Conflict as Phase Transition: A Dynamical Systems Theory of Escalation in Coupled Organizational Networks

Boris Kriger[1,2]

[1]Information Physics Institute, Gosport, Hampshire, United Kingdom,
boris.kriger@informationphysicsinstitute.net
[2]Institute of Integrative and Interdisciplinary Research, Toronto, Canada,
boriskriger@interdisciplinary-institute.org

Abstract

We propose that conflict escalation is not a property of individuals but a **phase transition** in coupled networks—occurring when the spectral radius of interpersonal coupling exceeds aggregate decay. This reframes organizational conflict from a psychological phenomenon to a system-level variable governed by network topology.

Drawing on nonlinear dynamics and network science, we formalize conflict as a transmissible quantity propagating through organizational structures, analogous to epidemic dynamics. The framework generates a striking prediction: **in certain network configurations, escalation becomes structurally inevitable regardless of who initiates**. This removes moral personalization from conflict analysis and redirects attention to structural conditions.

We derive testable predictions, propose empirical validation comparing network properties against individual traits, and specify conditions under which the framework should be abandoned. If network coupling predicts escalation better than personality variables, this challenges four decades of individualist organizational psychology.

Keywords: phase transition, network dynamics, conflict escalation, spectral radius, coupled systems, organizational behavior

1 The Core Claim

This paper makes one central theoretical claim:

> **Escalation is not a property of people. It is a property of networks—emerging when the spectral radius of coupling exceeds aggregate decay.**

Formally:

$$\text{Escalation occurs when } \rho(\mathbf{A}) > \lambda \tag{1}$$

where $\rho(\mathbf{A})$ is the spectral radius of the interpersonal coupling matrix and λ is the system's decay rate.

This is the language of nonlinear dynamics and complex systems, applied to organizational behavior. It implies:

1. **Conflict is transmissible**—not metaphorically, but literally, through coupling terms
2. **Escalation is a phase transition**—a qualitative shift in system behavior at a critical threshold

3. **Structure dominates individuals**—network topology predicts outcomes better than personality traits
4. **Some structures escalate inevitably**—regardless of who initiates or individual intentions

These claims are strong. They challenge the individualist tradition in organizational psychology. This paper develops them formally and specifies how they can be tested and falsified.

1.1 What This Is Not

This is not primarily a synthesis of existing theories, though it draws on threshold models (Granovetter, 1978), frustration-aggression (Berkowitz, 1989), and conservation of resources (Hobfoll, 1989). The synthesis is instrumental—a way to ground the framework in established constructs.

The contribution is architectural: **translating organizational conflict into the language of coupled dynamical systems with threshold activation**. The specific functional forms are negotiable. The architecture—decay, violation, resource modulation, coupling—is the theoretical core.

1.2 Why This Matters

If the framework is correct, it reverses the standard question:

Traditional approach	This framework
"Which individuals are conflict-prone?"	"Which structures enable escalation?"
"How do we fix difficult people?"	"How do we redesign coupling topology?"
Conflict as individual pathology	Conflict as system state
Moral responsibility on persons	Structural conditions as cause

This is not merely a reframing. It has empirical consequences: network properties should predict escalation better than aggregated individual differences. Section 5 specifies the test.

1.3 Boundary Conditions

The framework models **reactive escalation**—responses to perceived violations that propagate through networks. It explicitly excludes:

- **Strategic actors** who calculate provocation for instrumental gain
- **Predatory conflict** initiated without perceived violation
- **Structural role conflicts** arising from institutional design rather than interpersonal dynamics

Including strategic actors would require game-theoretic apparatus and would dissolve the framework's clean separation of structure from strategy. This boundary is a feature, not a limitation—it keeps the theory testable.

2 The Dynamical System

2.1 State Variables

Each agent A_i has:

- **Activation level** $G_i(t) \geq 0$: intensity of conflict-oriented behavior
- **Effective threshold** $T_i(t)$: violation magnitude required to trigger response
- **Resource level** $R_i(t)$: coping capacity

2.2 The Core Equation

Activation evolves according to:

$$\frac{dG_i}{dt} = -\lambda G_i + \beta V_i(R_i) + \sum_j \alpha_{ij} G_j \tag{2}$$

Four terms, each essential:

Term	Symbol	Meaning	Source tradition
Decay	$-\lambda G_i$	Conflict intensity diminishes without fuel	Control theory
Violation response	βV_i	Threshold-triggered activation	Frustration-aggression
Resource modulation	$V_i(R_i)$	Scarcity lowers effective threshold	Conservation of resources
Coupling	$\sum \alpha_{ij} G_j$	Others' activation increases own	Network contagion

The coupling term is what makes this a network theory rather than an individual-difference model. It treats conflict as **literally transmissible** between connected agents.

2.3 The Critical Insight: Epidemic Analogy

The coupling term $\sum \alpha_{ij} G_j$ has the same mathematical structure as disease transmission in SIR models. This is not metaphor—it's isomorphism.

Epidemic model	Conflict model
Infection state	Activation level G_i
Transmission rate	Coupling coefficient α_{ij}
Recovery rate	Decay rate λ
Basic reproduction number R_0	Spectral radius ratio $\rho(\mathbf{A})/\lambda$
Epidemic threshold	Escalation threshold

This analogy yields a powerful prediction:

> **In certain network structures, it doesn't matter who starts. The system escalates inevitably.**

Just as some populations exceed epidemic thresholds regardless of patient zero, some organizational structures exceed escalation thresholds regardless of initial trigger.

2.4 The Phase Transition

Proposition 1 (Escalation as Phase Transition)**.** *The system exhibits qualitatively different behavior above and below a critical threshold:*

$$\rho(\mathbf{A})/\lambda < 1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \textit{Perturbations decay; conflicts resolve} \tag{3}$$

$$\rho(\mathbf{A})/\lambda > 1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \textit{Perturbations amplify; escalation becomes self-sustaining} \tag{4}$$

This is a **bifurcation**—a qualitative change in system dynamics at a critical parameter value. Below threshold, the system is self-correcting. Above threshold, it is self-amplifying.

The transition is sharp. Small changes in network structure near the critical point produce large changes in escalation probability. This explains why similar triggers produce different outcomes across contexts: the systems may be on opposite sides of the threshold.

3 The Architectural Core

3.1 Invariants vs. Negotiables

The framework has a fixed architecture and negotiable implementation details:

Architectural invariants (the theory):

- Four-term structure: decay + violation + resources + coupling
- Threshold-based activation
- Network-mediated transmission
- Phase transition at critical coupling/decay ratio

Negotiable specifications (implementation choices):

- Linear vs. sigmoid threshold function
- Multiplicative vs. additive resource modulation
- Linear vs. saturating coupling
- Specific functional forms

Changing the specifications tests robustness. Changing the architecture abandons the theory.

3.2 Why These Four Terms?

Each term captures an empirically documented mechanism:

Decay ($-\lambda G$): Conflict intensity fades without reinforcement. Observed in cooling-off effects, time-based de-escalation (Pruitt and Kim, 2004).

Violation response (βV): Goal-blockage triggers aggressive response. The frustration-aggression hypothesis, extensively validated (Berkowitz, 1989).

Resource modulation (R affects T or V): Scarcity amplifies stress responses. Conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989).

Coupling ($\sum \alpha_{ij} G_j$): Conflict spreads through social connections. Documented in emotional contagion (Hatfield et al., 1993), conflict spillover (Bolger et al., 1989).

The contribution is not discovering these mechanisms but **composing them into a system** where their interaction produces emergent behavior (phase transitions) not predictable from any mechanism alone.

4 Predictions

4.1 The Central Prediction

Prediction 1 (Network Dominance). Network coupling structure predicts escalation better than aggregated individual characteristics.

Test: Compare AUC of:

- Model A: Episode-mean trait anger + agreeableness + conflict style
- Model B: Spectral radius + network density + clustering coefficient

Success criterion: Model B AUC exceeds Model A by ≥ 0.08.

What this means: If true, four decades of focus on "difficult personalities" has been asking the wrong question. Structure matters more than traits.

4.2 Derived Predictions

Prediction 2 (Phase Transition). Escalation probability shows sharp nonlinearity around $\rho(\mathbf{A})/\lambda = 1$.

Test: Plot escalation rate against spectral radius / decay ratio. Look for sigmoid with steep transition region.

Success criterion: Logistic fit shows inflection point; transition region steeper than linear model.

Prediction 3 (Structural Inevitability). In high-coupling networks ($\rho(\mathbf{A})/\lambda > 1.5$), escalation probability exceeds 80% regardless of individual differences.

Test: Among episodes in high-coupling networks, variance explained by individual traits $< 10\%$.

What this means: Some structures are "doomed"—escalation is virtually certain regardless of who is involved.

Prediction 4 (Threshold Effect). Activation probability shows discontinuity at individual thresholds.

Success criterion: Regression discontinuity coefficient > 0.3 SD.

Prediction 5 (Resource-Threshold Interaction). Resource scarcity lowers effective threshold (not just amplifies response).

Test: Observed behavioral threshold correlates positively with resources.

Success criterion: $r > 0.25$, $p < .01$.

4.3 What Would Falsify the Framework

Finding	**Interpretation**
Model A $\geq$ Model B (traits beat structure)	Network theory not warranted
No phase transition (linear relationship)	Coupling matters but no critical threshold
High-coupling networks show $< 50\%$ escalation	Structure doesn't dominate
No threshold discontinuity	Threshold architecture wrong

We commit to publishing results under any outcome.

5 Proposed Empirical Test

5.1 Design

Prospective longitudinal study: measure network structure and individual traits before conflicts emerge; track escalation outcomes.

Sample: 4–6 organizations, 20–30 teams, ∼250 participants, 6-month observation.

Key measurements:

- Network coupling: interaction frequency × relationship quality matrix
- Individual traits: BFI, STAXI-2, Thomas-Kilmann
- Weekly: perceived violation, activation level, resources
- Episode outcome: escalation (reaches formal action or involves 3+ people) vs. resolution

5.2 Critical Comparison

The framework lives or dies on Prediction 1. We construct the fairest possible comparison:

Model A (Individual Differences):

$$P(\text{escalation}) = \text{logit}^{-1}(b_0 + b_1 \cdot \text{mean\_anger} + b_2 \cdot \text{mean\_agreeableness} + b_3 \cdot \text{min\_threshold}) \quad (5)$$

Uses the episode's "most volatile" participant (highest anger, lowest agreeableness, lowest threshold).

Model B (Network Structure):

$$P(\text{escalation}) = \text{logit}^{-1}(b_0 + b_1 \cdot \text{spectral\_radius} + b_2 \cdot \text{density} + b_3 \cdot \text{mean\_coupling}) \quad (6)$$

Uses only structural properties, no individual information.

Evaluation: 10-fold cross-validation, stratified by organization. Report AUC with confidence intervals.

5.3 If Network Structure Wins

If Model B significantly outperforms Model A:

- Supports the phase transition theory
- Suggests organizational interventions should target structure, not individuals
- Challenges individualist paradigm in organizational psychology

5.4 If Individual Differences Win

If Model A $\geq$ Model B:

- The network framework adds no predictive value
- Individual differences remain primary
- The elegant mathematics doesn't translate to empirical advantage
- We report this honestly and explore why

6 Implications

6.1 Theoretical

The framework proposes a **paradigm shift** in conflict research: from individual pathology to system dynamics.

This parallels developments in other fields:

- *Epidemiology:* from individual immunity to herd immunity and network structure
- *Ecology:* from individual fitness to community dynamics
- *Economics:* from rational agents to systemic risk

If validated, organizational behavior would join these fields in recognizing that system properties can dominate individual properties.

6.2 Practical

If network structure predicts escalation:

1. **Audit coupling topology** before conflicts emerge to identify vulnerable structures
2. **Redesign networks** to reduce spectral radius (fewer dense clusters, more bridging ties)
3. **Increase system decay** through cooling-off periods, delayed communication
4. **Stop blaming individuals** for conflicts that are structurally determined

Traditional intervention	This framework
Conflict resolution training	Network restructuring
Anger management	Coupling reduction
Mediation for individuals	Decay mechanisms for system

6.3 Philosophical

The framework removes moral personalization from conflict analysis.

When $\rho(\mathbf{A})/\lambda > 1$, asking "who started it?" becomes as meaningful as asking which neuron started a seizure. The system was primed; the trigger was incidental.

This has ethical implications:

- Blame shifts from persons to structures
- Responsibility shifts from participants to architects
- Intervention shifts from punishment to design

Whether this shift is desirable is a values question beyond this paper's scope. But the empirical claim is testable: do structures determine outcomes more than individuals do?

7 Conclusion

We have proposed that organizational conflict escalation is a **phase transition in coupled networks**, occurring when spectral radius exceeds decay. This treats conflict not as individual pathology but as a system state governed by network topology.

The framework makes a strong, testable prediction: network structure should predict escalation better than personality traits. If confirmed, this challenges the individualist tradition in organizational psychology and suggests that intervention should target structures rather than persons.

The mathematics are borrowed from nonlinear dynamics and epidemiology. The novelty is applying them to organizational conflict—treating activation as literally transmissible through coupling, with escalation as a critical transition.

We have specified falsification criteria and committed to publishing under any outcome. The framework may prove wrong. But if right, it suggests that some organizational conflicts are not about the people involved. They are about how those people are connected.

> **The question is not who is difficult. The question is which structures are unstable.**

A Mathematical Details

A.1 Stability Analysis

The linearized system around the zero equilibrium has Jacobian:

$$\mathbf{J} = -\lambda \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A} \tag{7}$$

Eigenvalues are $\mu_k = -\lambda + \sigma_k(\mathbf{A})$ where σ_k are eigenvalues of the coupling matrix.

The system is unstable (escalation) when $\max_k(\mu_k) > 0$, i.e., when $\rho(\mathbf{A}) > \lambda$.

A.2 Epidemic Analogy Formalization

In the SIR model, the basic reproduction number R_0 determines epidemic threshold. Here, the analogous quantity is:

$$R_{\text{conflict}} = \frac{\rho(\mathbf{A})}{\lambda} \tag{8}$$

When $R_{\text{conflict}} > 1$, the "conflict-free" equilibrium becomes unstable and small perturbations grow.

A.3 Cascade Probability Approximation

For a population with threshold distribution $F(T)$ and mean coupling $\bar{\alpha}$:

$$P(\text{cascade} \mid V_0) \approx F(V_0) \cdot \min\left(1, \frac{\rho(\mathbf{A})}{\lambda}\right) \tag{9}$$

This shows cascade probability depends on both threshold exceedance ($F(V_0)$) and network criticality ($\rho(\mathbf{A})/\lambda$).

B Measurement Instruments

B.1 Perceived Violation Scale

7 items, weekly administration (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree):

1. I was treated with less respect than I expected.
2. Decisions affecting me were made unfairly.
3. My status or standing was diminished.
4. My autonomy to do my work was restricted.
5. I had less access to resources than I should have.
6. I was excluded from conversations I should have been part of.
7. My contributions were not appropriately recognized.

Targets: $\alpha > 0.80$; test-retest $r > 0.60$; convergent validity with Organizational Justice Scale $r > 0.50$ (negative).

B.2 Conflict Behavior Coding Protocol

6-level ordinal scale:

0. **None:** No conflict behavior
1. **Acknowledgment:** Brief verbal dissatisfaction
2. **Direct communication:** Professional issue-raising
3. **Third-party involvement:** Complaints to others; ally-seeking
4. **Formal action:** Grievance, mediation request
5. **Escalated action:** Coalition building, public confrontation

Target inter-rater reliability: $\kappa > 0.75$.

B.3 Network Coupling Estimation

Coupling matrix estimated from:

$$\alpha_{ij} = w_1 \cdot \text{interaction\_frequency}_{ij} + w_2 \cdot \text{relationship\_quality}_{ij} + w_3 \cdot \text{power\_asymmetry}_{ij} \tag{10}$$

Weights calibrated on pilot data. Spectral radius computed from resulting matrix.

C Pre-Registration Template

Primary hypothesis: Network coupling structure (spectral radius) predicts conflict escalation better than aggregated individual traits.

Success criterion: Model B AUC − Model A AUC ≥ 0.08 with 95% CI excluding 0.

Falsification criterion: If Model A AUC $\geq$ Model B AUC, or if difference < 0.03, network theory is not supported.

Commitment: Results published regardless of outcome.

References

Berkowitz, L. (1989). Frustration-aggression hypothesis: Examination and reformulation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 106(1):59–73.

Bolger, N., DeLongis, A., Kessler, R. C., and Wethington, E. (1989). The contagion of stress across multiple roles. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 51:175–183.

Dollard, J., Miller, N. E., Doob, L. W., Mowrer, O. H., and Sears, R. R. (1939). *Frustration and Aggression*. Yale University Press.

Granovetter, M. (1978). Threshold models of collective behavior. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(6):1420–1443.

Greer, L. L., Jehn, K. A., and Mannix, E. A. (2008). Conflict transformation: A longitudinal investigation of the relationships between different types of intragroup conflict and the moderating role of conflict resolution. *Small Group Research*, 39(3):278–302.

Gurr, T. R. (1970). *Why Men Rebel*. Princeton University Press.

Hatfield, E., Cacioppo, J. T., and Rapson, R. L. (1993). Emotional contagion. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 2(3):96–100.

Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44(3):513–524.

Hobfoll, S. E. (2001). The influence of culture, community, and the nested-self in the stress process: Advancing conservation of resources theory. *Applied Psychology*, 50(3):337–421.

Jehn, K. A. and Bendersky, C. (2003). Intragroup conflict in organizations: A contingency perspective on the conflict-outcome relationship. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 25:187–242.

Macy, M. W. (1991). Chains of cooperation: Threshold effects in collective action. *American Sociological Review*, 56(6):730–747.

Pruitt, D. G. and Kim, S. H. (2004). *Social Conflict: Escalation, Stalemate, and Settlement*. McGraw-Hill, 3rd edition.

Schelling, T. C. (1960). *The Strategy of Conflict*. Harvard University Press.