiations can, therefore, be defined as a form of interpersonal communication aimed at reaching an agreement in the conditions of a partial conflict of interest. It should be emphasized that this should be an agreement acceptable to all participants of the negotiations. The purpose of negotiations cannot be to come to full agreement [10].

Negotiations can be positional or integrative. Among the positional negotiations, there are soft negotiations, the aim of which is to communicate at all costs, avoiding conflict, uncritical trust, submission to pressure and submissiveness. The second type of negotiation is hard negotiations, the aim of which is to win at all costs, through being relentlessly and deceitfully combative, by treating interlocutors like enemies, being demanding, acting without trust, cheating, threatening, ridiculing and humiliating. Integration negotiations are treating the conflict as a problem to be solved. Such negotiations consist of four steps: identifying and defining the problem, understanding the essence of the problem (that is recognizing the actual needs and interests of the parties as opposed to adopting positions), jointly creating alternative solutions and jointly assessing and selecting the best solutions. This leads to the choice of a solution that meets the expectations to the greatest extent, so that no one feels injured [11].

Conclusions

Conflicts can play a positive role in relation to the social structure if they are tolerated and institutionalized. It is even said that in democratic systems, they are not only harmless to the social structure, but even desirable. Through positive conflict, reforms are undertaken, social integration takes place, the adaptation processes of individuals to the changing conditions of life are intensified. Conflict in terms of one of the theoreticians is a mechanism in democratic states that allows self-regulation of the social structure. Thanks to it, the efficiency of the social system is increased and permanent optimization of the functioning of social institutions continues.

Communities differ in their susceptibility to conflict and the ability to solve them. Conflicts are less frequent where there is a high degree of consensus regarding the norms to regulate the mutual relations between their members and between groups. In stable communities, there is a general consensus as to what are the rights of citizens and authorities, and how much prestige is given to individual positions, offices and institutions. Society, however, also knows exactly what the institutions' responsibilities are. If there is any normative ambiguity in this area, then there is a field for endless conflicts. However, they are not dangerous when there are widely accepted, and, at the same time, effective procedures for solving them. If the normative consensus breaks down, the situation of a social crisis comes to the fore, and as a result, the structure of the state may even fail and the foundations of the social order may be shattered. As a result of the changes, it is no longer clear who should have and who actually has responsibilities. The norms on which the current social relations were built are disrupted. Subsequently, different groups feeling dissatisfied with the existing rules make attempts to realize their own interests on their own.

In conclusion, it is necessary to agree with the theorists of sociology and psychology indicating that it is difficult to imagine the development of the world without conflict. It is the

attempt to reconcile conflicting interests, needs and ideas that forms the basis for new ideas and solutions. Conflict, therefore, has a great potential for development, but it also gives an impulse to be combative, which will continue until one of the parties possesses this scarce good. Sociologists and psychologists, however, point out that it is not conflict that is the source of misunderstanding and struggle between people, but the way to resolve it. When we let ourselves be carried away by emotions, we stand in a lost position, escalate the conflict, and achieve the opposite effect from the intended. Therefore, knowledge of the art of negotiation allows the application of verified principles, maintaining contact with the party to the conflict and counteracts manipulation, which, in consequence, gives a chance for agreement.

Acknowledgement

Conflict of interests

The author declared no conflict of interests.

Author contributions

The author contributed to the interpretation of results and writing of the paper. The author read and approved the final manuscript.

Ethical statement

The research complies with all national and international ethical requirements.

ORCID

Agnieszka Araucz-Boruc ⓘD https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7480-8377

References

1. Słaboń A. *Konflikt społeczny i negocjacje*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego; 2008.

2. Sztumski J. *Konflikty i negocjacje jako sposoby ich przezwyciężania*. Częstochowa: Wydaw. Wydziału Zarządzania Politechniki Częstochowskiej; 2000.

3. Uniszewski Z. *Konflikty i negocjacje*. Warszawa: Prószyński i S-ka; 2000.

4. Malikowski M, Seręga Z (eds.). *Konflikty społeczne w Polsce w okresie zmian systemowych. Studia, komunikaty, eseje*. Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Pedagogicznej; 2000.

5. Balawajder K. *Komunikacja, konflikty, negocjacje w organizacji*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego; 1988.

6. Sztompka P. *Socjologia. Analiza społeczeństwa*. Kraków: Znak; 2002.

7. Denst-Sadura A. *M jak mediacje*. Głos nauczycielski. 2008;25.

8. Nęcki Z. *Komunikacja międzyludzka*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Profesjonalnej Szkoły Biznesu; 1996.

9. Cichobłaziński L. *Techniki negocjacji i mediacji*. Częstochowa: Wydawnictwo Politechniki Częstochowskiej; 2008.

10. Waszkiewicz J. *Jak Polak z Polakiem? Szkice o kulturze negocjowania*. Warszawa, Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN; 1997.

11. Hammer H. *Psychologia społeczna. Teoria i praktyka*. Warszawa: Difin; 2005.

Biographical note

Agnieszka Araucz-Boruc – Dr., is an adjunct professor at the Institute of Security Sciences at the Faculty of Social Sciences of the Siedlce University of Natural Sciences and Humanities. She received a doctorate in social sciences in the field of security science in 2013 after defending her thesis titled *Defense education of youth in Poland in the years 1945-1989*.She is the author of the scientific monograph *Security and defense in education of youth*, a scientific co-editor of three monographs by several authors, and the author of chapters in scientific monographs and scientific articles on social security, civic and patriotic education, and education for security. She is involved in organization of national and international scientific conferences and in the implementation of statutory research funded by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education. She is the Secretary of the Discipline Council of the Institute of Security Sciences, a member of the Education for Security Team of the Pedagogical Science Committee of the PAS in the *Research Sub-team – Educational Challenges for Security*, a member of the Advisory Board of the Center for Research on Safety of Transport Participants, and the Head of Postgraduate Studies in Local Government and Non-Profit Sector Education. She is the academic supervisor of degree candidates in the fields of applied criminology and national security. Scientific interests: social security, education for security, occupational health and safety, health security, and first aid.

Specyfika konfliktów społecznych w społeczeństwie demokratycznym

STRESZCZENIE	Człowiek jest bytem społecznym, z którego wynika jego życie grupowe, wynikają również kontakty między ludźmi w różnych typach systemów społecznych. Kontakty te dotyczą ludzi zróżnicowanych kulturowo i prowadzą do różnic co do wartości, pragnień, poglądów czy też nawyków. Dlatego też jesteśmy świadkami, że to co jedni uznają za dobre, drudzy uważają za nie do przyjęcia. Spory, kontrowersje i konflikty są charakterystyczne dla ustroju demokratycznego, a pluralizm jest jedną z konstytucyjnych podstaw demokracji. Istnienie i ścieranie się odmienności stanowią niejednokrotnie źródło konfliktów w społeczeństwach demokratycznych. Konflikty społeczne były, są i nadal będą towarzyszyć nam na co dzień, ponieważ ich skala jest bardzo szeroka, od zwyczajnej kłótni, aż do wojen. Musimy tylko nauczyć się radzić sobie z nimi, przede wszystkim poprzez rozpoznawanie, działanie i likwidację skutków.
SŁOWA KLUCZOWE	demokracja, bezpieczeństwo, społeczeństwo, konflikt, samoregulacja struktury społecznej

How to cite this paper