



ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

**A Thesis Submitted to the Department of
Educational Planning and Management College of
Education and Behavioral Sciences.**

**TEACHER-PRINCIPAL CONFLICTS IN SELECTED GOVERNMENT
SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF NORTH SHOA ZONE, OROMIA
REGIONAL STATE**

RESARCHER: DEMEKE SIME (BA)

DECEMBER, 2020

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Declaration

In Practical Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS IN SCHOOL LEADERSHIP

RESARCHER: DEMEKE SIME AbEBE (BA)

TEACHER-PRINCIPAL CONFLICTS IN SELECTED GOVERNMENT
SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF NORTH SHOA ZONE, OROMIA REGIONAL
STATE

Dedication

I dedicate this thesis to my wife Birhane Degefa and my three children Daniel Demeke, Dagim Demeke and Habtamu Demeke who strongly motivates me to complete my study successfully. as well as my brother Getachew Sime who advise me in all direction .in order to complete my study successfully

Statement of the author

First, I declared that this thesis is my own work and that all sources of materials used for this thesis have been acknowledged. This thesis has been submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for MA. Degree at Addis Ababa University and is deposited at the University Library to make available to borrowers under the rules of the library. I strongly declared that this thesis is not submitted to any others institutions anywhere for the award of any academic degree, diploma or certificate.

Brief quotation from this thesis is allowed without special permission provided that accurate acknowledgement of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the head the postgraduate program Director or the Head of Department of Educational Planning and Management when in his or her judgment the use of the material is in the interest of Scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author.

Name: Demeke Sime Signature: _____

Place: Addis Abeba University

Date of Submission: December- 2021

Acronyms

KETB	Kebele Education and Training Board
MoE	Ministry of Education
SRC	Students Representative Council
SPS	Statistical Package for Social Science
PTA	Parent Teacher Association
UNESCO	United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization

Biographical sketch of the author

The author was born on September 1975 in WereJarso Woredas of North Shoa Zone of Oromia regional State. He attended his primary education at Dega Borsu Primary School from grade (1-6) and (7-12) at Gohastiyon Secondary School. The author received his Bachelor Degree in Education in major management and in minor English from sent merry University in 2012. Currently the author is working as a teacher, teaching at Secondary school in North Shoa Zone. He joined school of Postgraduate Directorate Program Directorate at Addis Ababa University in 2018 for the current study.

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to praise Addis Ababa University for providing me the opportunity in the entire period of this study. Next I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to my punctual advisor Dr Abebaw Yirga Admasu for their positive, valuable, reliable professional guidance, constructive comments, suggestions and encouragement starting from proposal development up to thesis research writing and completion. Without their feedback and suggestions, I would not be able to complete satisfactorily the thesis.

Many thanks to my beloved wife Birhane Degefa for being always beside me and helped me very much when I felt things were not working out, as they should, and was a source of support, calmness and joy as well as her unreserved continuous advice and encouragement throughout my research work. Moreover I would like to Thanks my brother Getachew Sime for his un reserved valuable, continuous professional advise

Finally, heartfelt thanks department heads, school directors of secondary of North Shoa Zone for their support in filling out the questionnaire in time and their cooperation in providing me the necessary materials and Addis Ababa University,

TABLE OF CONTENTS	
DEDICATION	III
STATEMENT OF THE AUTHOR	IV
ACRONYMS	V
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF THE AUTHOR	VI
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	VII
LIST OF TABLES	X
ABSTRACT	XI
1. INTRODUCTION	39
1.1. Background of the Study	39
1.2. Statement of the Problem	41
1.3. Research Questions	43
1.4. Objectives of the Study	43
1.4.1. General objective	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.5. Significance of the study	43
1.7. Operational Definitions of Key Terms	44
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	45
2.1 Theoretical View of Conflict	45
2.2. Nature of Conflict in Organization	46
2.3. Types of Conflict and its Sources	49
2.3.1. Sources Intrapersonal Conflict	50
2.3.2. Sources of Interpersonal Conflict	51
2.3.3. Sources of Intragroup conflict	52
2.3.4 Sources of Intergroup conflict	53
2.4. Conflict Management	54
2.4.1. Managing intrapersonal conflict	56
2.4.2. Managing interpersonal conflict	56
2.4.3. Managing Intragroup conflicts	58
2.4.4. Managing intergroup conflicts	58
2.5. The Role of Educational Leaders in the Management of Conflicts	59
2.6. Effects of Conflict in Organizations	60
3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	64

3.1. Research Design	64
3.2. Description of the Study Area	64
3.3. Sources of Data	65
3.3.1. Primary source of data	65
3.3.2. Secondary Sources of data	65
3.4. Population, Sample and Sampling Techniques	65
3.5. Methods of Data Collection	67
3.5.1. Questionnaire	67
3.5.2. Interviews	68
3.5.3. Document review	68
3.6. Procedures of Data Collection	68
3.7. Methods of Data Analysis	69
3.8. Ethical Considerations	69
4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	70
4.1. Characteristics of Respondents	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.2 Conflict in the Schools	70
4.3. Types of Conflict Observed in Schools	51
4.3.1 Sources of Intrapersonal Conflict	53
4.3.2 Source of Interpersonal Conflict	53
4.3.3 Sources of Intragroup Conflict	59
4.3.4 Source of Intergroup Conflict	63
4.3.4 Source of Intergroup Conflict	64
4.4. Conflict Management Strategies	68
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	74
5.1. Summary	74
5.2. CONCLUSION	78
5.3. Recommendations	80
6. REFERENCES	84
7. APPENDICS	89

List of Tables

1. Sample Schools	30
2. Characteristics of Respondents	34
3. Whether Conflict exist in the schools	37
4. Common Cause factor leading to conflicts	38
5.Types Conflict found in Schools	42
6. Intrapersonal Conflict and its Sources	44
7. Interpersonal Conflict and its Basic Source	49
8. Intra Group Conflict and Basic sources	55
9. Intergroup Conflict and Its Basic Source	59
10. Conflict Management Strategies	64

Abstract

This paper is discussed and explore about the teacher-principal conflict in selected government secondary schools of North Shoa Zone in Oromia Region states.

The purpose of this study to assesses the common sources of conflict, types of conflict, strategies used to minimize conflict .

Methods- In order to achieve the objective, the researcher use the descriptive survey research design. Both quantitative and qualitative approach was used to collect the data

Sources of data for this research was collected from both primary and secondary sources.

The primary sources of data were gathered from secondary school leaders ,Teachers, student council PTA and KETB.The secondary sources data were recorded documents, feedbacks and reports

Sampling Procedures and techniques -The teachers were selected using stratified random sampling whereas school leaders were selected using available sampling technique .On the other hand, the schools in North Shoa were also selected using simple random sampling.

Instrument of data collection-The data from each respondent was collected using questionnaire. and interview. Both open and close ended questionnaires were prepared. Quantitative data collected through questionnaire .

Techniques of analysis data –data analyzed using statical tools, t-test, mean scores, standard deviation, p-value using spss version 20.T

The main finding come out from this study- were communication barriers, uncomfortable working environment, lack of participatory decision, lack of clarity of authority structure difference in perception task interdependent working activities, dignity, security and equity are found to be the major source of conflict

The most common types of conflict exist in schools- were interpersonal and intergroup conflict, collaborative compromising approach and problem solving were the strategies to minimize conflict in the schools.

Based on the finding the following conclusion was drawn. These, there is no healthy communication, network, less participatory decisions on the school finance and resources

allocations, inadequate facilities in the schools, undefined role and authority structures there were no magnified open discussion, description of role and responsibilities regular meeting between teachers and school leaders in the schools to manage conflict. inappropriate use of collaborative and Compromising approach strategies for handling conflicts and poor accountability on the use of school finance and resource allocation by the school principals from the finding it is possible to conclude that conflict has more negative influence on schools rather than positive one.

1.I-NTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

Conflict involves two or more persons or groups with respect to perceived blockage of goal by either of the parties towards an object otherwise opportunity of interest. It implied therefore that when the parties are not cooperating, they are opposing and conflict emerges. Conflict is inevitable in all human social interactions due to their varying backgrounds, beliefs or values and experiences, all gendering towards misunderstanding preceded by relationship this basic and inherent feature of relationship, be they relationships between and among individuals and one group and another, one party and another or between one departments and another in secondary schools.(Ugwuegbu, 1999).

Pilgrim (2004) states that without conflict growth is limited. It is feared and avoided by school leaders because they do not know how to deal with conflict. Since unresolved conflict can be as poisonous to the efficiency in secondary schools as the virus is to the computer. Having an understanding about how people deal with conflict gives the school leaders an additional tool for managing schools properly. Conflict management strategies are one of the most important social skills required of leaders for growth and high performance in the schools. A school is a complex social system in which a wide range of activities takes place to seek specific goals of the schools. The main participants in the school system are parents, students, teachers, principals and other administrative staffs with different backgrounds and interests. However, the interaction of these groups and individuals in the dynamic school context may not always be in agreement, and conflicts may be some of the outcomes. Wherever there is interaction, there may be

conflict. So the participants have the potential for producing both highly constructive and destructive consequences for school functioning (Rahim, 2001).

Whenever individuals with varying needs, values, and personalities come together within school structure, it could be considered as expression of hostility, negative attitudes, antagonism, aggression, rivalry and misunderstanding. It is also associated with situations that involve contradictory or irreconcilable interests between opposing parties in the schools.

Holt (1993) States that Conflict is indeed a category of school system and it is furthermore seen as a fundamental and constructive part of school organization. So conflict is not just an inevitability of school life but may be seen as a process through which school grows and develops overtime. Conflict is ranked among few basic forms of human interaction and is thus an inevitable and integral part of life, Margaret (2007). stated that efficient management should ensure the required cooperation among individuals and bring about agreement harmony in contrast, conflict within a school as a normal and acceptable state of affairs. In fact, too little conflict in a school could cause stagnation and while uncontrolled conflict could cause over conformity team work may deteriorate and distrust may grow among individual group who need to cooperate in their efforts and for individuals, some feel defeated while the self-image of others will decline (Carter, 2008).

According to Nelsons-Jones (1995) Explains that not only can conflict in the workplace be a cause of stress and unhappiness but it also can lower their outputs and in the extreme causes, bring strikes. Furthermore, emphatically states that many times in the midst of conflict, opposing individual or groups to put their own interests or goals above those of the organization, resulting in the lessening and destructive impacts on the school organization and the member's activities (Kinard,1986). This indicated that conflict in a school needs effective management. Each conflict situation must be dealt with individually according to its unique characteristics. No one best style work in all situations to control conflict, even within a single school (Robinson, 2000).Communication barriers, role ambiguity, unclear expectations, or rules, unresolved prior conflicts, competition for scarce resources among teachers are some of the factors that may lead to conflict in schools.

Due to the dynamic nature of conflicts when one source of conflict is removed it was replaced by another so through continuous research activities were required in the area). Local researchers on conflicts that arose in schools are limited but much remains to be done.

Fikru(1993) point out that dissatisfaction of some teachers and worker, unnecessarily dominating (authoritative) of school leaders dissatisfaction in performance evaluation system, lack of fulfilling transfer requests of staff interference of educational authorities Is a source of conflict. Gebretensay (2002.) find out that communication problems, outdated rules and guidelines, bad work environment factors that may cause generating conflict.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Conflict is in particular are unavoidable situation in day to day human life. In the school there is a conflict between teachers and students, teachers and the surrounding community. Much attempt were done to minimize conflict but even if one source of conflict is resolved it will replaced by another conflict (Hanson, 1991).

Conflict is considered to have both positive and negative impact in organizations. Basically, conflict is not a problem but the way how of handling is a problem. Carter (2008), find out conflict received through dialogue and persuaded to the peace without further problem if more attention given for how conflict should be treated. In addition, Holt (1993) pointed out that the aspects of conflict which leads to hostility, negative attitude, antagonism, aggregation rivalry and miss-understanding between school leaders and teachers. Most of such kinds of conflicts are because of lack of skills to handle it.

Furthermore, Nelsons (1995) on conflict lessening in school emphasis organizations between teachers and school leaders which hinder the impact of school goals lead to violence because of not well treated. Most of the studies were conducted on the issue but still no one gave the final solution because the way conflict emerges is different and still it needs further study. On the other hand,

school leaders in particular and teacher in general might be unable understand and identify the level of conflict and its sources and the strategies to minimize conflict clearly. Besides this there could be lack of clear and standardized strategies of conflict management in secondary schools. Due to the dynamic nature of conflicts when one source of conflict is removed it were replaced by another (through continuous research activities were required in the area). Local researchers on conflicts that arose in schools are limited but much remains to be done. Fikru,(1993) point out that dissatisfaction of some teachers and worker, unnecessarily dominating (authoritative) school leaders, dissatisfaction in performance evaluation system, lack of fulfilling transfer requests of staff interference of educational authorities Gebretensay (2002) find out that, conflict generating factors in schools such as communication barriers, following outdated rules and guidelines, bad work environment, incapability of educational leaders, lack of professional commitment of teachers, resistance to change among teachers in the workplace, Furthermore, Fikru (1993) also stated the dissatisfaction of some teachers and administrative workers because of unnecessary domination of school leaders, like dissatisfaction in performance evaluation system and lack of fulfilling transfer requests of staff. Gonie (1998) find out that career development and teacher's performances evaluation system is a factors leading to conflict in the schools. In addition researcher Gebretensay(2002) and Fikru(1993) focused on Addis Ababa secondary school at Regional level where as (Genie, 1998) studies conflict on the context of Amahra region secondary schools focused that on the general sources of conflict and types conflict at regional level and none of them had not focused at zonal level.

The researcher study concentrated on sources of conflict, type of conflict, strategies to manage conflict and the impact of conflict in selected government secondary schools of North Shoa Zone and it needs more emphasis teachers-principal conflict and its impact in secondary schools specifically which had not studies in North Shoa Zone as far as the knowledge of the researcher conducting on conflict centering specific zone on conflict and its impact. This is crucial and timely used to identify the specific problem found in the studied zone This study conducted to identify sources, type of conflict, impacts, and alternative strategies to minimize conflict. Therefore, the main purpose was to explore Teacher-principal Conflict and its impact in selected government secondary Schools of North Shoa Zone.

1.3. Research Questions

The research was intended to find possible solutions to the following basic questions.

1. What types of conflict between teachers and principals?
2. What are the sources of conflict between teachers and principals in secondary school of North Shoa Zone?
3. What are the strategies used by school principals to solve the observed types of conflict?
4. What are the strategies used to minimize the conflict between teacher and principal in secondary school of North Shoa Zone?

1.4. Objectives of the Study

The general objective of the study is to explore teacher- principal conflict in selected government secondary schools of North Shoa Zone.

1.5. Significance of the study

This study was assumed to be very important since it was expected to benefit the following bodies. Teachers, principals and other educational officials may get some ideas on how to overcome teacher-principals conflict in selected secondary schools. The students and parents may benefit from the study to identify the existing problems with possible corrective measures. And also, other researchers may benefit from the study in that it may serve as basis for studying in related areas. Finally, the findings of such a study provided insight to school leaders, teachers and concerned educational authorities help them to identify causes and adopt appropriate strategies to manage conflicts effectively.

1.6. Delimitation of the Study

Conflicts are currently problems at all levels of school systems all over the country. But, the focus area of the problem was delimited to selected government secondary schools of North Shoa Zone, Oromia regional state. North shoa zon has 14 woredas. Since this zone very wide and difficult to manages all woredas in the sample, the researcher delimited to seven woredas purposely. The researcher was select seven government secondary school from the sample woredas of the zone using simple random sampling method.

1.7. Operational Definitions of Key Terms

Conflict: is opposition or hostility, which leads to either passive or violent resistance in the school between the principal and teacher in secondary schools.

Conflict management- is a way in which principals and teacher takes an active role and intervenes in conflict episode in secondary schools.

Principals: -Refers an individual responsible for initiating instruction a particular discipline includes principals, vice-principal's.

Secondary school: - Refers to school system established to offer secondary school education by public for grade 9 to 10 in North Shoa Zone.

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This section is devoted to treating some important topics which are related to organizational conflicts in general and that of school teacher-principal conflicts in particular. The topics dealt with are: the nature of conflict, causes of conflict, types of conflict sources of conflict, strategies of managing conflict the role of principals in managing conflict and impact in secondary schools.

2.1 Theoretical View of Conflict

Holt (1993) describes four distinct views conflict. These are traditional view argues that every conflict always be stopped as soon as possible. In fact, the term conflict was used synonymously with the term violence and destruction. In school system, conflict has been discouraged and has been recognized as bad for school. In fact, principal has been evaluated for the absences or presences of conflicting favors this idea briefly stated as the following an educational leader may view conflict as unnecessary and harmful to an organization if this is the philosophical foundation, the leaders' reaction would be to fear its occurrence and to eliminate all the evidence of conflict.

Behavioral view argues that conflict is an inevitable consequence of group and organizational behavior. Because it cannot be eliminated, proponents argue it must be accepted and should be encouraged as a way of broaching carefully protected issues that need airing and resolution and interactionists views suggests that an unusually harmonious environment is not conducive to growth because it makes individuals overly quit. Creating anxiety will be necessary to instigate changes (Owens, 1998)

Finally, an emerging view recognizes that individual imperfections make conflict inevitable, inexcusable not to control it. In contrast, the views see harmony and tranquility as inherently good. Although behaviorists, inter actionists and emerging views of conflict accept the inevitability of conflict, they differ in the ways of treating conflict (Ackerman, 2003)

Mayer (2001) identified three-dimensional perspective of viewed as cognitive(perception), emotional (feeling) and behavioral (action) dimensions. This three-dimensional perspective can helpus understand the complexities of conflict and why a conflict sometimes seems to proceed in contradictory directions. Cognitive (perceptions), conflict is a belief or understanding that one's own needs, interests, wants, or values are incompatible with someone else's and Conflict also involves an emotional reaction to a situation or interaction sign as disagreement of some kind. The emotion felt might be fear, sadness, bitterness, anger, or hopelessness.

The behavioral component may be minimal, but the conflict is still very real to the person experiencing the feelings. Conflict also consists of the actions that we take express our feelings, articulate our perceptions, and get our needs met in a way that has the potential for interfering important to with someone else's ability to get his or her need. Obviously, the natures of a conflict in one dimension greatly affect its nature in the other two dimensions. People can go rapidly in and out of conflict, and the strength or character of conflict along each dimension can change quickly and frequently. And even though each of the three dimensions affects the others, a change in the level of conflict in one dimension does not necessarily cause a similar change in the other dimensions. Sometimes an increase in one dimension is associated with a decrease in another dimension (Owens, 1998).

2.2. Nature of Conflict in Organization

Conflict may involve individual or group disagreements, struggles, disputes, quarrels, or even physical fighting. It ranges from work issues of responsibility, power, authority, and ethics to interpersonal matters like misunderstandings, difference of opinion. (Erasmus and Marietta, 2000) explain that poor communication between two persons cause conflict. This conflict can be harmful to employee satisfaction and job performance if it becomes excessive and unmanageable. Conflict also rampantly occurs at school. Principals have experienced with many problems of school administration such as financial problem, school climate and school facilities. Conflict management also is a part of school administration problem. Conflict happens whenever and wherever in school

hence principal's decision making can influence everyone and control the situation to get better or worse. Unresolved conflicts can lead to job dissatisfaction, high absenteeism and turnover, prolonged disruption of activities, and lack of concerted effort by organization members (De Janasz, et al, 2006).

Mohammad and Raman (2011) Nature of Conflict stressed that conflict is a fact of life in organizations. Basically, the factors of organizational conflict in school can be classified into two main categories: structural factors, which relate to the nature of the organization and the way in which work is organized; and personal factors, which relate to differences between organizational or school members. Structural aspects are likely to cause conflicts. They are specialization, common resources, goal differences, interdependence, authority relationships, status differences, jurisdictional ambiguities and roles and expectations. Conflicts may arise. For example, when one may have insufficient knowledge of the other's job responsibilities, dissatisfaction in either party may exist. It is anticipated that the management of organizational conflict involves channeling the energies, expertise, and resources of the members of conflicting groups for synergistic solutions to their common problems or attainment of overall organizational goals (Wright, 1990).

Goal differences is identified that normally groups or departments in the organization have different and incompatible goals, increasing the chances of employees experiencing conflict and Interdependence Sometimes one employee must depend on another to complete a task. When workers are in an interdependent situation, it is easy to blame a co-worker when something goes wrong (Champoux, 2003).

De Janasz, et al (2006) stated that human beings are unique who possess a variety of physical, intellectual, emotional, economic, and social differences. However, some organizations are creating a more egalitarian appearance to reduce conflicts that result from status differences. Each party has a different understanding of that role for example one teacher who has many roles at the same time, teaching students in many classes, being a consultant for students and working for finance department in schools.

Personal Factors: according to Rahim (2001) stated that the most common personal factors associated with schools conflict are skills and abilities, personality conflicts, perceptions, diversity, and personal problems. Skills and abilities usually the members of a department or work team have different levels of skills and abilities. Conflict can result when an experienced employee must work with a novice who has good theoretical knowledge but few practical skills. For example, a long-teaching teacher in school who was graduated many years ago and she is familiar to teach in the old way of teaching will have a conflict with young newcomer teacher who has an advance technique of teaching

Durbin (2005) admitted that personality conflicts are a reality in any group setting, including the workplace. There always seems to be at least one co-worker who is difficult to get along with. One of the most difficult personality traits is abrasiveness. An abrasive person is often hardworking and achievement-oriented, but critical and insensitive to others' feelings. Other irritating personality traits include laziness and gossiping.

Poor communication is common cause of conflict which can lead to and allow barriers to be erected. Probably the easiest way to prevent do conflict is to ensure good communication. However, both too little and too much communication can lead to conflict. On the one hand, when there is too little communication, associates not know enough about each other's intentions, goals, or plans. Coordination becomes difficult, and misunderstandings are more likely to occur, which can result in conflict. On the other hand, too much communication can also result in misunderstandings that cause conflict conceptualizing conflict taps an interactive process manifested in incompatibility, Disagreement, or dissonance within or between social entities (Hitt et al, 2006)

.Kirkwood (2002), various types of conflict that exist in organizations include data conflicts, structural conflicts, relationship conflicts, and interest conflicts. Conflicts can lead to disputes, grievances, lawsuits complaints, strikes, and disciplinary actions. Conflict can occur at a number of levels of human functioning. Conflict in your head between opposing motives or ideas is shown by your "internal dialogue" and is at the intrapersonal level, Fisher(2000) Conflict inter-group conflict occurs between collections of people such as ethnic or racial groups,

Cormack et al (1996). International conflict occurs between states at the global level. Competition for resources certainly plays apart, but value and power conflict are often intertwined and sometimes predominate. The differences are articulated through the channels of diplomacy in a constant game of give and take, or threat and counter threat, sometimes for the highest of stakes. Mechanisms of propaganda can lead to many of the same social psychological distortions that characterize interpersonal and intergroup conflict (Fisher, 2000) two or more people or social units. The literature tries to confine itself to conflicts in organizational life -organizational conflict. In most cases, organizational conflicts involve interpersonal conflict and intergroup conflict.

2.3. Types of Conflict and its Sources

Conflict arises when interests collide usually as the results divergent in organizational goals personal ambition, group loyalties, demand on scarce resources Therefore, conflict originate from multitude of sources found at individual and organizational level in institutions. That is within and between informal organizational level, within or between formal organizational level and between formal and informal organizational level (Rahim, 1996).

According to Plunkett and Attner(1989), the sources of conflict include; shared resources, differences in goals, difference in perceptions and values, disagreements in the role requirements, nature of work activities, individual approaches, and the stage of organizational development.

Gray and Starke(1998)also suggested that there are six sources of conflict. These are: Limited resources interdependent work activities, differentiation of activities, communication problems, differences in perceptions and the environment of the organization. According to these writers, conflict can also arise from a number of other sources, such as individual differences, unclear authority structures (people don't know how far their authority extends), differences in attitude, task asymmetries (one group is more powerful than another and the weaker group tries to change the situation, difference in time horizons (some departments have a long-run view and others have a short -run view).

According to Deutsch (2000) possible sources of conflicts are poor communication the alignment or the amount of resources is insufficient including inconsistent, missing, too strong or uninformed leadership at any level in organization,

2.3.1.Sources of Intrapersonal Conflict

Conflict within the intrapersonal, can indicate the presence of, opposing, divergent and conflicting ideas, feelings and activities. Characteristics of such tension are uncertainty, hesitation, stress, anxiety, depression and insomnia. For example, a principal might be task orientated at the expense of human relations. This can cause stress within the principal if he/she has to decide whether to admonish an educator whose work is not up to standard. . Intrapersonal conflict is caused by poor person- environment fit, poor time management, underestimation or over estimation of skills, and assigned tasks that do not bring much goals, interests, values or abilities, lack of confidence, feeling of powerlessness, physical body but it often occupies ones thought and cause a great deal of emotion. (Hart, 2001).

The primary sources of intrapersonal conflict as suggested by Kinard (1988) are; conflicting needs, role ambiguity, incompatibility of in the schools and personal values. At the individual level, behavioral scientists have asserted personality as :The dynamic organizations within the individual of those need dispositions that govern his/her unique reactions to the environment. In other words, individuals with the same formal responsibility in a school organization may perceive these differently because of differences in their personalities.

There are three basic types of intrapersonal conflicts as indicated. Kundu and Tutoo,(1989). Approach-approach conflict, refers to the conflict between positive valences that are equal in strength), approach- Avoidance conflict, (occurs when a person has to deal

with a situation which possesses both positive and negative aspects) and avoidance. Avoidance conflict occurs when each of the competing alternatives possesses negative (consequences). Intrapersonal conflict exists within an individual him/her self. It arises from conflicting goals and interests, lack of required ability for a particular job, lack of facilities, rules and regulations and when his/ her path is blocked by other people. Such conflicts can cause a person frustrations, tension and anxiety. In general, the sources of intrapersonal conflict are mainly structural; they are situational imposed, and these are mainly characterized in the form of five identified antecedents 'sources of intrapersonal conflicts. (Rahim,1996) survey report identifies the major causes of such conflict as: assignment and goal incongruous, inappropriate demand on capacity, school structure, creating conflicting goals, policies, and delayed decisions, supervisory styles, and position

2.3.2. Sources of Interpersonal Conflict

These types of conflict occur between one individual and another who are brought together in work place or any elsewhere confrontations between individual and another occurring where they have to complete for limited resources(Carter,2008). He also said that employees are concerned about their position, status, power etc. within the school organizations and any encroachment on them, also they are often competing with each other for the cognition approval and promotion Interpersonal conflict is broadly considered as disagreements, incompatible interest concerning goals, policies, rules and discordant behavior that creates anger, distrust, fear and rejection resentment. This is the most common and visible type of divergence in schools and other organizations where people are involved. The origins of such discord can also lie outside the school organization, for example, two colleagues may be competing for the chairmanship of a tennis club and this can be transferred to school activities (Westhuizen, 1991).

Kinard (1988) identified three primary sources of interpersonal conflict. These are personality difference, power struggles, and competition. Interpersonal conflict involves conflict between two or more individuals and is probably the most common and most recognized conflict. This may involve conflict between two departmental managers who are competing for limited capital and manpower resources. Likewise, interpersonal conflicts can develop when there are three equally deserving professors and they are

all up for promotion, but only one of them can be promoted because budget and positional constraints also described about the occurrence of interpersonal conflict. He said. It occurs between two more persons when attitudes, motives, values, expectations, or activities are incompatible and if the individuals perceive themselves to be in disagreement.

2.3.3.Sources of Intragroup conflict

Intragroup conflict refers to disagreements of differences among the members of a group or its subgroups regarding the goals, functions, or activities of the group (Carter,2008) members of the same group (department, or two or more subgroups within a group) develop conflict either substantive or affective one, based on intellectual disagreement, or on emotional responses to a situation

Gorden(1998) describes intragroup conflict as largely interpersonal conflict between persons. Interpersonal conflict is always present in groups because individuals differ in terms of values, beliefs, attitudes and behavior. As a result, some people are more attracted to some than to others. The better underlying relationships, the easier it is for people to work together. Conflicts in small groups can, however, play a constructive role since it can stimulate creativity and renewal in that they start to communicate and work together as a unit. There are multiple factors which affect intragroup conflict. Among the major factors, leadership style is to be the primary source of this conflict. Group composition and size, Group cohesiveness and group think and external threats and their outcomes are also the sources of intragroup conflict.

2.3.4 Sources of Intergroup conflict

Intergroup conflict emerges between two or more groups of people (Larson and Mildred, 2000) define Intergroup conflict as oppositions and clashes that arise between two or more groups while indicate that such conflict is highly intense and costly to the group involved. Intergroup conflict can therefore occur between two or more schools.

According to Ivancevich and Matterson (2002) intergroup conflict within organization occurs at three levels. That is horizontal level, vertical level and line staffing that explains as follows. Horizontal level refers to clashes between groups of employees at the same hierarchical level in organization. in school situation horizontal conflict will occurs if department desires a larger proportions of scarce resources at the expense of other departments. Vertical conflict occurs when supervisors try to control subordinate resists the control and line staff conflict is a clash over authority relationship

Jennings and wattam(2005) indicate line staff conflict can easily occur from different organizational roles of line and staff. An example is where the staff decisions taken by the personnel department(a staff function), the staff function is taken by the department. This implies conflict in the schools can be occurring at different level and also conflict resolution paramount to effective management of the schools. different groups in the school, such as different departments, especially if they are competing for scarce resources like number of educators, time allocation for extramural activities, textbooks and other learning material, teaching aids and so on.

Van der Bank (1995)intergroup conflict refers to differences and clashes between groups, departments, or divisions within an organization. (Hellriegel and Slocum 1998). According to these writers, the causes of intergroup conflicts are: task interdependency, task dependencies, inconsistent performance criteria and rewards, intergroup differences and problems in sharing scarce common resources.

Organ and Bateman(1991) indicated three major factors that contribute to intergroup conflicts in organizations. First, the need for joint decision making creates potential for conflict. This refers to the dependence and interdependence over and between groups dictated by the systems nature of organizations. Second; the difference in goals: - multiple goals exist within the same organization. This is because different individuals and groups develop different goals by virtue of internally inconsistent reward systems, competition for scarce resources, etc.At last, but not least, Kinard (1988) summarized that there are four primary sources of intergroup conflict. These are limited resources, communication problems, conflicting interests, and over lapping tasks.

2.4. Conflict Management

This section deals with conflict management strategies. Properly managed conflict can lead to an outcome that are productive and enhances the health of the school and lead to create innovation but if ineffective management of conflict, on the other hand, leads to creates frustration, deteriorating organization climate and finally increasing. Compromising, collaborating, Open discussion, Professionalism and meritocracy in appointment school leaders, and legal disciplinary measures are the strategy that minimizes conflict in the school

Motivation is an integral aspect of human behavior that psychologist has suggested manage conflict and have invested great interest in understanding better. Moreover, even with the most widely visioning, conflict will arise; each conflict to be managed will comprise a different combination of impediment to favorable change or will have different variation of similar impediment. Thus success in managing conflict by the visioning school leaders will be determined by the strategy they select in managing conflict(Bono and Judge, 2003).

According to Owens (2004) states that frequent and powerful conflict can have a devastating impact on the behavior of people in organizations. Such conflict results in physical and psychological withdrawal and is a widely occurring phenomenon in schools that is often written off as laziness on the part of teachers who have been spoiled by soft administrative practices. Management of

conflict can lead to outcomes that are productive and enhance the health of the organization and frequently creates a climate that exacerbates the situation and is likely to develop a downward spiral of mounting frustration, deteriorating organizational climate, and increasing destructiveness.

Chandan (1994) lends us general ideas as to how we deal with conflicts. According to there are four guiding principles that are used for conflict management, these are Preventing conflict according him four preventive measures are taken in the management of conflict. Goal structure should be clearly defined and the role and contribution of each unit and the individual in these units towards the organizational goal must be clearly identified. Reward system is fair compensation system must be there in order not to create individual competition or conflict within units of the schools. The greater the trust among members of unit, the more honest and open the communication among individuals and unit should be encouraged to communicate openly with each other so that they can all understand each other's problems and help each other when necessary. Coordination properly coordinated activities reduce conflict (swart 2001)

Resolving behavioral Conflict has five primary strategies for dealing with and reducing the impact of behavioral conflict are identified. These are ignoring the quarrel: - In certain situations, it may be advisable for managers to play passive role and avoid it all together. The parties involved in the conflict may themselves prefer to avoid conflict. Smoothing this simply means covering up the conflict by appealing for the need for unity rather than addressing the issue of conflict itself. Compromising in dealing with compromising each party gives up something and also gains something. This technique of conflict resolution is very common in negotiations between the labor unions and management bodies. Forcing is this is the technique of domination where the dominator has the power and authority to enforce his own views over the opposing confecting party (Gorden, 1997)

Fisher (2000) states that strategies of managing conflicts are problem solving, resolving structural based conflicts, stimulating conflict then problem solving involve confronting the conflict in order to seek the best solution to the problem. This approach objectively assumes that in all schools, no matter how well they are managed, there will be differences of opinions which must be

resolved, through discussions and respect for differing viewpoints. This technique is very useful in resolving conflicts arising out of semantic misunderstandings. Resolving structural based conflicts can be solved or prevented by redesigning organizational structure and work flow and stimulating conflict is pointed out earlier that under certain circumstances conflicts necessary and desirable in order to create changes and challenges with in the organization.

Gray and Nooks (1995) states that situation, management would adopt a policy of conflict stimulation so that it encourages change and innovation. Some of the factors that stimulate or create conflict are too much satisfaction with the status quo, low rate of employee turnover, shortage of new ideas, strong resistance to change, friendly relations taking precedence over organizational goals and excessive efforts at avoiding conflict

2.4.1.Managing intrapersonal conflict

Intrapersonal conflict is the conflict within an individual. Unless it is carefully handled, It Cause a person frustrations, tension and anxiety (Carter, 2008). According to him its management Involves matching the individual goals and role expectations with the needs of the tasks and with the role demand in order to optimize the goal of the individual and the organization as well. Individual conflict can sometimes be resolved by reassessment and new ranking of the value in the choice situations. This results is either of a change in the situation or because of the development of new insight or understanding on the part of educational leader.

2.4.2.Managing interpersonal conflict

Different strategies may be used to handle Interpersonal conflict. Blake and Mouton in (Rahim and Bonoma, 2001) presented five styles for managing this type of conflict. These are avoiding, accommodating, competing, compromising and collaborations.

Rashid and Archer(1989) listed three possible strategies that are used to manage interpersonal conflicts. The first one is win-lose strategy: - In this approach only one person wins while the other person suffers from the humiliation of losing. But there are cases

where personal dominance by the boss, rule by majority, and or rule by powerful minority use this strategy for the proper management of this type of conflict. The second style is lose- losing strategy is a "compromising" technique in which everyone gains a little but lose a lot-by compromising standards, qualities, and other important values; but resolving the conflict to a certain extent. The last one is win-win strategy. This states that "everybody can win and nobody loses." This involves realistic, goal oriented, problem-solving efforts leading to discussions by consensus. In this case, people tend to be problem-centered than ego-centered. They carry out open and honest transactions with each other, focusing on goals and using an integrative strategy so that both parties stand to gain.

Rahim (1996) suggested five styles. These are, integrating which involves openness, exchange of information, and examination of differences to reach a solution acceptable to both parties. It involves problem solving which may lead to creative solutions. Obliging is also called smoothing, which refers to the tendency to minimize or suppress the open recognition of real or perceived differences in conflict situations while emphasizing common interest (Hellriegel and Slocum, 1998). In this case, the leader acts as though the conflict will pass with time and appears to the need for cooperation. This style is effective on a short-term basis. Dominating is similar to win lose orientation or forcing behavior to win one's position. The successful use of dominating style results in outcomes that are satisfactory to only one of the parties. There are extreme emergencies and quick action is necessary unpopular course of action must be taken for long term organizational impact and survival; and when others are trying to take advantage of someone, and the person needs to take quick action for self-protection. Avoiding is the tendency to with draw from or remains neutral in conflict situations. Compromising is referring to both parties give up something to make a mutually acceptable decision This is a give- and take approach involving moderate concern for both self and others.

Problem-solving is a mechanism in which the cases are looked into and eliminated through corrective action. Scientific approach to problem solving and its steps are elaborated by (UNESCO, 1998) as follows: Recognize that the problem exists, Collect facts pertaining to it; Analyze and classify information; Establish one or more hypothetic solutions; Select each one and assess feasibility;

Select the optimal solution and try it; and Check and make adjustment if necessary. Thus, conflict-resolution is an important aspect of problem-solving. But, (Rahim and Bonoma, 1996) suggested that there is no best style for handling conflict-it all depends on the situation

To sum up, in terms of management style people responds to conflict management in different ways. These ways are shift between the degree of cooperativeness and the degree of assertiveness. Cooperativeness is the desire to satisfy another party's needs and concerns while assertiveness is the desire to satisfy one's own needs and concern (Schermehorn and Chappell, 2000).

2.4.3. Managing Intragroup conflicts

It is suggested that team building is the prominent method among others to manage Intragroup Conflict. It helps the group members to learn the integrative or collaborative styles of behavior in handling disagreements. It was also noted that negotiation is another technique that can be effectively used together with team building intragroup conflict can be reduced by transferring one or more of the conflicting members to other units. This type of conflict may also be reduced by making a group more cohesive and homogeneous through interventions for organizational development. Principals' relevant qualification is needed. The head of the department or the manager can also affect the amount of conflict by altering the reward system, rules, procedures, and goals (Rahim and Bonoma, 2001).

2.4.4. Managing intergroup conflicts

The most effective ways of managing intergroup conflicts are collaboration and compromise. Conflict can also be minimized by the changes in the organization's reward system, better personnel selection and other training programs (Hellriegel and Slocum, 1998). According to them variety of other mechanisms such as interventions by superiors, use of super ordinate goals shared goals of

groups that can be achieved only through cooperation, separate integrating groups, and standardized practices are used to manage intergroup conflicts.

Ivancevich and Matterson (1996) listed seven styles of managing intergroup conflict through resolution. These are problem solving (face to face discussion), super ordinate goals, expansion of resources; avoidance, forcing, smoothing (de-emphasizing their difference), and compromise (no distinct winner or loser). These writers also pointed out for strategies for managing intergroup conflicts through stimulation, communication or information, bringing outside (new) individuals into the group, altering the organization's structure, and stimulating competition. There are also other tactics used to resolve intergroup conflicts. These are: identifying subordinate goals, interchanging group members, identifying a common external threat, reward cooperation, and involve the third party as a facilitator (Hunt, 1992).

2.5. The Role of Educational Leaders in the Management of Conflicts

Leader is interpreted as someone set direction I an effort and influences people to follow that direction accordingly, four major variables were identified. First, to lead involve influencing other. Second, where there are leaders there are followers. Third, leaders often become visible when an innovative response is need. Fourth leaders are people who have clear idea of what they to achieve (Carter, 2008).

Educational leaders are the heart and soul of conflict management. Because, leading involves influencing others, such as conflicting parties in order to accomplish conflict resolution. Principals need to understand individual and group manners, causes of conflicts, styles of handling conflicts and leadership styles. Educational managers must develop relationships that ensure adequate communication with their subordinates ‘teachers (Fullans, 2002).

Hunt (1992). states that the perceptual skills of a leader depend on the capacity to read the requirements of the situation, especially the requirements of the task and his/her subordinates, and his/her flexibility in reacting that situation. Hence, the modern approach of educational leaders relies not so much in what they are able to do, but in what they are able to stimulate and help others to do. Emphasis on leadership is motivated by increase complexity of school reforms efforts and needs for more people to participate in reform to ensure its success.

The strategy for conflict resolution is articulated by the educational leaders will needs to correspond to that of the leader's qualities styles and capabilities for if it is not, preferred accomplishments will be jeopardized (Barth, 2001). Educational leaders are relatively consistent in the way that they try to influence other's behavior. Leader who dominates his/her subordinates in one situation is not likely to use a high degree of consideration and participation in another. The behavior patterns of a leader called leadership style, can be classified as autocratic, participative and laissez -faire (Kinard, 1988). it is hoped that most of the research reviewed in this section provide a theoretical framework for identifying the nature of conflict, the types of conflicts, the sources of conflicts, techniques of resolving conflicts and the leadership roles of educational managers to manage conflicts in school organizations.

2.6. Effects of Conflict in Organizations

Most people can think of conflict situations in their that have diverted conflict time, energy and money away from the organizations goals. If lasts for a long time or if it becomes intense it a have negative impact. At the inter-individual level cooperation and team work may deteriorate and distrust may grow among people who need to cooperate in their efforts and for individuals, some feel defeated while the self-image of others will decline (Carter, 2008).

According to Nelsons-Jones (1995) Explains that not only can conflict in the workplace be a cause of stress and unhappiness but it also can lower their outputs and in the extreme causes, bring strikes. Furthermore, emphatically states that many times, in the midst

of conflict, opposing individual or groups will put their own interests or goals above those of the organization, resulting in the lessening of the performances and conflict can have destructive impacts on the organization and the member's activities.

Owens (2001) also discoursed that frequent and powerful conflict can have a devastating impact on the behavior of the people in an organization in the fact conflict often develops into hostility which also causes people to withdrawal both physically and psychologically. In schools situation, physical withdrawal can take in the forms of absences, tardiness, and turnover which is often written off by laziness on the part of the teacher and psychological withdrawal can also take in the forms of alienation, apathy and indifferences.

Eccles and Gambaro (1995) asserts that conflict can lead to outright hostile or aggressive behavior such as mob action, property damage and minor theft of property. Intense conflict can lead to sabotage, stealing, lying and distortion of reality information and similar behavior that can have a negative impact on the organization. School performances mainly based on strong principal leadership, attention to the quality of instruction that convey the expectation of all student are expected to obtain at least a basic mastery of simple skill and the use of measure of student achievement as the basis for program of evaluation based on the issue of consistency and stability in school impact up on different over time (Obi, 2000).

Hunt (1992) generally listed six points with regards to the negative impacts of conflict. These are conflicts may prevent members from 'seeing' task at all. Dislocate the entire group and produce polarizations. Subvert the objectives in favor of sub-goals. Lead people to use defensive and blocking in their group. Result in the disintegration of the entire group and stimulate a win-lose conflict, where reason is secondary to the emotion.

Gray and Starke (1998) also identified three negative outcome of conflict listed as follows. These are a decline in communication between conflicting parties, hostility and aggression development and over conformity to group demands. The impacts of conflict result in an urge for excellence and creativity. Such conflict takes in the form of healthy competition (inter-personal or inter group

competition) with such types of competitions better ideas are produced. People are forced to search for new approaches. Long standing problems are dealt with people and forced to their ideas and the tension stimulates interest and creativity.

Jennings and Witham (2005) explain that conflict is a necessary agent to stimulate change and innovation and that problem and inefficiencies in working will be highlighted by conflict. Note that the impact of conflict in groups can become more cohesive and operate more effectively as teams, increasing more group and individual motivation which goes a long way to boost standards of performance as result of commitment and concern to make better decisions, then conflict and disagreement between decision makers can improve organizational decision making. Robbins (2000) asserts that a certain amount of in an organization is healthy as it prevents the organization from stagnating and from producing myopic decisions. Moreover, conflict is needed, because it helps to raise and address problems, energies works to be on the most appropriate issues and useful forces in an organization if managed correctly, can be the potentials forces for innovation and change, it can lead to outcomes that are productive and can enhance the health of the organization overtime. Thus, conflict in itself is neither good nor bad in value terms it is natural and it is largely dependent on the way it is treated.

Billisberry (1999) listed the following three benefit of conflict; the first one is conflict improves interpersonal relation. People need room to release their strong feelings (such as angers) that likely to have because the aspect of their works and their workmates. Secondly, conflict improves group dynamics. Conflict can help by revealing personal agendas and laying the foundation for the appropriate group goals, norms and procedures. Finally, Conflict improves ideas and practices, hearing alternative ideas and suggestion from others may enable to arrive at better solution to the problem.

3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This section of the study also describes description of the study area, research design, and procedure of the study, source of data and instrument of data collection, target of population, sample techniques and method of data analysis.

3.1. Research Design

The researcher used descriptive survey design with both quantitative and qualitative research approach because it is hoped appropriate to get an exact description of the status of conflict between teacher- principal conflict and its impact in selected secondary schools. This method allows the collection of quantitative data through wide use of questionnaires and interviews

The descriptive research was intended to describe the existing phenomena of the teacher-principal conflict in selected government secondary school of North Shoa Zone. Hence, the goal of this study was to explore sources of conflict, types of conflict the alternative strategies used to minimize conflict in selected secondary school of North Shoa Zone. To get valid and reliable data, the researcher depended on primary and secondary sources from the respondents and literature respectively.

3.2. Description of the Study Area

The study was conducted in North Shoa Zone selected Government secondary schools in Oromia Regional State. North Shoa Zone is one of the 18 zones of Oromia Regional State that is found at 112km to the North of Addis Ababa. Its capital city is Fiche. It shares borderline with Amahra Regional states in the North Addis Ababa, in south and west shoa with an estimated area of 929,085 hectares.

These Woredas are slightly varies in infrastructure and socio status. Based on the statistical report of 2007 population and housing census results, North Shoa Zone has a total population of 1,427,525 of whom 714,632 were men and 712,893 were women (CSA,

2007). North Shoa Zone has three different climate zones. Namely, Degas /Cool zone (42.18%),WoinaDega /Subtropical zone (34.82%) and Kola /Tropical zone (23%) according to North shoa zone 2015 Agricultural office report.

3.3. Sources of Data

Data for this research was collected from both primary and secondary sources. The primary sources of data were school leaders and secondary school teachers. The secondary sources were recorded documents, feedbacks and reports and the primary and secondary sources of data are used in the study to collect data by using instruments: questionnaire, interview, and document Analysis

3.3.1. Primary source of data

Primary data were gathered from school leaders and teachers through questionnaire as well as interview from PTA representatives and student council and Kebele education training board (KETB).

3.3.2. Secondary Sources of data

The secondary sources of data were obtained through documents. For this purpose, synthesized information was collected from sample school's records, reports mints and other related documents to the study.

3.4. Population, Sample and Sampling Techniques

According to the evidence of North Shoa zone education office 2015Zonal report I rely on this old data of 2015? b/c I Couldn't got most recent written document in the zone office , the zone comprises 14 Woredas with 38 Governmental secondary schools. The population of the study area include 895 secondary school's teachers (718 males and 177 female). 72 school leaders, 200 teachers Since it is difficult to cover all the study areas of the zone and manage it properly. Seven Woredas were selected among the 14 Wordas in the zone. There are 16 government secondary schools in the study area in the seven Woredas. Seven secondary schools

were selected by simple random sampling technique from 16 secondary schools in the study area in order to give equal chance for all schools in the Words from seven selected government secondary schools of the zone. Finally, 72 school leaders were selected by available sampling technique since their number is manageable and 84 Teachers were selected by stratified random sampling technique from 200 teachers found in the study area in order give equal chance for all teachers in the sample area. Regarding, interview 7 SRC (student’s representative council), 7PTA and 7 KETB educations training board chairperson was selected from sample school by availability sampling technique.

Table.1Sample of schools

Secondary Schools	Respondents					
	School leaders			Teachers		
	P	S	%	P	S	%
Mukakule	10	10	100	12	6	50
Gohatsiyon	11	11	100	34	17	50
Degam	10	10	100	26	13	50
G/Guracha	11	11	100	44	22	50
Fitche	10	10	100	14	7	50
TulluMilki	10	10	100	20	10	50
Debre Tsige	10	10	100	20	10	50
Total	72	72	100%	200	84	50%
Simple random sampling	Availability Sampling			Stratified random sampling		

P=population **S**=sample

3.5. Instruments of Data Collection

The necessary data for the study were collected using instruments: questionnaire, Interview, and Document Analysis.

3.5.1. Questionnaire

The researcher used questionnaire, as it is most important method to collect quantitative and qualitative data from the respondents. It allows individuals ample time and privacy to complete the responses and it is easy to administer. Closed ended and Open-ended items were prepared to get information from respondents. The questions in the questionnaire were divided into **three** sections. The first section was required the participant's biographical information. the second set of questions were classified under basic research questions based on the five point Likert scale responses and the last section based on open-ended type of items to collect the data. The questionnaires has **four** items. the nature items were ,open ended, close ended-(choice scale) It were prepared by **the researcher for school leaders, and teachers**. The researcher was prepare one **similar** set of questionnaires for school **leaders and teachers** (5=strongly agree ,4= agree ,3= undecided , 2=disagree , and 1= strongly disagree. the questionnaire first prepared and then **approved** by the **advisors** before it was administered.

After the finalized versions of the instruments were prepared, pilot testing of the instruments was made in Tulu Milki secondary school in North Shoa Zone. The pilot test was conducted on 22 respondents (10 school leaders and 12 teachers). Based on the pilot test the researcher checked the internal consistency of the instruments by using Crombach-Alpha. The reliability coefficient of test result of the teacher and principal questionnaire which measures the current teacher-principal conflict and its impact had internal consistency is equal to or greater than ($\alpha \geq 0.5$). After conducting the pilot test reliability coefficient for part two questionnaire for sources conflict items were 0.784. types of conflict items were 0.746 alternative strategies to manage conflict items 0.776 and impacts conflict were 0.764 at $\alpha = 0.05$. The average of total reliability coefficient were 0.768. The researcher was decided to use the questionnaire and to develop the questionnaire as final instrument. Final the questionnaire first prepared and then approved by the advisors before it was administered

3.5.2. Interviews

Quantitative forms of questionnaires were insufficient to provide all the necessary information about the teacher-principal conflict in secondary schools of North Shoa Zone. As a result, the researcher used interviews to find opinions of PTA student's councils and Keble education training board on teacher-principal conflicts in secondary schools. Interview guideline was **prepared** by **researcher** for the respondents.

The interview contained **similar idea** with the contents of the questionnaire. For this purpose, interview guideline was prepared for 7 PTA, 7 students' council and 7 Keble education training board for sample school to get in depth information about the issue. Interviews with participants were transcribed and analyzed to confirm credibility in the study and researcher was checking to ensure the accuracy of data. Questions for interview were prepared in English language and translated to Afaan Oromo during interview in order to avoid communication barriers. and it was conducted face-to-face.it takes 20 mint for each session 7 hours for all

3.5.3. Document review

Information obtained from different files, documents, records and transcript which found from sample schools are used to supplement quantitative data on the issues of conflict between teacher and principal.

3.6. Procedures of Data Collection

To answer the research questions raised, the researcher goes through of data gathering procedures. These procedures help the researcher to get authentic and relevant data from the sample units.

The researcher introduced objectives and purposes of the research. Before utilizing any of the instruments brief explanations were provided by the researcher to the respondents for ensuring transparency and clarity. In addition, page of written brief was attached

to all of the tools as their covering page. The interviews were directly utilized by the researcher to collect the needed data. Time for collecting data was decided through mutual discussions between the researcher and the respondents. In addition, the respondents were informed about the objective of completing the questionnaires and the interview that confidentiality of their response and that the data would be utilized for the academic purpose and the data from documents conducted by viewing documents those available in secondary schools of North Shoa Zone.

The final questionnaires were administered to respondents in the selected school. The respondents were allowed giving their own answers to each item independently and the data collectors were closely assist and supervise them to solve any confusion regarding to the instrument. Finally, the questionnaires were collected and make it ready for data analysis,

3.7 Techniques of Data Analysis

The Study use qualitative quantitative data. The quantitative data collected were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as using five Likert scale in that the types of conflict sources of conflict. Alternative strategies of conflicts were analyzed. Descriptive technique such as a frequency distribution and percentages were used to determine the Personal characteristics of the respondents. Inferential statistics t-test to check whether or not there is statistically significant differences between the group's respondents. Qualitative data from interview and documents were analyzed narration. The data gathered from respondents through questionnaire were tailed, tabulated and organized in systematic form for interpretation.

3.8. Ethical Considerations

The participants were not obligated to fill their names in the questionnaires in order to keep the data confidential and secured. . The researcher used anonymous instead of using their real names to increase confidentiality of respondent. Time for collecting data was

decided through mutual discussions between the researcher and the respondents. For the confidentiality of their response and the data would be utilized for the academic purpose only.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section present result of the data collected through questionnaire and interview from school leaders and principals. In the first sections the general characteristics of the respondents are presented. These include age, experience, qualification, marital status and positions of the respondents. This section deals with presentation, analysis and interpretation of the data collected from respondents of 72 school leaders and 84 teachers through questionnaire and from 7 SRC representatives, 7 PTA and 7 KETB chairpersons through interview and document analysis.

The data were presented in tables and analyzed using appropriate statistical tools such as percentage, mean value, combined mean value, standard deviation, and t-test. The items were discussed qualitatively through descriptive statements. The data obtained from interviews used as supplementary information. The data obtained from quantitative were coded and analyzed with the help of a computer using spss version 20. Data analysis was first made accordingly to descriptive information following the research questions. The data were scored by calculating the percentages, means, combine mean, p-value. standard deviation and t-test was employed to determine the statistical significance of mean differences among respondents.

4.2 Conflict in the School

This section present the result obtained from study participants teachers and school leaders Firstly it was present the data about the existence of conflict in schools. In order to find the answer for each study questions, response of the questionnaire is presented in table. This section provides discussion and integrated the data obtained on the themes, whether Conflict exists in the school or not in selected government secondary schools of North Shoa zone.

Table 3. whether Conflict exist in the school

No	Response	No of respondents	%
1	Yes	153	98.1
2	No	3	1.9
	Total	156	100

As it indicated on the table present result of the data collected through questionnaire and **interview** from school leaders and principals. Respondents were asked whether there was conflict in secondary schools or not. As shown in the table 3 above, 153(98.1%) of the respondent stated the existence of conflict in secondary schools. This information from the respondent is in agreement with literatures, which indicated that conflict is natural in human situation (Murphy, 2006). In addition, the data obtained from interview also substantial that the existence of conflict in school. More importantly, some respondents of the interview states that schools have always a point of disagreement which leads to conflict, though it should be managed systematically.

2.2 Common Sources of Conflict

Table 4: Common Sources of Conflict

No	Items	Mean		Combine M	SD		T	p-value	Degree of freedom
		School leaders	Teacher		School Leader	Teacher			
1	Poor communication in school.	4.26	4.18	4.22	0.68	0.73	-645	0.956	154
2	Competitions for common goals but scarce resources are source of conflict.	4.17	3.99	4.08	0.98	0.84	0.920	0.766	154
3	Ideological differences among school community.	3.88	3.76	3.82	0.98	0.82	0.834	0.064	154
4	Need of equity	4.35	4.07	4.21	0.89	0.82	0.983	0.289	154
5	Lack of participation in decision making	4.23	4.35	4.25	0.78	0.66	0.395	0.86	154
6	Differences in perception among the staff about school.	4.12	4.07	4.09	0.89	0.82	1.064	0.65	154
7	Uncomfortable working environment of the school organization.	4.07	4.08	4.07	0.59	0.41	0.96	0.083	154
8	Individual differences among teachers and principal	3.96	3.89	3.92	0.97	0.96	0.46	0.725	154
9	Unclear authority structure between teacher and principal	3.36	3.58	3.47	1.32	1.35	1.003	0.83	154

Key:df (154)M=mean, SD=Std deviation, CO.M=combined Mean, df =degree of freedom p=p-value, level of significance at $\alpha=0.05$

This section deals with commonly identified sources of conflict that create conflict between teachers and school leaders in government secondary schools. An open-ended questionnaire items were prepared for both school leaders and teachers and their responses are summarized in table 4. Respondents were free to give their point of view of any kind regarding the sources that create conflict between teachers and school leaders. The researcher establishes or set common sources for issues raised by the respondents.

The above table 4 item 1 the respondents were asked to give their level of agreement with the statement whether that poor communications was a common source of conflict or not. The mean values of response of school leaders were found 4.26, SD= 0.68 and teachers mean value were 4.18, SD=0.73 and combined mean value was 4.22. which shows that the majority of school leaders and teachers believe that poor communication common causes conflict in the schools. The computed t- value is 0.645 with p-value of 0.956s at $\alpha=0.05$ where calculated p-value greater than 0.05. this implied that there is no statistically significant difference between opinions of the respondents. The qualitative data from KETB through interview that the existence of conflict between the respondents. The interview also states that school leaders and teacher have not well communicate networkin planning, teaching and learning and other school activities in school which leads to conflict.

Hitt et al, (2006) also supports the idea that poor communication is common cause of conflict which can lead to and allow barriers to be erected. Both too little and too much communication can lead to conflict. Too little communication, associates not know enough about each other's intentions, goals, or plans. Coordination becomes difficult, and misunderstandings are more likely to occur, where as too much communication can also result in misunderstandings that cause conflict conceptualizing conflict taps an interactive process manifested in incompatibility, disagreement, or dissonance within or between social entities.

The data on Table 4 item 2 above also elicit whether competitions for common goals and scare resources are considered to be the sources of conflict or not. The mean values of school leaders were found to be 3.99, SD=0.98 and teachers were 4.12, SD=0.84 with combined mean 4.08 mutually agrees. As can be observed from the table t-value is 0.92 and p-value of 0.766 at $\alpha=0.05$ with the degree of freedom 154 where the calculated p-value is greater than 0.05. This implied there is no statistically significant difference

between opinions of the respondents. This indicated that most of school leaders and teachers have common believe on scarcity in the secondary schools. Scholars also supports the idea Gray and Starke (1998) also suggested that limited resources is sources of conflict. Conflict arises when interests collide usually as of the results divergent in organizational goal and demand on scares resources the data from interview result shows that there was a competition common goal and shortage resources in the schools.

In the same table item 3 respondents were asked whether ideological difference cause conflict or not. The mean values of school leaders were found 3.88, SD=0.98 and teachers were 3.76, SD=0.82 with combined mean 3.82.the data indicated majority of the respondents have common understanding on the issue that ideological difference cause conflict in the schools. computed t-test 0.834 at $\alpha=0.05$ and p-value of 0.064 with degree of freedom 154.where calculated p-value 0.064 greater than 0.05.Then the data revealed that there is no statistically significant difference between opinions of the respondents. This implied both school leaders and teachers argue that ideological difference cause conflict in schools. Scholar Ghaffar (2010) agree on this point stated that conflict value and goal conflict are the factors that leading to conflict in school organization group of respondents. In addition, the data obtained from interview also substantial that the existence of conflict in school. More importantly, some respondents of the interview states that schools have always a point of disagreement which leads to conflict, though it is managed systematically.

In the same table item 4 the respondents were asked whether dignity, security equity **are** source of conflict or not. The mean value of school leaders were found 4.35, SD=0.89 and teachers were found to be 4.07 SD=0.82 with combined mean 4.21. The data revealed both school leaders and of teacher's common agreement on the issue. The computed t-value was 0.983 at $\alpha=0.05$ and p-value 0.289 with degree of freedom 154. Where the calculated p-value 0 .289s is greater than 0.05. This shows response of the two group's respondents revealed that there is no statistically significant difference between opinions of the two groups of respondents. This indicated that majority of the respondents agree on the on the issue that dignity, security equity common sources of conflicts. Fisher (2000). Both individual and groups have undesirable needs for identity, dignity security, equity, participation in decision that affect than frustration of these basic needs because a source of social conflict.

Table 4 item 5 respondents were also asked to state their level of agreement or disagreement whether lack of participation in decision making cause conflict or not. The mean value of school leaders were found 4.23, SD=0.78 and teachers were found 4.35 SD=0.66 with combined mean 4.25 which shows common agreement on the issue. The computed t-test was 0.395 at $\alpha=0.05$ and p-value 0.66 with degree of freedom 154. where calculated p-value greater than 0.05. Then data revealed that there is no statistically significant difference between opinions of two group of the respondents' response. This shows school leaders and teachers believe that lack of participatory decision making cause of conflict in secondary schools. This was cross checked by the data gathered through interview indicated that there was lack of participatory decision between principals and teachers which was common sources of conflict in secondary schools in the study area.

In same table item 6 respondents were also asked to state their level of agreement or disagreement whether difference in perception is another source of conflict or not. The mean value of school leaders were found 4.12 and SD=0.89 and teachers were 4.07, and SD=1.064 with combined mean 4.09 that indicated common agreements on issue difference in perception source of conflict in secondary schools. The computed test value was 1.064 and p-value 0.65 at $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom 154. where calculated p-value greater than 0.05. then data revealed that there is no statistically significant difference between opinions of the two groups of the respondents Though most literatures support the views forwarded by the respondents, Difference in perception is source of conflict in various literature for example (Gray and Stark, 1998) state difference in perception cause conflict with regard to this, respondents In addition, the data obtained from interview also substantial that the existence of conflict in school. More importantly, some respondents of the qualitative data gathered through interview states that schools have always a point of disagreement which leads to conflict, though if not managed properly and systematically.

In same table item 7 the respondents were asked whether uncomfortable working environment of the school cause conflict or not. The mean value of school leaders were found 4.07 and SD=0.59 and teachers were 4.08 and SD=0.41 with combined mean 4.07 which shows common agreement on the issue. This indicated that Majority of the respondents agree that uncomfortable working

environment is the sources of conflict in school. The computed t-test was 0.96 and p-value 0.083 at $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom 154. The calculated p-value 0.083 is greater than 0.05. The data shows that there is no statistically significant difference between opinions of two groups of the respondents. This implied that uncomfortable working environment sources of conflict in the school, the qualitative data from KETB through interview support the idea underline that unconducive working environment one of the factors lead to conflict in secondary schools.

In same table item above item 8 respondents were asked whether individual difference cause conflict or not. In line with this the mean value of school leaders were found 3.96, SD=0.97 and teachers were 3.89, and SD=0.96 with combined mean 3.92 implied that individual difference is a sources of conflict. The computed t-value was 0.46 and p-value 0.725 at $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom 154 and 0.05. where p value greater than 0.05 this implied; there is no significant difference among opinions of the respondents. Similarly, the qualitative data gathered during interview the respondents informed that “individual difference such as qualification, interest in goal differences and differences perception sources of conflict in secondary school.”

In the same table item 9 the respondents were asked whether the respondents that the task interdependent work activities are cause of conflict or not. The data obtained from the table 9 item 9 above reveals that the mean value of school leaders were found 4.04 SD=0.91 and teachers 4.20, SD=0.99 with combined mean 4.12. The mean combined value shows that task interdependent work activities are cause of conflict. The computed t-value -1.08 at $\alpha=0.05$ and p-value 0.46 with degree of freedom 154. where p value greater 0.46 than 0.05). Data revealed that there is no statistically significant difference between opinions of the respondents which shows that most of both respondents support the statement that interdependent work activities are the cause of conflict in secondary schools. The qualitative data gathered through interview on this issue similarly indicated that, The Principals were not continuously encouraged and support teachers to work the activities in the school dependently and mutually supporting each other in selected government secondary schools in the study area.

Finally, on the same table 4 item 10 the respondents were asked whether lack of unclear school leaders were found 3.36 SD=1.32 and teachers were found 3.58, SD=1.35 with combined mean 3.47. The descriptive statistics results also ratified that the mean scores of school leaders is higher than that of teachers which implied that school leaders believe that lack of unclear authority structure sources conflict in secondary schools while teachers consider it as insignificant to be a sources of conflict in the schools. The computed independent t-test was 1.003 at $\alpha=0.05$ and p-value of 0.83 with degree of freedom 154. Calculated p value is greater 0.83 than 0.05. This result shows that there is no statistically significant difference between opinions of the respondents.

According to Gray and Stark (1998) lack of clarity in authority can result conflict since people do not know how far their authority extends. With this regard both groups of respondent have different view. These differences might due to their position because school leaders have an opportunity to understand the situation.

4.3. Types of Conflict Observed in Schools

There are four types of conflict in schools. Interpersonal (Conflict between individuals) and conflict between groups or intergroup conflicts are highest types of conflict in their school while conflict within intrapersonal and Intragroup types of conflict are the least of conflict in schools. Respondents give their response which types conflict exist selected government secondary schools of the study area s can be seen from the table

Table 5. Types of Conflict observed in Schools

No	Types of conflicts	Numbers of Respondents				ave
		School leaders		Teachers		
		No	%	No	%	
1	Intrapersonal Conflict	6	8.33	10	11.90	10.11
2	Interpersonal conflict	36	50.0	40	47.61	48.8
3	Intragroup Conflict	17	23.61	14	16.67	20.14
4	Intergroup Conflict	13	18.05	20	23.80	20.9
	Total	72	100	84	100	100

Table 5 above shows that there are four types of conflict in schools. Both principal and teachers stated the existence of each types of conflict in school. Principal and teachers were also asked to express the types of conflict found in selected government secondary schools of the north shoa zone. The most possible types of conflict obtained from literature were asked and responses were given and the data obtained from table revealed that the types of conflict in selected secondary schools implied that (48.8%) reports interpersonal conflict,(20.9%) Intergroup, (20.14%) and (10.11%) intrapersonal and intragroup respectively. From this we can see among the four types of conflict exist in schools are interpersonal and intergroup conflict the most common types of conflict on the other hand intrapersonal type of conflict is reported to be the least types of conflict existed in schools. In line with this Ghaffar (2010) states, when there is authoritative, management system in school, which is pressurize the teachers from managerial sides, there were be more interpersonal conflict.

4.3.1 Sources of Intrapersonal Conflict

Table 6.Sources of Intrapersonal Conflict

No	Items	Mean		Combine M	SD		t	P-value	df
		Schools leader	Teacher		School leaders	Teacher			
1	Uncomfortable working environment affect work	4.40	4.32	4.36	0.65	0.64	0.790	-.085	154
2	Overload on the teaching and learning in the school	4.60	4.52	4.56	0.66	0.65	0.797	0.521	154
3	Satisfaction with the decisions made in the school	2.70	3.60	2.71	0.96	0.965	0.387	0.866	154
4	Mismatch between responsibilities and performance evaluation criteria in the school	2.96	2.76	2.86	1.34	1.25	1.043	0.326	154
5	Low standard of living (low salary)	2.34	2.55	2.44	1.29	1.25	1.040	0.86	154
6	Lack of facilities, rules and regulations affect work	3.92	4.10	4.01	1.19	0.95	0.958	0.123	154
7	Emotional instability on my work	3.23	3.43	3.03	1.29	1.17	1.040	0.086	154
8	Lack of required ability for particular job	2.69	3.35	2.35	0.93	.074	0.803	0.88	154

Key: df (154) t=t-test, SD=Std deviation, df =degree of freedom p= p-value, level of significance at $\alpha=0.05$

Members of the sample respondents were requested to comment on intrapersonal conflict. The data were collected on whether conflict with in an individual conflict (conflict within an individual) and some such as Uncomfortable working environment Overload on the teaching and learning in the school mismatch between responsibilities and poor performance evaluation criteria is a sources of intrapersonal conflict

In table6 item 1 the respondents were asked uncomfortable working environment a sources intrapersonal conflict in secondary schools or not. The mean value of school leaders were found 4.40 SD=0.65 and teachers were 4.32 SD=0.64 with combined mean of 4.36. This shows that a majority of school leaders and teachers believe that uncomfortable working environment is causing factors of intrapersonal conflict. The computed independent t-value 0.79 and p-value 0.085 at $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom 154.where the calculated p value is greater than 0.05. Then the data shows that there is no statistically significant difference between opinions of the respondents. The data depicts both School leaders and teachers agree uncomfortable working environment is a causing factor for intrapersonal conflict. This means both school leaders and teachers common believe on the existence uncomfortable working environment cause of intrapersonal conflict in secondary schools. The qualitative data collected from interview support this idea.

In table 6 item 2 the respondents asked whether overload on teaching and learning process in the secondary schools as a factor for intrapersonal conflict or not. An effort was made to check whether the two groups of respondents have a common believe or not on their opinion towards the problem of high workload by applying statistical methods. The mean value of school leaders were found 4.60, and SD=0.66 and teachers were found 4.52 and SD=0.65 with combined mean 4.56. This implied that overload on teaching and learning process is a source of intrapersonal conflict in the secondary schools. The computed independent t-test -0.797 and p-value 0.52 at $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom 154. Then the where calculated p-value 0.52 greater than 0.05.The data shows that there is no statistically significant difference between opinions of the respondents. This indicated that most of the respondents agree that overload teaching and learning cause intrapersonal conflict in secondary schools. The qualitative data

obtained from interview conducted with PTA, KETB and sRC support this idea which stated that

Overload on teaching and learning process is a source of intrapersonal conflict in the secondary schools because teachers overload became tension, stress, depression, anxiety and other conflicting idea within the person is a sources of intrapersonal conflict

Scholars such as Heart.(2001) support the idea that overloading of teachers leads to feeling of powerlessness, lack of confidences, assigned tasks that do not bring much goals, interests and values in the schools.

. In same table item 3 respondents were asked whether the decision made in school sources of intrapersonal conflict or not. The mean value of school leaders were found 2, 71 SD=0.96. and the mean value of teachers were found 3.60,SD=0.965 and the combined mean were 3.15.The data revealed that school leaders disfavors that the decision made in school insignificantly cause intrapersonal conflict while the mean value of teachers were found 3.60,SD=0.965,Depicts that teachers agree decision made in school cause intrapersonal conflict. The data shows responses obtained from respondents shows that the school leaders do not believe that the decision made in school are not sources of conflict because the mean rating was below the average mean (3.00). While teachers mean rating was above the average mean which indicate that the decision made in school a sources of intrapersonal conflict. Because the mean rating was above average mean (3.115). This shows that of the respondents believe that decisions made in school are a sources of intrapersonal conflict. The computed t-value 0.387 and p-value 0.866 at $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom 154.Then the data implied that there is no statistically significant difference between opinions of the respondents.

In the same table item 4 the respondents were asked whether mismatch between responsibility and evaluation can cause conflict intrapersonal conflict or not. Mean value of school leaders were found 2.96 and teachers were found 2.76 with the combined mean of 2.86 implied that both group of respondents believe that mismatch between responsibility and performances evaluation criteria system can rarely consider as sources of conflict intrapersonal conflict.

Because the mean rating was below the average mean (3.00). The data depicts that mismatch between responsibility and performances evaluation criteria was not a sources intrapersonal conflict. The computed t-test value -1.043 and p-value 0.326 at $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom 154. where calculated p-value greater than 0.05. Then the data shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the respondents.

Teachers always declare of the poor performances evaluation criteria system practically observed, is irrelevant to the things they do. They also tend to feel that they are evaluated by people who do not know evaluation performances criteria them well as also indicated cause of intrapersonal conflict in secondary schools.”Rahim (1996) support the idea that the sources of intrapersonal conflict such mismatch between responsibilities and performance evaluation criteria in secondary schools.

With regards to the item 5 in the same table the respondents were asked whether low standard of living (low salary) raises intrapersonal conflict or not. The mean value of school leaders were found to be 2.34 with $SD=1.34$ and teachers were found 2.55. and $SD=1.25$ with combined mean of 2. The combined mean depicts disagree because the mean rating was below the average mean (3.00). The revealed that low standard living is not supported by teacher and school leaders as sources of intrapersonal conflict in secondary schools. The computed t-test 1.04 and p-value of 0.86 at $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom 154. The data shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the groups of respondents. The data hellcats that majority of the respondents disagree that low standard of living is not factor that leading to interpersonal (Kinard,1988) supports the idea that conflict within the intrapersonal, can indicate the presence of, opposing, divergent and conflicting ideas, feelings and activities. Characteristics of such tension are uncertainty, hesitation, stress, anxiety, and depression in cause by low standard of living

In the same table item 6 respondents were asked to express their level of agreement on the issue that lack of facilities, non- operational rules and guidelines as a sources of conflict within

intrapersonal conflict. The data shows that mean value of school leaders were found 3.92 with $SD=0.95$ and teachers were found 4.10 and $SD=0.958$ with combined mean value 4.01. Whereas combined mean indicated lack of facilities, non- operational rules and guidelines as sources of intrapersonal conflict. The computed t-test 0.958 and p-value of 0.123 at $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom 154. The calculated p value is greater than 0.05. The data shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the respondent. Hence, both teacher and school leaders have common believe on this issue. This was cross checked by qualitative the data gathered through interview. During the interview the respondents similarly indicated that

Lack of facilities such as teaching materials like text books, desks tables, non- operational rules and different guidelines were a sources of conflict in secondary schools

With respect to item 7 in the same table respondents were asked to express their agreement or disagreement on the issue that emotional stability is a factor to intrapersonal conflict. Table 6 item 7 the data point ousted that the mean value of school leaders were found 3.23, $SD=1.29$ and teachers 3.43, $SD=1.17$ with combined mean value of 3.03 which shows undecided on the issue where as combined mean indicated common agree on the statement. The computed t-test 1.04 and p-value of 0.086 at $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom 154. where calculated p-value greater than 0.05. The data shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the respondents. Depicted that both have teachers and school leaders common believe on the idea that individual's emotional instability can be considerably the source of intrapersonal conflict.

Finally in the same table in item 8 the respondents were asked to express their agreement whether lack of required ability for a particular job a sources of intrapersonal conflict or not. The mean value of school leaders were found 3.69, $SD=0.93$ and teachers mean value were found 2.00, $SD=1.19$ mean rating was below the average mean (3.00) which implied that lack of required ability for a particular job a insignificantly sources of intrapersonal conflict in the

schools but school leaders consider the that lack of required ability for a particular job a sources of intrapersonal conflict. With combined mean value 2.35. implied that lack of required ability for a particular job rarely sources of intrapersonal conflict in the schools. The computed t-test 0.803 and p-value 0.881 at $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom 154. where calculated p-value greater than 0.05. This implied that there is no statistically significant difference between opinions of the respondents.

The qualitative data gathered through interview on this issue similarly indicated that lack of necessary capacity for a particular work a sources of intrapersonal conflict in secondary schools because it may cause stress, lack of confidences the work place to perform the activities in the schools.

Scholars support the idea Kundu and Tutoo(1989) States that intrapersonal conflict exists within an individual him/her self. It arises from conflicting goals and interests, lack of required ability for a particular job, when his/ her path is blocked by other people. Such conflicts can cause a person frustrations, tension and anxiety

4.3.2 Source of Interpersonal Conflict

Table7. Sources Interpersonal Conflict

No	Item	Mean		Co. M	SD		t	P-value	df
		School leaders	Teacher		School leaders	Teacher			
1	There is absence of cooperation between the staffs which cause conflict between individuals.	3.86	3.91	3.88	1.139	0.97	0.29	0.148	154
2	There are consistent views and aims among individuals (teachers and/or school leaders) in schools which helped to work without conflict between staff.	2.23	2.57	2.40	0.969	0.97	2.08	0.55	154
3	There is inappropriate implementation of rules and regulations	3.91	3.87	3.89	0.878	0.93	0.2	0.515	154
4.	Individuals (teachers and/ or school leaders) confront each other their disagreement and disputes in constructive way.	3.97	4.05	4.01	0.969	0.54	2.13	0.00	154
5	Communication barriers appear among the Teachers and School leaders.	4.24	4.19	4.21	0.877	0.808	0.53	0.572	154
6	Age, sex and ethnic difference cause conflict.	4.33	2.73	3.5	0.921	1.28	0.62	0.728	154
7	Competing with each other for recognition, approval and promotion	4.16	4.26	4.21	0.78	0.6	1.46	0.198	154
8	There is competition for limited resources in the school	4.55	4.44	4.49	0.71	0.63	1.08	0.515	154

Key df (154),t= t-test SD=Std deviation,df =degree of freedom p-value, level of significance at $\alpha=05$

This interpersonal conflict refers to the conflict between two or more staff members of the same or different hierarchical levels in the structure under consideration. Table 7 above, showed that how often the issues raised in interpersonal conflict. In an attempt to find out, respondents opinion whether the issues are thought to be the source of interpersonal conflict. As indicates in table 5 both school leaders and teachers stated that interpersonal conflict is the most possible types of conflict found in the schools. The data obtained from table 5 also show that 36(50%) of school leaders and 40 (47.7%) of teachers reported the existence of interpersonal conflict in school which is the highest when compared reports interpersonal conflict and some sources as the following.

Table 7 item 1 indicated that, the respondents asked whether the lack of cooperation between the staff is a cause factor for interpersonal conflict or not. The data reveals that, lack of cooperation between the staffs which cause conflict between individuals was a source of interpersonal conflict in the schools. The majority of the respondents indicated. the mean value of school leaders were found 3.86, SD=1.13 and teachers were found 3.91 SD=1.14 with combined mean value of 3.88 which implied that both school leaders and teachers agree that lack of cooperation between the staff is a cause factor for interpersonal conflict. The computed t-test value 0.295 and p-value 0.148 at $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom 154. where the calculated p-value is greater than 0.05. This implied that there is no statistically significant difference between s opinions of the two groups. This indicated that lack of cooperation between the staff is a cause factor for interpersonal conflict. The qualitative data obtained from interview support this idea that absence of teamwork and collaboration between principals and teachers are sources of interpersonal conflict in selected government secondary schools. carter(2008) reports that interpersonal conflict is broadly considered as disagreements, incompatible interest concerning goals, policies, rules and, distrust, fear and rejection and absences of cooperation between the staff are the sources of interpersonal conflict in the schools.

In the same table item 2 indicated that, the respondents asked whether the existence of consistency of view and aims among school leaders and teachers which helped to work without conflict between staff or not. The mean value of school leaders were found 2.23, SD=0.969 and teachers were 2.57 SD=0.97 with combined mean 2.40 which shows undecided on the issue. This implied that both respondents have common understanding that the existence of consistency of view and aims among individual which helped to work without conflict between staff were not the cause of interpersonal conflict in the schools. The computed t-test 2.08 and p-value of 0.55 at $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom 154. Where p-value 0.55 is greater than 0.05. This implied that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of the respondents. Majority of the respondents from both group of school leaders and teachers shows common agreement on the issue. This indicated the existence of consistency of views teachers and school leaders are not the sources of interpersonal conflict in secondary schools

In the same table item 3 respondents were asked whether inappropriate implementations of rules and regulation cause interpersonal conflict or not. The data depicts school leaders and teachers shows agreements to the statements. The data revealed that the mean value of school leaders were found 3.91 SD=0.878 and teachers were 3.83 SD=1.22 with combined mean value 3.89. This implied that both school leaders and teachers were agree on the issue that inappropriate implementations of rules and regulation cause interpersonal conflict in secondary schools. The computed-test 0.273 and p-value of 0.515 at $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom 154, where p-value greater than 0.05. Then the data shows that there is no statistically significant difference between opinions the factor of interpersonal conflict in school-The qualitative data gathered through interview on this issue similarly support that Unfortunate accomplishment of rules, regulations and instructions and outdate systems were sources of interpersonal conflict in selected secondary schools.

In table 7 item 4 respondents were also asked whether individuals confront each other their disagreement and disputes in constructive way in the schools are cause interpersonal conflict or

not. The mean value of school leaders were found 3.97, $SD=0.696$ and teachers were found 4.05 $SD=0.54$ with combined mean 4.01. This indicated that that two groups of respondents have common understanding on the issue. The calculated t-test 2.134 and p-value of 0.352 at $\alpha=0.05$ and with degree of freedom 154. Where p-value greater than 0.05. The data depicts that there is no statistically significant difference between opinions of the respondents. Which means most school leaders and teachers have common understanding on the issue that individuals confront each other their disagreement and disputes in constructive way in the schools do not cause interpersonal conflict. The qualitative data gathered through interview on this issue similarly support

Kinard (1988) identified primary sources of interpersonal conflict. These are individual difference, power struggles, and competition. Individual differences in goals, expectations, values, proposed courses of action. Interpersonal conflict involves conflict between two or more individuals and is probably the most common and most recognized conflict in the schools

In the same table item 5 respondents were also asked whether communication barriers among teachers and School leaders cause interpersonal conflict or not. The mean value of school leaders was found 4.24, $SD=0.877$ and teachers were 4.19 $SD=0.808$ with combined mean of 4.21. Combined mean indicated common agreement of School leaders and teachers that poor communication (or its barrier) cause interpersonal conflict. This shows that two groups of respondents have common understanding on the issue. The computed t-test 0.536 and p-value of 0.572 at $\alpha=0.05$ and with degree of freedom 154. Where p-value greater than 0.05. Then the data shows that there is no statistically significant difference between opinions of the respondents. Scholars such that Hitt et.al (2006) support the idea that Communication barriers appear among the Teachers and School leader leading factors of cause interpersonal conflict because both too little and too much communication coordination becomes difficult, misunderstandings are more likely to occur, disagreement, dissonance within or between school leaders which cause of interpersonal conflict

In the same table item 6 respondents were asked whether age, sex and ethnic difference cause the kind of conflict interpersonal conflict factor or not. The data revealed that the mean value of school leaders were found 4.33, SD=0.921 and teachers were found 2.73 SD=1.17 with combined mean 3.50. Implies that age, sex and ethnic difference cause interpersonal conflict. The computed t-test 0.620 and p-value .728 at $\alpha=0.05$ and with degree of freedom 154. Where the calculated p-value greater than 0.05. Then the data revealed that there is no statistically significant difference between opinions of the respondents' response. From this it is possible to deduce that most school leaders and teachers believe that difference of age, sex and ethnic factors interpersonal conflict factor leading to conflict.

In table 7 item 7 respondents were asked whether competing with each other for recognition and promotion interpersonal causing factor of conflict or not. the mean value of school leaders were found 4.16 and SD of 0.78 and the mean value teachers were found to be 4.26 and SD=0.60 with combined mean 4.21. The data revealed that majority school leaders and teachers agree that competition for recognition, approval and promotion are a causing factor leading to interpersonal leading to Conflict. The computed t-test 1.459 and p-value 0.198 at $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom 154, where calculated p-value greater than 0.05. The data shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of respondents which indicated that they have common understanding that competing with each other for recognition, approval and promotion the cause of interpersonal conflict. The qualitative data gathered through interview on this issue similarly support that, opposing appreciation, supporting each other, approval, promotion and encouragement is a source of interpersonal Conflict in secondary school

Scholars support the idea such (Carter,2008) also states that employees are concerned about their position, status, power etc within the school organizations and any encroachment on them, also they are often competing with each other for the cognition approval and promotion interpersonal conflict is broadly considered as disagreements in secondary schools.

As can observe from the same table item 8 that most respondents whether competition for limited resource in schools is a factor for interpersonal conflict or not. The mean value of school leaders were found 4.55 and SD=0.71 and teachers were found 4.44 and SD=0.63 with combined mean 4.49 which shows agreement on the issue indicated common agreement that competition for limited resource in schools is a factor for intrapersonal conflict in secondary schools. The computed t-value 1.088 and p-value 0.515 at $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom 154, Where the calculated p-value greater than 0.05. Implied there is no statistically significant difference between opinions of the respondents. From the data obtained above, it is possible to say that majority of the respondents have common believe on competition for limited resources can be consider as source of interpersonal conflict. This result is supported by the literature in that competing for limited capital and manpower resources is one of the primary sources of interpersonal conflict (carter, 2008 and schermehorn, 2001). Such as different learning materials, especially if they are competing for scarce resources like number of educators, time allocation for extracurricular activities, textbooks and other learning material, teaching aids and so on

4.3.3 Sources of Intragroup Conflict

Table 8. Sources Intragroup Conflict

No	Items	Mean		Combine M	SD		t	P-value	Df
		School leaders	Teacher		School leaders	Teacher			
1	Satisfied with department's manner of working in the school as a team	2.73	2.76	2.74	1.06	0.93	-0.157	0.133	154
2	Group composition and size treat the work group differently	3.41	3.55	3.48	0.93	0.80	0.110	0.105	154
3	Unfair period distribution and the decision for all members in the department.	3.51	3.72	3.61	1.23	1.03	1.136	0.166	154
4	The members of the staff working group are supportive to one another ideas.	3.39	3.59	3.49	0.74	-1.62	0.83	0.47	154
5	The staff members are fairly treated.	3.73	3.62	3.67	1.07	0.702	0.48	3.96	154

Key df (154)t=t-test SD=Std deviation, ,df =degree of freedom ,p= p-value, level of significance at $\alpha=0.05$

An effort was made to collect data on certain issues that are thought to create intragroup conflict. On this regard, respondents were asked to answer how frequently these issues occur to create this type of conflict. With regard the, respondents were requested to give their comments on how this source frequently attributes to Intragroup conflict. As the data on table 5 shows 17(26.6%) of school leaders and 14(16.3%) of teachers, reported that this issue with creation of intra-group conflict in the schools and the sources forward as the following.

Table 8 items 1 the respondents was asked whether the department's manner of working in the school sources Intragroup Conflict or not. The mean value of school leaders was found to be 2.73 and SD of 1.06 and teachers were found to be 2.76 and SD of 0.93 with combined mean 2.74. The combined mean rating was below the average mean (3.00).this implied that both school leaders and teachers believed that department's manner of working in the school sources Intragroup Conflict. The calculated t-test -0.157 and p-value of 0.133 $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom 154.where the calculated p-value 0.133 is greater than 0.05then the data revealed that there is no statistically significant difference between the opinions of respondents. from this can deduce that both school leaders and teachers are in a position to the statement, which means majority of both groups seems are satisfied with department manner of work so that department's manner of working in the schools are not sources Intragroup Conflict in the schools. In contradictory the qualitative data gathered through interview from PTA this indicated that the department's manner of working in the schools is not collaborative and cooperative each other in selected secondary schools and these kinds of approach cause of Intragroup Conflict in the schools.

In the same table item 2 the respondents was asked whether Group composition and size treat the work group differently can cause Intragroup conflict or not. With respect to this, majority of the respondents in both group disagree on the issue, the data shows that the mean value of school leaders were found 3.41, SD=1.06) and teachers were 3.76 SD=0.93) with combined mean 3.58.the mean scores of the response is above the average mean 3.58 which implied that Group composition and size treat the work group differently sources Intragroup Conflict. The computed t-test -1.01 and p-value 0.105 at $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom 154.where p-value greater than 0.05.Then the data shows that there is no statistically significant difference between opinions of the respondents. The data indicated that School leaders do not treat the

work group unresponsively. The qualitative data obtained from interview support this idea that Leaders treatment the works group indifferently because of the group composition, size, group cohesiveness and other external threats and their outcomes is a sources intragroup conflict.

In table 8 item 3 the respondents were asked whether Unbalanced period distribution and the decision for all members in the department sources of Intragroup conflict or not. With this regard in both groups there is high number of respondent who feel good about the decision made by the school leaders and teachers on the statement. The mean value of school leaders was found to be 3.51, SD=1.23 and teachers mean value were 3.72 with SD=1.03 and the combined mean value 3.61. which implied that Unbalanced period distribution and the decision for all members in the department are sources of Intragroup conflict. The computed t-test 1.136 and p-value of 0.166 at $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom 154 Where p-value greater than 0.05. The data indicated that there is no statistically significant difference among opinions of the respondents

As shown on the same table item 4, the respondents asked whether. The members of the staff working group are supportive to one another ideas. of intra group conflict or not. This means the majority of the respondent does not think that lack of consensus among their group member is not a fundamental source of conflict. The mean value of school leaders were found 3.39, SD=0.74 and teachers were 3.59, SD=1.16 with combined mean 3.49 which implied that the respondents have common agreement on the issue. The computed t-test 0.83 and p-value of 0.47 at $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom 154 Where p-value greater than 0.05. The data indicated that there is no statistically significant difference among opinions of the respondents. This indicated that the respondents have common perceptions on the members of the staff working group are supportive to one another ideas are the sources of Intragroup Conflict. The qualitative data obtained from interview support this idea that there are general agreement consensus among the members of the working groups are less likely sources of intra group conflict in selected secondary schools.

At the same table item 5 respondents were requested to rate their level of agreement or disagreement whether the staff members are fairly treated in sources conflict or not. The mean value of school leaders were found 3.73, SD=1.07 and teachers were 3.62, SD=0.702 with combined mean 3.67. This implied that most of the respondents agree. The staff members are fairly treated as sources Intragroup conflict in the schools. The computed t-test 0.048 and p-value of 3.96 at $\alpha=0.05$ with the degree of freedom 154, where p value greater than 0.05. The data shows that there is no statistically significant difference between opinions of the respondents. From this one can deduce the majorities of both group respondents are in favor of the statement. This means the working groups are supportive to each other. Hence, there is less likely intragroup conflict because of lack of support on each other's idea.

4.3.4 Source of Intergroup Conflict

Table 9 sources of intergroup Conflict

No	Items	Mean		Combine M	SD		t	P-value	Df
		School leaders	Teacher		School leaders	Teacher			
1	I am annoyed (attack) with other departments' members in the school.	3.23	3.36	3.31	0.67	0.65	-1.25	0.079	154
2	There are task interdependence between departments and others departments which cause intergroup conflict.	3.30	3.20	3.25	1.16	1.18	0.543	0.774	154
3	Conflicts exist between departments due to competing with limited resources intergroup conflict.	4.01	3.85	3.97	1.029	1.02	0.977	0.316	154
4	Conflicts exist between departments due lack of professional commitment intergroup conflict s...	3.63	3.30	3.46	1.15	1.36	0.328	0.883	154
5	Problem of share experiences with departments with each others in the school.	3.50	3.44	3.47	1.17	1.14	0.523	0.320	154
6	Lack of practice in participatory decision making in the school.	4.06	3.96	4.01	0.70	0.65	1.06	0.784	154
7	Inconsistent performance and evaluation criteria a sources of intergroup conflict,	4.18	4.12	4.15	0.78	0.472	0.202	1.64	154

Key: df (154) t=t-test, SD=Std deviation, ,df =degree of freedom, p=p-value, level of significance at $\alpha=0.05$

4.3.4 Source of Intergroup Conflict

This section refers to sources of Inter-group conflict clashes between groups. It may occur between line and staff members in schools or between groups and the leadership bodies. The inter-group conflict in this case is the one that occurs between school leaders and teachers, which is one of the focus areas that this study is interested with the sources. Task interdependence, competing with limited resources intergroup conflict, Lack of practice in participatory decision making. The issues that are thought to be the sources of inter-group conflict were presented to both school leaders and teachers.

In table 9 item 1 the respondents were asked whether shows that they annoyed (attacked each other repeatedly with other department members sources of intergroup Conflict or not, the mean value of school leaders were found 3.23, SD=0.67 and teachers were found 3.36 SD=0.65 with combined mean 3.31. This implied that School leaders and teachers believe that they are aggravated with other departments are sources of intergroup Conflict. From this one can deduce that majority of the respondent agree that they annoyed with other departments are a sources of conflict. The computed t-test -1.252 and p-value was 0.079 at $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom 154. Where p value greater than 0.05 then the data shows that there is no statistically significant difference between opinions of the respondents.

On the same table item 2 both groups of respondents were asked whether view their level of agreement about task interdependency sources of intergroup Conflict or not. The mean value of school leaders were found to be 3.30 with SD of 1.16 and teachers mean value were found 3.20 and SD=1.18 with combined mean 3.25. Implied task interdependency sources of intergroup Conflict The computed t-test -0.543 and p-value 0.774 $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom 154. Where p value greater than 0.05. The data shows that there is no statistically significance t difference among the respondents. According to data on table 14 item 2 shows

both respondents believe that task interdependency has significant role to lead the groups to intergroup conflict.

With respect to item 3 in the same table above, respondents were asked to express their agreement or disagreement whether competing with limited resource factor to intergroup conflict or not., the mean value of school leaders were found to be 4.01 with SD of 1.029 and teachers mean value were 3.85 and SD of 1.02 with combined mean 3.97.this implied that the majority School leaders and teachers agree that there is a clash between departments because of lack of sufficient resource for competing with limited resource in the schools agree on the issue where as combined mean indicated common agreement on the statement. The computed t-test 0.977 and p-value 0.316 $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom 154.Where the calculated p-value greater than 0.05.the data shows that there is no statistically significant difference between opinions of the respondents. With regard to competing with limited resource the majority of the respondents

With respect to item 3 in table 9 above, respondents were asked to express their agreement or disagreement whether competing with limited resource factor to intergroup conflict or not. the mean value of school leaders were found to be 4.01 with SD of 1.029 and teachers mean value were 3.85 and SD of 1.02 with combined mean 3.97 mutually agree. As can be observed from the table t-value is 0.977 and p-value 0.316 $\alpha=0.05$ at $\alpha=0.05$ with the degree of freedom 154 where the calculated p-value is greater than 0.05.this implied there is no statistically significant difference between opinions of the respondents. School leaders and teachers agree that there is a clash between departments because of lack of sufficient resource. The data also elicit whether competitions for common goals and scare of resources are considered to be the sources of conflict in the schools are a factors to cause conflict. This indicated that most of school leaders and teachers have common believe on competitions for common goals and scare of resources are considered as the sources of conflict in the secondary schools. Scholars

also supports the idea Gray and Starke (1998) also suggested that Limited resources in sources of conflict. Conflict arises when interests collide usually as of the results divergent in organizational goal and demand on scarce resources the data from interview result shows that there was a competition common goal and shortage resources in the schools.

Table 9 item 4 the respondents asked whether lack of professional commitment as a source of conflict or not. the mean value of school leaders were found 3.63, SD=1.04 indicated that school leaders believe more lack of professional commitment as a source of conflict whereas teachers were found 3.30 SD=1.04 combined mean 3.46 which shows that both of the respondent agree that lack of professional commitment as a source of conflict. The computed t-test-0.328 and p-value 0.883 at $\alpha=0.05$ and with degree of freedom 154. This implied that the calculated p-value greater than 0.05 then the data shows that there is no statistically significant difference between opinions of the respondents. It was reported that a majority of their respondents School leaders and teachers agreed that intergroup conflict exist for lack of professional commitment. However, the qualitative data obtained from interview indicated that School leaders and teachers believe or consider themselves as a professionally committed worker in their departments.

On the other hands, statements on item 5 on the same table the respondents were asked to give their agreement or disagreements whether lack sharing experience it may be a leading factor to cause intergroup conflict or not. From the same table it can be inferred that School leaders and teachers favor the statement. the mean value of school leaders were found to be 3.50 with SD of 1.17 and teachers mean value were 3.44 and SD of 1.14 with combined mean 3.47 which shows agree on the issue. The computed t-test-0.523 and p-value 0.320 at $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom 154 Where the calculated p-value greater than 0.05. Then the data shows that there is no statistically significant difference between opinions of the respondent. This shows that majority of respondents support sharing of experience among school department cause

intergroup conflict. The qualitative data gathered through interview on this issue similarly support that

Since the school leaders and teachers have different background, different capacity of knowledge, ability to perform activity and one is more experienced than other. In order to narrow their gap of knowledge sharing experience very essential but lack sharing experience it may be a leading factor to cause intergroup conflict in selected secondary schools.

In the same table item 6 the respondents were asked to give their agreement or disagreements whether lack in participatory decision making as a causing factor of intergroup conflict or not. The mean value of school leaders were found 4.06 and SD of 0.70 and teachers mean value were 3.96 and SD of 0.65 with combined mean 4.01 These indicated majority of school leaders and teachers believe that failure to practice participatory decision making can raise intergroup conflict. The computed t-test 1.060 and p-value 0.784 at $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom 154. where the calculated p-value 0.784 greater than 0.05. Then the data shows that there is no statistically significant difference between opinions of the respondents. The result data revealed that School leaders and teachers have common understanding that lack in participatory decision making sources of intergroup conflict the schools. The qualitative data gathered through interview from PTA and KETB on this issue similarly indicated that

Lacks in participatory decision making become a sources of conflict when there is no close and regular communication, when there is a failure to practice open discussion between school leaders and teachers in secondary schools

Literature also support the idea that lacks of participatory discussion making as a solution by de-emphasizing their differences, face to face discussion, interchanging information are means of avoid intergroup conflict as result of this lack participatory decision making sources of intergroup conflict (Ivancevich and Matterson, 1996)

The same table item 7 the respondents were asked whether competition for limited resources that cause conflict or not. The mean value of school leaders were found 4.18, SD=1.26 and teachers were 4.12 SD=1.17 with combined mean 4.15. The computed t-value was 0.494 and p-value 1.64 at $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom 154, where p-value greater than 0.05. The data revealed that there is no statistically significant difference between opinions of the respondents Which implied that both school leaders and teachers have common understanding that competition for limited resources sources of conflict schools The qualitative data gathered through interview from PTA on this issue similarly indicated that competition for limited resources such that for extramural activities, textbooks and other learning material, teaching aids and so on are a sources of Intragroup conflict in the schools.

4.4. Conflict Management Strategies

Table 10 Conflict Management Strategies

No	Items	Mean		Co .M	SD		t	P-value	Df
		School leaders	Teacher		School leaders	Teacher			
1	Open discussion on differences between teacher and school leaders	4.20	4.33	4.26	0.86		1.19	0.475	154
2	Legal disciplinary measures, such as written reprimand, Punishment in fine, demotion, discharge or dismiss from the school can manage conflict.	3.94	2.21	3.07	0.75	0.60	-1.34	0.22	154
3	Professionalism and meritocracy in appointment of teachers and school leaders	4.27	4.29	4.28	0.58	0.67	0.225	0.457	154
4	Transparency and accountability in financial and resource allocation in school	3.92	4.17	4.04	0.95	0.78	1.81	0.801	154
5	Following compromising approach while dealing with conflict	4.17	3.99	4.08	0.97	0.79	1.299	0.821	154
6	Regular meeting and consultation in school is a method to managing conflict.	4.27	4.37	4.32	0.688	.0578	0.942	0.697	154
7	Clear description of roles and responsibility between teacher and principal.	4.30	4.28	4.29	0.81	0.58	0.189	0.506	154
8	Encouraging parties to work together to find mutually acceptable solution to problems (collaboration approach)	4.27	4.29	4.28	0.86	0.67	0.465	0.56	154

Key: df (154)t=t-test, SD=Std deviation, df =degree of freedom=p-value, level of significance at $\alpha=0.05$

This section deals with conflict management strategies. Properly managed conflict can lead to outcomes that are productive and enhances the health of the school and lead to create innovation but if ineffective management of conflict, on the other hand, can and regularly creates frustration, deteriorating organization climate and finally increasing destructiveness. Their responses were grouped under 8 data categories. The frequency distribution of the data is clearly seen in Table 10 In other words, how frequently these methods of resolving conflicts are appeared in secondary schools. Compromising, collaborating, Open discussion, Professionalism and meritocracy in appointment school leaders, and legal disciplinary measures question items were prepared for school leaders and teachers to give their opinion on how to manage conflicts and solve school problems as discuss below.

Table 10 item 1 school leaders and teachers were requested to state their level of agreement or disagreement whether open discussion on differences between teacher and school leaders is a way to manage conflict by exchange information that of conflict management strategies or not. The mean value of school leaders were found 4.20, $SD=0.86$ and teachers were found 4.33 $SD=0.85$ with combined mean 4.26 which shows agree on the issue where as combined mean indicated common agree on the statement. The computed t-test 1.19 and p-value 0.475 at $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom 154. Where the calculated p-value greater than 0.05. Then the data shows that there is no statistically significant difference between opinions of the respondents. The strategies listed in the statement are exchange of accurate information, open discussion with this regard item respectively. Agree that exchange of accurate information is a strategy to be used to manage, conflict. This shows majority of both groups respondent belief conflict is managed by exchanging information similarly school leaders and teacher's belief that conflict is managed through open discussion on difference between teachers and school leaders.

In the same table item 2 depicts School leaders and teachers agree that legal disciplinary measure can manage conflict. This was evident in that there was difference in belief between the two groups of respondent on the stated strategies. Although school leaders belief that

disciplinary measures can manage conflict, the mean value of school leaders were found 3.94, SD=0.75 and teachers were 2.21, SD=0.60 with combined mean 3.07 the data revealed that schools leaders more agree that disciplinary measures were taken to correct individuals who committed in secondary schools than teachers however the teachers mean rating was below the average mean (3.00)so teachers disagree that legal disciplinary measures were not taken to correct individuals whether committed or not. But the combined mean implied that both group of respondents agree the opinion regarding legal disciplinary measures were taken to correct individuals. The computed t-test 1.13 and p-value 0.22 at $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom 154. Where the calculated p-value 0.220 greater than 0.05.the data indicated that there is no significant difference between opinions of the respondent. Secondary school's disciplinary measures to correct individuals. The qualitative data collected from interview from interviewees from PTA, and KETB revealed that

Legal disciplinary measures of secondary schools to correct individuals who committed mistakes discipline committees took disciplinary actions when violence have been occurred which to controlling and managing conflicts in secondary schools. oral and written reprimands Punishment in fine were the usual disciplinary measures to correct individuals who committed mistakes but disciplinary measures were not taken in some cases which conflicts often causes trivial later and discipline committees might care for some issues that might have an undesirable impact on the relations of school members

Previous studies also support the qualitative data that legal disciplinary measure such as demotion discharging; punishment in fine, written reprimand, however school leaders still tend to apply bureaucratic style of managing conflict and most schools have work rules that if violated, can result in various penalties, including discharge (French,1987).

In the same table item 3 the respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement on the strategies of conflict management like professionalism and meritocracy in appointments of teachers and school leaders can help to manage conflict management Strategies or not. the

mean value of school leaders were found to be 4.27, SD is 0.58 and teachers found to be 4.29 SD is 0.67 with combined mean 4.28 which shows agree on the issue where as combined mean indicated common agree on the statement. The computed t-test 0.225 and p value 0.455 at $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom 154. Where p -value greater than 0.05. Then the data shows that there is no statistically significant mean difference between the respondents. The result shows School leaders and teachers agree that professionalism and meritocracy can help manage conflict. The qualitative data gathered through interview from KETB

Professionalism and meritocracy in appointments of school leaders without unnecessary interference other authorities rather than educational officials and experts in selection of school leaders.

In the same table item 4 the respondents were asked whether being transparent and accountable in financial and resource allocation in school was Conflict. Management Strategies or not. The mean value of school leaders were found 3.92, SD=0.95 and teachers were 4.17 SD=0.78) with combined mean 4.04. this implied that majority School leaders and teachers agree that conflict can be managed through being transparent and accountable in financial and resource allocation in school is way of managing conflict in secondary schools. The computed t-test 1.81 and p-value 0.801 at $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom 154. Where p value 0.801 is greater than 0.05 then the data shows that there is no statistically significant difference between opinions of the respondents. The qualitative data obtained from PTA through interview support this idea that

Privileged accountability on the use of school finance by the school and transparency principals 'resource allocation in school may the strategies managing conflict in the school.

On the same table the respondents were requested to give their response on give and take approach method school leaders and teachers agree to the statement or not. The mean value of

school leaders were found 4.27, SD=0.58 and teachers were 4.29 SD=0.67) with combined mean 4.28 which shows agree on the issue where as combined mean indicated common agree on the statement. The computed 0.225 and p-value 0.0456 at $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom 154. Where p value greater than 0.05 then the data shows that there is no statistically significant difference opinions of between the respondents

In the same table item 5 the respondents were asked whether Compromising approach help schools for Conflict Management Strategies or not. The mean value of school leaders were found 4.17, SD=0.95 and teachers were 3.99 SD=0.60) with combined mean 4.08.this implied that majority School leaders and teachers agree that conflict can be managed. The computed t-test 1.81 and p-value 0.801 at $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom 154.Where p value 0.801 is greater than 0.05 then the data shows that there is no statistically significant difference between opinions of the respondents concerning compromising approach in the schools The qualitative data obtained from PTA through interview support this idea that by face to face discussion, emphasis common interest, collect the fact and information using style cooperativeness and assertiveness where there is no dominate parties solving the problems Literature also support that idea that following compromising approach techniques dealing each party gives up something and also gains something. Conflict managing strategies in negotiations between school leaders and teachers with mutually acceptable decision (Rahim and Bonoma, 1996)

Table 10 Item 6 on the same table above requested respondents asked to rate their level of agreement whether regular meeting and consultation in schools are a strategy to manage conflict or not. The mean value of school leaders were found 4.27, SD=0.688 and teachers were found 4.32 SD=0.72 with combined mean 4.32. Which implied that majority of the respondents agree that regular meeting and consultation is a strategies used to manage conflict in the schools. The computed t-test 0.688 and p value 0.697 at $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom

154. Where p value greater than 0.05 then the data shows that there is no statistically significant difference between opinions of the respondent. The data shows that majority of school leaders and teachers agree that regular meeting and consultation is a strategy to manage conflict in the schools. The qualitative data gathered through interview from PTA and KETB on this issue similarly support that

In regular meeting and consultation the school leaders and teachers have to have equal participation, open discussion, exchange of information, to improve idea and practices, to arrive at better solution for the problem, taking corrective action by face to face discussion, emphasis common interest, collect the fact and information then discuss and training program on collected facts and information, using style cooperativeness and assertiveness, compromising and collaboration strategies

In the same table item 7 the respondents were asked whether that clear and description of roles and responsibility between teacher and principal Conflict Management Strategies or not. The mean value of school leaders were found 4.30, $SD=0.81$ and teachers were found 4.28 $SD=0.58$ with combined mean 4.29. shows that clear and description of roles and responsibility between teacher and principal Conflict Management Strategies. The computed t- test 0.189 and p-value 0.506 at $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom 154. Where the calculated p-value greater than 0.05. Then the data shows that there is no statistically significant difference between opinions of the respondents. Which implied that majority of respondents group; school leaders and teachers believe that defining clear and description of roles and responsibility between school leaders and teachers is a Strategy managing conflicts in secondary schools. The qualitative data gathered through interview from PTA and KETB on this issue similarly support that

But clearly demarked specified guide line, manual, policy and strategic documents which shows roles and responsibility of school leaders and teachers is a strategy managing conflicts

in secondary because everyone knows his mandate in which activity they are accountable and responsible in the schools.

At the same table item 8 the respondents were asked whether Encouraging staff to work together to find mutually acceptable solution to problems of conflict management strategies or not. The mean value of school leaders were found 4.27, SD=0.86 and teachers were 4.29 SD=0.67 with combined mean 4.28. Implied that Encouraging the staff to work together to find mutually acceptable solution to problems of conflict management strategies The computed t-value was 0.425 and p-value 0.56 at $\alpha=0.05$ with degree of freedom 154. where p-value greater than 0.05 The data revealed that there is no statistically significant difference between opinions of the respondents. The qualitative data obtained from PTA through interview support this idea that

Encouraging staff to work together to find mutually acceptable solution to problems applying dialogue by adopting roundtable conference and discussion on the issue is a way of minimize conflict in the schools.

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Summary

This study was conducted on the topic entitled ‘Teachers-principal conflict in selected government secondary schools of North Shoa Zone of Oromia Regional State.’ The main aim of this study was to explore teacher- principal conflicts in secondary schools. To this end, basic questions were raised which addressed the areas such as the sources, types, alternative strategy of managing conflict in secondary schools. The study aims to answer the following basic questions:

1. What are the sources of conflict between teachers and principals in selected Government secondary school of North Shoa Zone?
2. What are the types of conflict between teacher and principal in selected Government secondary school of North Shoa Zone?
3. What are the strategies used to minimize conflict between teacher and principal selected Government secondary school of North Shoa Zone?

The study was conducted in seven government secondary schools selected on the bases of simple random sampling techniques. The subjects of the study were 72 school leaders selected by availability sampling and 84 teachers selected by simple random sampling .in addition 21 respondents from PTA, KETB and CRC chairperson selected from sample schools by availability sampling for interview. Descriptive survey research method was used to gather the data from the respondents. The data collected from both school leaders and teachers through questionnaires, interviews and documentary analyzes. The questionnaires consisted of both closed-ended and open-ended items. The data was analyzed using both qualitative and

quantitative procedures. The data collected from both group of respondents were analyzed. Percentages and frequencies was used during the analysis the general characteristics of the respondents and descriptive statistics such mean combined mean, standard deviation, p-value and t-test to check the significance differences between the respondents The qualitative data collected through interview was analyzed qualitatively by narration in line with quantitative data. According to the result of data analysis, the following major findings were identified. The findings and conclusions were drawn from the analyzed data. Finally, based on the analysis of the data the major findings of the study are presented as follow:

- Regarding the experience of the majority 90(57.7%)of respondent had work experience more than 11 years, and52(33.6%) of them had work experience between 6 and 10 years experience. The more experiences may the more challenging and more managing conflict in the schools.
- The findings of the study revealed that majority of school leaders and teachers believed that uncomfortable working environment, poor communication, difference in perception4.36,4.25 and 4.09combined mean respectively and task interdependent working activities, dignity, security and equity4.12 and 4.21, combined mean respectively are the most common sources conflict in the secondary schools. with of combined mean scores indicated that most of the respondents agree uncomfortable working environment, poor communication ,difference in perception, unclear authority structure, task interdependent working activities, dignity, security and equity is a sources of conflict in secondary schools. Moreover over loading of teaching learning, lacks of participatory decisions and unclear authority structure were found to be the common sources of conflict in the secondary schools with combined mean scores 4.56 4.25 and 3.47respectively are the main sources of conflict in secondary schools.
- The finding of study shows that the most types of conflict exist in school is among the four types of conflict is found to be interpersonal conflict followed by intergroup conflict (51% and23.8%) respectively. On the other hand, intrapersonal and intragroup type of conflict (18.35% and 10.10) respectively reported to be the least types of conflict in secondary schools.

The finding revealed that the most sources of intrapersonal conflict source variable are Overload on the teaching and learning in the school, Unconducive working environment, shortage of facility in the schools with the mean scores of 4.56, 4.36 and 4.01 respectively are the major sources of intrapersonal conflict in the schools,

- The findings underscored that emotional instability, low standards of living (low salary), lack of required ability for particular job with 3.03, and 2.35 combined mean scores respectively are the least sources of Intragroup conflict in secondary schools.
- The findings of this study revealed that major sources of interpersonal conflict are competition for limited resources, Competing with each other for recognition, approval and promotion and Communication barriers appear among the staff with combined mean scores 4.49, 4.21 and 4.21 respectively and, inappropriate implementation of rules and regulations and absence of cooperation between the staffs with the combined mean scores of 4.01 and 3.89 respectively are also the prominent sources of interpersonal conflict in secondary schools.
- The finding of the study revealed that the sources of Intragroup conflicts are unfair treatment of the staff, Group composition and size, treat the work group differently, unsupportive working group and unfair period distribution and the decision for all members in the departments with the combined mean of 3.67, 3.61 and 3.49, respectively are the main sources of intra-group conflict in secondary schools.
- The finding of study identified that inconsistent performance and evaluation criteria, Lack of practice in participatory decision making competing with limited resources with combined mean scores of 4.12, 4.01 and 3.97 respectively. The main sources of intergroup conflict in the secondary schools. Task interdependence and problem of share experiences with departments are other sources of intergroup conflict in secondary schools.
- The result of the study indicated that, open discussion on differences with combined mean scores of regular meeting and consultation with combined mean scores of clear description of role and responsibilities with combined mean scores of 4.26, 4.32 and 4.29 respectively are the strategies managing conflict and in addition professionalism and meritocracy in appointment,

- encouraging parties to work together to find mutually acceptable solution to problems, collaboration approach and Compromising approach with combined mean scores of 4.28 ,4.26 and 4.08 respectively was found as good alternative strategy of managing and reducing conflict in school
- The findings of this study revealed legal disciplinary measures, such as written reprimand, Punishment in fine, demotion, discharge or dismiss from the school can manage conflict and transparency and accountability in financial and resource allocation in school is a way to manage conflict with the combined mean scores of 3.07 and 3.81 respectively reported the least accepted alternative strategies for managing conflict in the schools,
- The findings of the study revealed that, both group of respondent believe that conflict has more negative impact on school work. They reported that conflict can create bad feeling in school among the conflicting parties and intensive conflict affect staff in school with combined mean scores of 4.38 and 4.15respectively.
- The findings of the study indicated that conflict result better out come and in creating innovative idea with combined mean scores of 3.22 and 3.26 respectively. On the other hands if no conflict, innovative and creative idea may not produce, less intergroup competition, and conflict in idea prevented the schools from producing myopic decisions. Lessening the performances of the schools. The data revealed the usefulness of conflict if properly managed.

5.2. Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. The finding of study shows that uncomfortable working environment, communication lacks of participatory decisions, lack of facilities and unclear authority structure are the common source of conflict in secondary schools. This implied there is no healthy communication, network less participatory decisions on the school issue, inadequate facilities undefined, authority structures were the factors contributing to conflict in North Shoa Zone secondary schools.

2. The findings of the study, that competing with each other for recognition, approval and promotion, in appropriate implementation of rules and regulations and absence of cooperation in the schools therefore it possible to conclude that competing inappropriate implementation of rules and regulations and absence of cooperation between the staffs members are the prominent factors that leads of interpersonal conflict in secondary schools.

3. The findings indicate that, unfair treatment, unsupportive working group, Inconsistent performance and evaluation criteria, Lack of practice in participatory decision with others departments the contributing factors for intergroup conflict. This implied that school leaders treat differently. Did not encourage to support the working group and the school had evaluate the performances of staff with inconsistent criteria which leads to intergroup conflict in the schools leaders understanding of the goals of evaluation on the part of teachers and improper implementation of the issue under consideration by the people assigned to it. Some school leaders relate to the personal characteristics of workers, but make comparison between work performances teachers and staff, instead of comparing the person with his /her performance.

4.The finding indicate that, open discussion on differences ,regular meeting and consultation clear description of role and responsibilities collaboration approach and Compromising

approach, transparency and accountability in financial and resource allocation in schools are good alternative strategy to minimize conflict in the school but could be concluded that there were no magnified open discussion, description of role and responsibilities regular meeting between teachers and school leaders in the schools. Therefore it can be conclude that inappropriate use of collaborative approach and Compromising approach strategies for handling conflicts and poor accountability on the use of school finance and resource allocation by the school principal in the schools,

5. The disciplinary measures might not be necessary, if necessary making corrections earlier may assist in reduction the unnecessary development of conflict. Besides, disciplinary measures to be taken to handle conflict at a certain stage should be based on the degree of mistakes committed by victims but discipline committees might care for some issues that might have an undesirable impact on the relations of school members and causes trivial later.

6. The finding indicates conflicts have positive and negative impact in secondary schools, and occurred in the form of. Intrapersonal, interpersonal, intragroup and intergroup types. Both personal and group conflict believed that conflict has more negative impact on schools that create bad feeling, decline in communication among the conflicting parties to group demands and personals. From the finding it is possible to conclude that conflict has more negative impact on schools rather than positive one

5.3. Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations were drawn

- School principals should be arranging round table conferences for staff in order to utilize them for handling conflicts in the schools. Prominent conflict handling strategies such as collaborating, compromising and problem solving. Hence, school leaders should know about them and steps should be taken to improve conflict management strategies in school. Principals should engage themselves, open door management and participatory decision, good governance reduce conflict in schools
- Oromia educational bureaus in collaboration with Zone and Words education offices establish effective communication network among the schools. This is to ensure that secondary schools are consulted before major decisions and actions concerning conflict and its management strategies in secondary schools.
- Words education offices taken measures by allocation resources and finance to improve the performance of schools with the collaboration of school community and other community on identified school resources and financial problem suggested by principals and school committee but principals should be accountable and transparent in financial and in allocations of resources to minimize conflict in the school.
- Oromia educational bureaus and Words education office may be improved the capacity of principals through in-service training courses and arranged refreshment trainings on school leadership to improve their ability of managing conflict.
- Words education offices arrange regular experience sharing for school principals to develop skills in educational leadership on the topics such as conflict and its types that may exist in school, conflict management and to improve their decision making skill

- School principals should be selecting the most relevant method of conflict management according to the situation and the persons involved and to establish comfortable working condition. Its suggested that tolerance of school principals accept criticisms during open discussions with teacher's meetings on academic issue dialogue and round table conference. This may help schools principals to identify sources of conflict, types and strategies to reduce and minimize conflict.
- Finally, further study should be conducted teacher-principal conflict and impact to identify sources, types, impact and strategies of managing conflict school problems that lead to conflict at national level.

6. REFERENCES

- Abdul, G. 2010 PhD Scholar. Education Qurtuba University of science and information technology.
*Journal of Managerial Science. Peshawar. Campus. Pakistan*3(2):32-38
- Ackerman, D, 2003.Taproots for a new century *tapping the best of traditional and progressive education* .phi Delta kappen.
- Antcliffe, J, 1998.*Some Approaches to Conflict with Adolescents in classrooms*. Rout Ledge, New York.
- Barth, S.W.2001. *Organization Behavior(6th ed)* Boston: Donnelly& Sons Company.
- Baron R.A. 1990. *Conflict in organizations* In K. R. Rurphy and F. E. Saal Psychology in organizations: Integrating Science and Practice.. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum
- Best, J.W. and. Klan, D 1998. *Scientific Investigation*. Heinemann, Press.london,
- Best, G. 2006,*Introduction to peace and conflict studies* in West Africa. Spectrum Books
- Billisberry, J. 1999. *Power and Managing Conflict* (Books4), London the open university Press
- Burthis, J.O.1995. Grouping and Leading as citizen action. *Journal of leadership studies*.2: 50-63
- Bono, J.E.and Judge T.A. 2003 Self confidence age work .understanding of motivational impact of transformational leaders, *Academic management journal*.46:554-571
- Borden, K. and Abbott, B.B. 1986. *Research Design and Methodology: A process approach*. California: Mayfield publishing company
- Blasé, J. and Blasé, J. R. 1994. *Empowering teachers: What successful principals do*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Campbell, R.F, Carbally,J.E and,Nustrand. R.O,2001.*Introduction to Administration* Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc.

- Carter, McNamara. 2008. *Field Guide to Leadership and Supervision*. MBA, PhD, Authenticity consulting. LLC.
- Chandan, J. 1994. *Organizational Behavior*, New Delhi: Vikas Publishing.
- Creswell, J. W. 2009. *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach*. 3rd ed. University of Nebraska- Lincoln: SAGE Publications, Inc,
- Cormack, G, Dale, N, Emend, P, Sigurdsson. Stuart. B. D. 1996. *Building consensus for a sustainable future: Putting principles into practice*. Ottawa National Round table on the Environment and the Economy.
- Champoux, J. E. 2003. *Organizational behavior: essential tenets 2nd ed*. Canada: South-Western.
- Champoux, J. E. 2006. *Organizational behavior: integrating individuals, groups and organizations* New Delhi: Radha Publications.
- De Janasz, S. C, Dowd, K O. and Schneider, B. Z. 2006, *Interpersonal Skills in Organizations*. 2nd Ed. New York: McGraw- Hill/Irwin
- Deutsch, M and Coleman. P. 2000. *The handbook of conflict resolution: Theory and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Filippo.
- Deutsch. M, 2005. *Cooperation and conflict* .In West, M.A, and Smith, K.G the essentials of teamwork: International perspective .Maryland: Wiley
- Durbin, A. J. 2005. *Fundamentals of Organizational Behavior*. 3rd ed. Canada: South-Western, Thomson
- Eccles, G.S, A.S, Lronard and Gabarro, 1995. *Managing Behavior in an Organization*. McGraw-hill, London
- Edgewise, O. O. 2003. *Conflict management in secondary schools* Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of Nigeria.
- Erasmus, Swart. L. and Marietta. V. 2000 *Advanced communication Skill*. 1st Ed. Pretoria: Mc Painters.
- E.M. 1991. *Educational Administration and Organizational Behavior* (3rd Ed), Boston: Ally nard Bacon
- French, W.L. 1987. *The personal management process: Human resources administration and development*. 6th ed. Boston: Hough Wilton Mifflin.
- Fisher, Wele, 1990, *The social psychology of inter-group and international conflict resolution*. Network: -pringer-verlags.

- FikruWele, 1993A *strategy for managing Conflict in the primary Teachers Training institutes of) A.A.U.Ethiopia*", Unpublished Master Thesis.
- Fisher, R.J.1993. *"The Potential for Peace-building: Forging a Bridge fromPeacekeeping to Peacemaking,"* Peace and Change.
- Fisher, R.J. 2000. *Sources of Conflict and Methods of Conflict Resolution*; New York: Springer-Verlags.
- Fullans, M. 2002. *Interactive conflict resolution*. Syracuse University press. New York.
- GebretensayTesfaye, 2002, *A Study of factors that generate conflict between government secondary school teachers and educational managers in Addis Ababa Administrative Region*, A Thesis presented to The School of Graduate Studies Addis Ababa University.
- Glatter,R, and I.P.Fader, 1996.*Understanding School management*. Open University Educational enterprises ltd.
- Gray. Miller, p.A. and. Noakes.1995.*Challenging Behavior in School*. New York.
- Gray, J.L. and. StrakeF.A, 1998.*Organizational Behavior-concepts and Applications*: Columbus Bell and How`ell Company.
- GonieTegbaru, 1998. Study on teacher and principal conflict in Amahra secondary schoolsunpublished master thesis A.A.U.
- Gorden, J.R.1997.*A diagnostic approach to Organization Behavior*: Boston Allyn and Bacon Inc.
- Hanson, E.M. 1996. *Educational Administration and Organizational Behavior3rd Ed*Boston: Allyn and Bacon
- Hart, T.E.2001.Vision as emerging leadership phenomena. Unpublished master thesis: manthan Kansas State University.
- .
- Hellriegel, F, D and.Slocum J.W.1998.*Management*, London: Wesley publishing company.
- Hitt, M. A., Miller, C. C. A. 2006 *Organizational Behavior: A Strategic Approach*. USA: John Wiley& Sons, Inc.
- Hocker, J. L. & Wilmot, W. W, *Interpersonal conflict*3rd Ed.
- Holt, D.H. 1993. *Management: principals and Practice*. Englew: Prentice Hall In.
- Hoighes, M. Patter, R. And Thomas, H.ends.1985.*Managing Education*. London: Holt Rinehart and Winston

- Holt, D.H. 1993. *Management: principals and Practice*. Englew:-Prentice Hall Inc.
- Hough's, M. Patter, R. And Thomas, H.ends.1985 *Managing Education*. London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Hunt, J. W. 1992.*Managing people at work*. Managers Guides to Behavior in Organizations London. Hill Book Company.
- Ivancevich, J.M. and Watterson, M.T.1996. *Organizational behavior and Management*. 4th Ed. Houston: Irwin Inc.
- Iravo, A.M, 2002. A Study on Preparation of School Principals and Implications on their Administrative Performance. Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis University of Nairobi.
- Jehn, K. A. 1997. Qualitative Analysis of Conflict: Types and Dimensions in Organizational Groups. *Administratively Quarterly* No. 42, Vol. 3, pp. 421–618.
- Johnson,P.E.2005.*Conflict and the school leader*. University of Connecticut.
- Kellermann,P.F.1996 *Interpersonal Conflict Management* in Group Psychotherapy integrative perspective. Group analysis.
- Kinard, J. 1988. *Management*, Toronto: D.C.Health and company.
- Kirkwood, D, 2002. *Conflict resolution and the ADR initiative* at GSW.
- Kundu, C.L and D.N.Tutoo 1999 *Educational psychology*, New Delhi Sterling Publishing Private Limited'
- Kothari, C .2003. *Research methodology: Methods and techniques*. H.S poplar New Delhi.
- Kriesberg L. 1998. *Constructive conflict: From escalation to resolution*. Lanham, MD: Rowman Littlefield.
- Laue, J. H. 1990. *The emergence and institutionalization of third- party roles in conflict*", in John, B and Frank, D eds. *Conflict: readings in management and resolution*, USA: Macmillan
- Lutherans, F.1989. *Organizational Behavior, 3th ed* New York: Mc Grew -Hill Book Company.
- Margaret Owusu-Mensah,2007.Conflict in primary schools and its impact on teaching and learning: a cause study of ejjesujuaban district. Masters of Art faculty of Fine Art college of Art and Social sciences department of art general studies.
- Mayer, BS, 2001. *The Dynamics of Conflict Resolution: A Practitioner's Guide*.
- McNamara, C, 2007. "*Basics of Conflict Management*" Adapted from the Field Guide to Leadership and Supervision. Methuen

- Robbins, S. 1989. *Organizational Behavior: Concepts, Controversies and Applications* (4 th ed) .New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India.
- M.o.E.1994. *Education and Training policy*, Addis Ababa: EMPXDA.
- M.o.E.1994. *Education and Training policy*, Addis Ababa: EMPXDA.
- Mohammad.Johdi Salleh & Raman Ramani, 2011. *Conflict Management* in the MARA Education Institutions, Malaysia. National Seminar of Deans Council, Faculties of Education, Universities of Malaysia (SMDD2011) University Putra Malaysia, Serdang, Selangor.27&28September 2011.
- Murphy, J. and Porter, A.2006. Leadership for learning: a research based model and taxonomy of behaviors*Journal of leadership and management*. 27(2), 179-201.
- Nelson,1995,*Interpersonal Team LeadershipSkill*.Hospital Material Management Quarterly.
- Obi,E.2004. *Issues in Educational Administration*. Enugu: Empathy International Organ. D.
- Owens, R.G. 1998. *Organizational Behavior in education* .Englewood cliff: Prentice. Hall inc.
- Owens, R.G. 2004. *Organizational Behavior in education* .Adaptive leadership and school reforms; Boston:-Allyn and Bacon.
- Plunkett, W.R. and Raymond, F. Attner1989. *Introduction to Management*, Boston: pws-Kent Publishing.
- Prinsloo, S.2002. *Conflict Management skills*. 2nd Ed Lynwood Glen: Prinsloo Publishers.
- Rahim, M. A. 1996. *Managing Conflict in Organizations* (2rd Ed.). CT: Quorum Books
- Rahim, M. A. 2001. *Managing Conflict in Organizations* (3rd Ed.). Westport, CT: Quorum Books
- Rahim, M. A .and Bonoma, T.V.2001." Managing organizational conflict", *TheJournalof psychological Report*.Vo 44.No.3, PP: 1323-1344
- Robinson. J.W.andLouisS.D.1991. *Conflict Management in CommunityGroups*Illinois:University of Illinois Board of Trustee.
- Robbins, S.P.2000.*Managing organizations: New challenges and perspective* New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.
- Schermerhor, J. and D, S Chappell.2000.*Introducing management* .New York: John Wiley and sons Inc.
- Steyn, J.C. de Klerk, J. & du Plessis, W.S.2003. *Education for democracy 3rd Ed*. Durban: Wachwa Publishers.

- Stoner, A.F. and Freeman, R.E. 1989. *Management(4th ed.* New Delhi: prentice Hall of India.
- Swart, M. 1998*Advanced Communication Skills.* Pretoria: Haum.
- Swart, M. 2001. *Advanced Communication Skills.*Pretoria;-Haum.
- Terry, R. And Stephen, G. 1999.*Principles of Management,* 8thed. Delhi: Nice Printing Press.
- Thorone, B.M. 1989.*Statistics for the behavioral Sciences.* California: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Toby, M.1999. *Conflict management.* Braamfontein: Staff College.
- Ugwu, B. C. E. (1994b). *Emotional conflict resolution among secondary school students:* Implication for guidance and counseling. Review of education.
- Umstot, D. D. (1987). *Understanding organizational behavior* Cos. Angeles San Francisco West Publishing Co.
- UNESCO, 1998.Basic Trains Programme In Educational Planning and Book V1.Bangkok..
- Wattaman. andT.S.Bateman. 1991. *Organizational Behavior.* Boston: Donnelly & Sons Company.
- Wilmot, J.and, Hocker S. 1998. *Preventative Approaches to Disruption.* McGraw. Hill New.
- Wright, Q. 1990. *The nature of conflict*“, in John B and Frank D eds. Conflict: readings in manage

7.0 APPENDICS

7.1.APPENDIC -A

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSIY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

Questionnaire to be filled by school leaders and teachers. The questionnaire is constructed to gather data used for the analysis of the research thesis. The purpose of the study is to collect information about Teacher-principal conflict in selected Government secondary schools of North Shoa Zone.

The Result and the Success of the research are based on the quality of the responses, and the researcher requests you to give accurate and honest responses to the items presented.

Confidentiality is granted and the date you give will be utilized only for the academic purpose.

Direction:

No need of writing your name

Put “√” in the box you agree with

Give your short and precise answers on the space provided.
You have to return the questionnaire to the researcher

Thank You in Advance for Your Cooperation!

Part One: General information

1. School code _____
2. Sex
Male Female
3. Age in a Year
1). 20 -30 2) 31- 40 3) 41 – 50 4). Above 51
4. Marital Status 1.Single 2. Married 3. Others
5. Qualification
1 Diploma 2 Degree 3 M.A/M.SC/M.Ed 4 Others
6. Work experience in years
1) 1-5 2) 6 – 10 3) 11 and above
7. Your current position 1). Teacher 2). School leaders

Part Two

Instructions: The statements listed below describe the extent teacher-principal conflict in secondary schools of North Shoa Zone. So you are asked to express your idea about each statement by indicating whether you are Strongly Disagree (1) Disagree (2) Undecided (3), Agree (4) Strongly Agree (5) then put thick marks (√) in the box provided..

Does conflict existing in your in school? 1. Yes 2. no

1. If your answer for the above question is yes, what types of conflict exist in your school?

1.1 Intrapersonal Conflict

1.2 Interpersonal Conflict

1.3 Intragroup Conflict

1.4 Intergroup Conflict

2. Common sources of conflict.

No	Statements	1	2	3	4	5
1	Poor communication problem causes conflict in my school.					
2	Competition for common goals and scarce resources are source of conflict.					
3	Ideological differences in goal cause conflict in my school.					
4	Need of dignity, security, equity are the source of conflict in school.					
5	Lack of participation in decision making cause conflict in school					
6	Differences in perception (attitude) among the staff cause conflict .					
7	Uncomfortable working environment of the school organization.					
8	Individual differences among teachers and principal cause conflict					
9	Task interdependent work activities are cause of conflict in school.					
10	Unclear authority structure between teacher and principal can be source of conflict in my school.					

If any other cause of conflict please, specify _____

3. Type of Conflict

3.1. Sources of intrapersonal conflict

No	Statements	1	2	3	4	5
1	Uncomfortable working environment affect work.					
2	Overload on the teaching and learning in the school.					
3	I satisfy with the decisions made in the school					
4	There is a good match between responsibilities and poor performance evaluation.					
5	Low standard of living (low salary).					
6	Lack of facilities, rules and regulations affect work.					
7	I am not emotionally stable on work					
8	I think there is lack of required ability for particular job					

If any other sources of intrapersonal conflict please, specify

3.2 Interpersonal Conflicts

No	Statements	1	2	3	4	5
1	There is the absence of cooperation between the staffs.					
2	There are consistent views and aims among individuals (teachers and/or school leaders) in schools.					
3	There is inappropriate implementation of rules and regulations					
4	Individuals (teachers and/ or principals) confront each other their disagreement and disputes in constructive way in my school					
5	Communication barriers appear among the Teachers and Principals.					
6	Age, sex and ethnic difference in the school.					
7	Competing with each other for recognition, approval and promotion					
8	There is competition for limited resources in the school					

If any other sources of interpersonal conflict please, specify

3.3 Sources of Intragroup conflict

No	Statements	1	2	3	4	5
1	I am satisfied with department's manner of working in the schools as team.					
2	Group composition and size treat the work group differently in school					
3	Unbalance period distribution and the decision of department in the school					
4	The members of staff working group are supportive to one another ideas.					
5	The staff members are fairly treated.					

If any other sources of intergroup conflict please Specify

3.4. Source of Intergroup Conflict

No	Statements	1	2	3	4	5
1	I annoyed with other departments members in the school.					
2	There are task interdependence between my departments and others departments.					
3	Conflicts exist between departments due to competing with limited resources.					
4	Conflicts exist between departments due to lack of professional commitment.					
5	Problem sharing experiences with department in other schools.					
6	Lack of practice in participatory decision making in the school.					
7	There is competition for limited resources that cause conflict in the group.					

If any other sources intergroup conflict please, specify

4. Conflict Management Strategies

No	Statements	1	2	3	4	5
1	Open discussion on differences between teacher and principals is a way to manage conflict.(problem solving)					
2	Disciplinary measures, (Written reprimand, Punishment in fine, Demotion, Discharge or dismiss from the school) can manage conflict.					
3	Use of student representative council (SRC) in management, Decision making and administration is a way to manage conflict.					
4	Professionalism and meritocracy in appointment of teachers and principals can help to manage conflict					
5	Transparency and accountability in financial and resource allocation in					

6	school is a way to manage conflict Using “give and take” approach methods (compromising) help for managing conflict.					
7	Regular meeting and consultation in school Management is a method to managing conflict.					
8	Clear and description of roles and responsibility between teacher and principal.					

If any other alternative strategies for conflict management in your School please specify it

PART THREE: OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

INSTRUCTION: Please give your answers and suggestions for the following questions regarding teacher-principal conflict in secondary schools’.

1. What are the strategies used for handling (minimizing) conflicts? Please list some points.

2. What types of conflict are frequently occurred in the secondary schools? Please List some point? _____

3. What are the sources of conflict in your school? Please List some point? _____

4 If you have additional suggestion regarding teacher-principal conflict and its impact in secondary school, please write some of them in spaces provided below
