



ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

**Conflict Management Practices in Government Secondary
and Preparatory Schools in Yeka Sub-City Addis Ababa**

BY

Shemlash Zewdie Bekele

June 2016

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

**Conflict Management Practices in Government Secondary
and Preparatory Schools in Yeka Sub-City Addis Ababa**

Shemlash Zewdie Bekele

**ATHESIS SUBMITTED TO ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY COLLEGE
OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDY DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN SCHOOL LEADERSHIP**

June 2016

Addis Ababa University

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Declaration

Conflict Management Practices in Government Secondary and Preparatory Schools in Yeka Sub-City Addis Ababa.

In the preparation of this thesis, all sources have been accurately reported and acknowledged. The work presented in this thesis is my own and it was done with strict supervision of my advisor.

Date

Shemlash Zewdie

Certificate

This MA thesis entitled “Conflict Management Practices in Government Secondary and Preparatory Schools in Yeka Sub-City Addis Ababa” has been written by Shemlash Zewdie under my guidance and supervision as university advisor or examiner. In my view, the work is an original effort of the candidate and all the materials used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Signed by the examining committee:

Examiner _____ Sig. _____ Date _____.

Examiner _____ Sig. _____ Date _____.

Advisor. _____ Sig. _____ Date _____..

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my deep and sincere gratitude to the following people who have played a significant role in making this thesis a reality:

Ambissa Kenea (PHD) who was my advisor deserves special acknowledgement for his unreserved support and valuable advice.

My family has given me the support I needed in pursuing academic career. I want to thank them all. Especially, my wife, Mestawet Gidissa deserves special acknowledgment.

Mekedes Asrat has devoted her valuable time in producing text materials. She deserves due thanks for her assistance.

This investigation was made possible with the assistance obtained from the sample participants they demonstrated their willingness in filling out the questionnaire. Colleagues and friend also deserve acknowledgement for their constant encouragement in the course of my graduate study.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgement	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables	vi
Abstract	viii
CHAPTER ONE	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem	3
1.3. Objectives of the Study	5
1.3.1. General Objective of the Study	5
1.3.2. Specific Objectives	5
1.4. Research Questions	5
1.5. Significance of the Study	6
1.6. Scope of the Study	6
1.7. Limitations of the Study	7
1.8. Organization of the Study	7
CHAPTER TWO	8
REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE	8
2.1. Introduction	8
2.2. Defining Conflict	8
2.3. Intra Organizational Conflict	12
2.4. Conflict Management	16
2.5. Stimulating Functional Conflict	17
2.6. Styles of Handling Interpersonal Conflict	18
2.7. Conflict Management Strategy	21
2.8. Empirical Studies	22
2.9. Theoretical Framework	25

CHAPTER THREE	27
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	27
3.1. Research Design.....	27
3.2. Study Area and Population.....	27
3.3. Sources of Data	27
3.4. Samples and Sampling Techniques.....	27
3.5. Sample Size	28
3.6. Data Gathering Instruments	28
3.7. Data Collection Procedures.....	29
3.8. Validity and Reliability	29
3.9. Methods of Data Analysis	30
3.10. Ethical Consideration	31
CHAPTER FOUR.....	32
DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	32
4.1. Demographic Characteristics	32
4.2. Types of Conflict.....	35
4.3. Conflict Management Styles	40
4.4. Conflict Management Strategy.....	50
CHAPTER FIVE	55
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION.....	55
5.1. Summary	55
5.2. Conclusion.....	57
5.3. Recommendation.....	57
Reference	58
Appendix	

List of Tables

Table 1: Stratified Random Sampling for Survey.....	28
Table 2: Reliability Statistics	30
Table 3: Mean Score Comparison Basis for Five Point Likert Scale Instrument.....	31
Table 4: Gender Distribution of Respondents	32
Table 5: Category wise Distribution of Age Group.....	33
Table 6: Qualification of Respondents	34
Table 7: Work Experience	35
Table 8: Mean Score Values of Intrapersonal Conflict Variables	36
Table 9: Oneway ANOVA on Scores of Intrapersonal Conflict	36
Table 10: Mean Score Values of Intragroup Conflict.....	37
Table 11: Oneway ANOVA on Intra group Conflict	38
Table 12: Mean Score Values of Inter group Conflict.....	39
Table 13: Oneway ANOVA on Intergroup Conflict.....	39
Table 14: Overall Mean Score Comparing of Conflict Types.....	40
Table 15: Mean Scores of Types of Conflict Respondent Groups	40
Table 16: Mean Score Values of Integrating Style.....	41
Table 17: Oneway ANOVA on Integrating Style.....	41
Table 18: Mean Score Values of Obliging Style	42
Table 19: Oneway ANOVA on Obliging	43
Table 20: MeanScore values of Dominating Style	43
Table 21: Oneway ANOVA on Dominating Style	44
Table 22: Mean Score Values on the Use of Avoiding Style	44
Table 23: Oneway ANOVA on Avoiding	45
Table 24: Post Hoc Tests	46
Table 25: Mean Score Compromising Style Among Three Respondent Groups.....	46
Table 26: Oneway ANOVA on Compromising	47
Table 27: Post Hoc Tests	48
Table 28: Overall Mean Score Comparing of Conflict Management Styles	48
Table 29: Mean Scores of Conflict Management Styles of Respondent Groups	49

Table 30: Mean Score Values of Perception on the Use of Negotiation	50
Table 31: One way ANOVA on Dimensions of Conflict Management Strategy	51
Table 32: Mean Score Values on the Perception of Superior Goal Strategy	52
Table 33: Mean Score Values on Third Party Intervention	53
Table 34: Overall Mean Score Comparing of Conflict Management Strategy	54
Table 35: Mean Scores of Types of Conflict Respondent Groups	54

Abstract

The aim of the study was to examine types of conflict, conflict management styles and strategies at Yeka sub-city secondary and preparatory schools of Addis Ababa City Administration. The basic question was ‘‘what are the practices of conflict management in government secondary and preparatory school in Yeka Sub City in Addis Ababa?’’ To select the samples of the research stratified, availability and random sampling techniques were used. In conducting this study, the required data was obtained through structured questionnaires. A sample of 242 employees were selected and completed a survey questionnaire. The study employed descriptive and inferential statistics for the purpose of data analysis with the help of SPSS version 21 software. It was confirmed that a moderate level of intergroup type of conflict was more prevalent in the target school system. Next to this comes intragroup conflict while intrapersonal conflict is least prevalent. Integrating style is practiced more frequently; next to this were obliging and dominating styles; avoiding and compromising are least exercised. The third party intervention is more exercised than the use of negotiation and superior goal strategy. It was concluded that the conflict management strategy of the secondary and preparatory schools of Yeka Sub-City were not so effective. It is recommended that the greater use of integrating style of conflict management is to be encouraged. On the other hand the low level practice of compromising style should be improved to a high level. Similarly the low level negotiation strategy, currently being practiced in the target school system, should be improved; a satisfactory level of negotiation strategy should be introduced.

Key words:

Types of Conflict, Styles of Conflict Management and conflict management strategy.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

Conflict is a natural and inevitable phenomenon in the human society. The theme of conflict has attracted the attention of the human mind from time immemorial. Over the years, the issue of conflict has been treated by authors in all of the social sciences. But it received different degrees of emphasis from social scientists during various periods of history (Rahim, 2001). According to Schellenberg (1996), most of the contributions to the study of social conflict came from philosophy and sociology, while a few contributions came from other disciplines, such as biological science.

In recent years, there have been renewed interest and significant changes in the study of conflict in social and organizational contexts. According to Thompson (1998), the formation of the “International Association of Conflict Management” to encourage research, teaching, and training and development on organizational conflict and the publication of the “International Journal of Management” confirms this renewed interest. Furthermore, since the recent past, a number of universities across the globe have shown great interest in teaching and research on social and organizational conflicts (Rahim, 2001).

In spite of the long acquaintance with and the growing interest of people towards conflict, scholars of social and organizational conflict did not come up with a single and clear definition for the term conflict. There is a variety of definitions provided by different authors at different times. For example, Bisno (1988) described conflict as a process of social interaction involving a struggle over claims to resources, power, status, beliefs and other preferences and desires. Another definition would be the one presented by Thompson (1998). According to Thompson conflict is a perception of differences of interests among people. Similarly, Pondy (1967) described organizational conflict as a dynamic process underlying organizational behavior.

Sociologists and philosophers have been studying social conflict for years. However, the study of conflict in relation to organizational contexts has been a recent phenomenon. Taylor (1911) as cited in Rahim (2001) was the pioneer to associate conflict with organizations. In the recent

past, there has been a growing interest in the study of conflict in organizations. Currently conflict in organizations is being considered as one of the most important factors that influences organizational performance. For instance, Pondy (1967) stresses that organizational theories designed to address problems of organizational efficiency need to accept conflict as one of the major organizational phenomena. His argument was that each problem in an organization is closely related to conflicts within the organization. Hocker and Wilmot (1991) also noted that organizational conflict is an important factor in the study of organizational behavior, development, and process.

Currently organizations are faced with intense challenges of competition on a global scale. Thus, they are attempting to introduce innovative changes to attain a competitive edge. Of course, introducing changes to an organization does not mean that these change oriented organizations are learning to manage conflicts more effectively. Rahim (2001) stated that studies have shown that many managers and administrators do not attempt to understand and deal with conflicts functionally; rather they tend to avoid or terminate them. Today, a moderate level of conflict in organizations with a proper handling is considered to be important for effective performance (Jehn et al, 1999). In spite of this progressive understanding, Rahim (2001) laments that the tendency of firms for reduction or termination of conflicts appears to remain unchanged. This fact implies that conflict in organizations is an area that needs further investigation for organizations could learn more from the findings and thereby improve their performances by using conflicts functionally.

From the perspective of conflicts, organizations of developing countries are no different from those found in developed nations. Of course, they may require much more learning and investigation in order to exploit organizational conflicts functionally. One important question may arise at this point. Are there some organizations in developing countries that are more worth the effort of research activities than others? Developing countries are characterized by their low level of human resource development. On the other hand, human resource development plays the most important role in the building of a nation, while educational institutions are primarily charged with the duty of human development works. In his publication “State and The University in Ethiopia under Three Regimes”, Balsvik (2007) suggests that the development of human resources is important for interpretation and understanding of reality, for discussion and

thinking, and for leadership training in order to find peaceful solutions based on local conditions. Furthermore, Balsvik (2007) states that universities are beacons of modernization and nation building, producing competent professionals to meet the development needs of nations. In Yeka Sub-City, there are six secondary and two preparatory schools. In these schools, there are 586 teaching staffs 48 school leaders and 302 supporting staffs. This study intends to examine and describe organizational conflict within the context of secondary and preparatory school systems.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

This study intended to describe types of conflict, conflict handling styles and conflict strategies in secondary schools of Yeka sub-City. The study has chosen educational institutions because these institutions are the most important types of organizations as indicated by Balsvik (2007), in the development of a nation. The argument of Balsvik justifies that educational institutions are worth the effort of research activities. Secondary and preparatory schools are also fundamental institutions in the development of human resources. Hence, the choice of educational institutions for the study of organizational conflict seems an appropriate measure.

Many studies have been conducted on organizational conflict on organizations in Ethiopia and Addis Ababa. For instance Tizalu (2014) has studied the effect of conflict handling styles on Bahirdar Textile factory. Berhanu (2014) investigated conflict and its management styles by using the perception of teachers, students and principals on government secondary schools of Kolfe – Keranyo Sub-City of Addis Ababa. Berhanu concluded that compromising was the first frequently used management style while avoiding was the second prevalent type.

Fekru (1993) examined the strategy for managing conflict in the primary teachers training institutes of Ethiopia and concluded that administrators lack the required knowledge of conflict resolving mechanisms. He also identified the existence of intrapersonal, interpersonal, intra-group and intergroup types of conflicts. Moreover, he confirmed that integrating, compromising and problem solving conflict handling styles were prevalent.

Gebretensay (2002) assessed factors of conflict between teachers and educational managers on secondary schools of Addis Ababa. He concluded that poor communication styles, outdated rules, and inefficiency of educational managers were some of the sources of conflict.

Gonie (1998) conducted a study on teacher-principal conflicts in secondary schools of the Amhara Regional state. He concluded that problems of performance evaluation and career development plan were the major causes of conflict.

Mulatu (2007) assessed conflict management practices in Admas University College and confirmed that the college exercises a poor type of conflict management practices.

Dimo (2014) examined factors that generate conflict between teachers and school leaders in Wolaita Zone secondary schools and concluded that inappropriate performance evaluation system, poor reward system, and communication barriers were the major causes of conflict between the two parties.

The studies reviewed above focused on conflict management styles (Mulatu, 2007; Berhanu 2014) and on factors of conflict (Gonie, 1998; Gebretensay, 2002), while Fekru (1993) tried to assess types of conflict and styles of conflict management. None of these studies assessed conflict management strategies separately from conflict management styles.

This study is different from the above studies since; it is designed to examine the nature of both conflict management styles and conflict management strategies separately as it has been treated in the literature by Spaho (2013), Rahim (2001), and others. Though there are distinct difference between this and those studies reviewed above.

Before describing the research gap intended to be filled by this research, it seems necessary to refer to two conflict situations, one at a global and the other at a national level. At a global level it has been stated that organizational conflict is still an area that needs further investigation for managers are still tending to reduce or terminate conflicts instead of exploiting them as an opportunity whenever possible (Rahim, 2001, Jehn et al, 1999). This situation by itself is a gap that invites researchers. At a national level the case of an Ethiopian manager is no different from its global counterparts, and thus organizational conflict is an issue to be studied. Without referring to this common global research gap regarding conflict in organizations, the researcher of this study feels that there are a limited number of researches on organizational conflict, particularly on conflicts in educational institution both at a national and regional levels or at local levels. So this study has been designed to fill this research gap.

1.3. Objectives of the Study

1.3.1. General Objective of the Study

The major objective of the study was to examine types of conflict, styles of handling interpersonal conflict and conflict management strategies in secondary and preparatory schools in Yeka Sub- City Addis Ababa.

1.3.2. Specific Objectives

The specific objectives describe purposes required to achieve the major objective of the study. The specific objectives were:

- A. To examine the status of intrapersonal conflict in secondary and preparatory schools of Yeka Sub-City in Addis Ababa City Administration.
- B. To assess the extent of intragroup conflict in secondary and preparatory schools of Yeka Sub-City in Addis Ababa City Administration
- C. To explore the extent of intergroup conflicts in secondary and preparatory schools of Yeka Sub-City in Addis Ababa City Administration.
- D. To examine the five independent dimensions of the styles of handling interpersonal conflict with superiors, subordinates and peers in secondary and preparatory schools of Yeka Sub-City in Addis Ababa City Administration.
- E. To investigate the nature of conflict management strategies in secondary and preparatory schools of Yeka Sub-City in Addis Ababa City Administration.

1.4. Research Questions

1. To what extent do intrapersonal, intragroup and intergroup conflicts exist in the target school system?
2. Which dimensions of interpersonal conflict handling styles are more prevalent?
3. Which conflict management styles characterize the school leadership, teaching and supporting staff?
4. What strategies have been designed to manage conflicts in the target schools?
5. What are the Strategies designed to stimulate functional conflicts?

1.5. Significance of the Study

This research may be valuable and could be used as an input for different parties including the researcher of this study. Becoming a successful researcher is a continual learning process in which we all make mistakes (Dawson, 2007). So in undertaking this study, the researcher of this study gained valuable skills and techniques which can be employed in other scientific researchers.

Research is a deliberate study for the purpose of increasing understanding or adding to knowledge. Therefore, the findings of this study were expected to increase the understanding on the nature of conflict in secondary and preparatory schools. To some extent, it also adds to the knowledge of organizational conflict regarding educational institutions.

The result of this study could as well be used as an input for policy makers and school educational managers particularly for those who were in the target school systems. These school managers may attempt to manage conflicts based on the findings of this study. They may also undertake further investigations for handling conflict in a more effective way.

Finally, the findings of this study could be used as an input for those who are interested in to undertaking further researches regarding organizational conflict on secondary and preparatory school systems.

1.6. Scope of the Study

Geographically the study is confined to government secondary and preparatory schools of Yeka Sub City in the Addis Ababa City Administration. In Yeka Sub-City, there are six secondary and two preparatory governmental schools. However, this study involves randomly three secondary and two available preparatory schools. Private secondary and preparatory schools were not included. The study was designed to reflect the nature of conflict and its management practices that were prevalent in the current academic year.

Conceptually this study used the following conflict variables to describe the nature and management practices: types of conflict, conflict management styles, and conflict management strategies. Types of organizational conflict are described in terms of the concepts of intrapersonal, interpersonal, intragroup and intergroup conflicts. Conflict management style was

described with the help of five styles: avoiding, dominating, obliging, integrating and compromising. Conceptual elements used to describe conflict management strategies were the concepts of arbitration, negotiation, and organizational goal. Other variables of conflict that might affect the nature of conflict and its management practices were not included.

1.7. Limitations of the Study

The major limitation arose from the negligence of some respondents; they didn't fill out the questionnaire giving the necessary attention to it. The other limitation was that some respondents lacked sufficient information to answer some questions and thus they guessed for the answers, which affected the quality of the result of the study.

The second limitation of the study was the use of only one demographic variable occupation, in the analysis of the data. The relationship between qualification and the use of conflict style has been presented. Similarly the relationship between sex and conflict styles have been considered. Nevertheless, assuming that these relationships have been examined in many studies, this study has omitted the task of analyzing this relationship. Though it was not the purpose of the study to examine such relationships, the omission narrowed the picture of the findings.

1.8. Organization of the Study

The study includes five major chapters. The first chapter is an introductory part, which consists of background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, research questions of the study, significance of the study, scope, and limitation of the study. The second chapter presents literature review, where theoretical concepts and empirical findings of previous studies related to the topic are reviewed. The third chapter deals with the research design and methodology, source of data, sampling design and data collection methods of the study. The fourth chapter presents, analyzes and interprets the data collected for the study. Finally Chapter five deals with summary, conclusion and recommendation.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

2.1. Introduction

This chapter presents review of related literature on organizational conflict. The review particularly focuses on topics that are related to the thematic concepts that constitute the framework of the study, whereas the framework was designed in such a way, that it can describe the objectives of the study. This review of literature emphasizes on concepts, ideas, and findings that are related to the objectives of the study. The review of the related literature is presented under two major parts theories and empirical studies.

2.2. Defining Conflict

Different scholars of various disciplines have defined conflict in different ways with concepts that range from general to specific interests. Hence, there is no generally accepted single definition for the term conflict. The following are some definitions display these variations:

Conflict is a breakdown in the formal standard procedures of decision-making processes, which leads group or individuals to experience a difficulty in selecting an alternative (March and Simon, 1958 cited in Rahim, 2001)

Conflict is a process of social interaction and a social situation where interests and activities of participants, individuals or groups, actually or apparently confront, block and disable the realization of one party's objectives (Jambrek and Penic, 2008, cited in Spaho, 2013)

It is observed that some of the writers have defined conflict as a process. Others have defined it as a situation; still some others as a behavior. Nevertheless, most of these definitions seem to have common elements. Incompatibility of goals, interests, values, or practices between two parties are the commonly used terms, ideas or concepts. However, the definition of March and Simon (1985) as cited in Rahim (2001) seems somewhat different from the others. March and Simon defined conflict in terms of behavior. It is clear that March and Simon are not interested in antecedents of conflict of any form.

Views of Conflict

There have been various views regarding the idea of organizational conflict. Goitom (2012) and Rahim (2001) classify the views on organizational conflict into three categories: Classical view, Neo-classical view, and Modern view.

The Classical view, considers organizational conflict as detrimental to organizational efficiency. Advocates of this classical view suggest that conflicts in organizations should be minimized. The classical organization theorists do not appreciate the positive impact that conflicts can have on organizations. Hence, they prescribed organizational structures with appropriate rules, procedures, and hierarchy of command in order to preclude the engagement of organization members into conflicts. The classical approach was based on the assumption that harmony, cooperation and the absence of conflict were appropriate for achieving organizational effectiveness. Taylor (1911) and his supporters, as classical theorists of organization, argued that the functioning of an organization would improve if the principles of scientific management were implemented. What Taylor particularly wanted to abolish was the conflict between labor and management. The other prominent classical organization theorist was Fayol (1916), who advocated that managerial functions were applicable to all sorts of organizational human endeavor. In general, the classic organization theorists attempted to eliminate conflict in organizations by designing mechanistic or bureaucratic organization structures.

The Neo-Classical view, Mayo (1933) was cited in Rahim (2001) as a pioneer in promoting the neo-classical view. This view of conflict is also known as human relationist view, after the human relation movement in the 1920s and which 1930s based on the studies of Mayo (1933). Conflict to Mayo was an evil, a symptom of the lack of social skills. Lewin (1948) was strong supporter of Mayo. Mayo (1933) and his associates, like the classic theorists, believed that conflicts are detrimental to organizational effectiveness. Thus, Mayo (1933) suggested the altering of the social system to minimize or eliminate conflicts and thereby improve organizational effectiveness.

Both Classical and Neo-classical organization theorists had intended to reduce conflicts in order to enhance organizational efficiency. The only difference between the two organizations theorists was the technical approach they prescribed to reduce organization conflict (Rahim,

2001). Whereas, Taylor, Fayol and their supporters prescribed the adoption of technical structural systems in organizations, Mayo suggested the altering of the social system to accomplish the reduction of conflicts in organizations. As both the Classical and the Neo-classical theorist did not accept the desirability of conflicts, they did not incorporate an element of conflict variable in their models of organization (Litterer, 1966).

The Modern view, classical approach to organization that had dominated the literature of organization behavior during the first half of the 20th century came to an end with the emergence of the modern view of organizational conflicts.

According to Robbins (1974), the philosophy of the modern view theorists or interactionists is identified by four characteristic features: recognition of the absolute necessity of conflict, explicit encouragement of opposition, defining conflict management to include stimulation as well as resolution methods, and considering the management of conflict as a major responsibility of administrators.

The interactionist view of conflict proposes that conflict should not only be considered as a positive force in a group; some conflict is absolutely necessary for an organization or a group to perform effectively (Goitom, 2012). It is now recognized that conflict within certain limits is essential to productivity. Conflict can be functional to the extent to which it results in the creative solution to problems or the effective attainment of organizational objectives that otherwise would not have been possible. Little or no conflict in organizations may lead to stagnation, poor decisions, and ineffectiveness. On the other hand, organizational conflict left uncontrolled may have dysfunctional outcomes (Rahim and Bonoma, 1979). The argument of Rahim and Bonom implies that too little or too much conflict are both dysfunctional for the effectiveness of an organization. Thus, a moderate amount of conflict, handled properly is essential for attaining and maintaining an optimum level of organizational effectiveness.

Sources of Conflict

There are lots of causes that initiate conflict. According to Plunkett and Attner (1989), the sources of conflict include: shared resources, differences in goals, differences in perception and values, disagreement in the role requirements, nature of work activities, individual approaches and the stage of organizational development.

Gray and stracke (1984) suggested six sources of conflict: limited resource, interdependent work, differences in activities, communication problems, differences in perceptions and organizational environment. According to Rahim (2001), conflict may originate from a number of sources, such as tasks, values, goals, and so on.

Conflict Classification, organizational conflict may be classified on two bases: on the basis of its source or on the basis of organizational levels at which it may originate. It has been found appropriate to classify conflict on the basis of their sources for proper understanding of its nature and implications. The classification of conflicts on the basis of their source or antecedent is described below.

Affective conflict, this type of conflict is also known as relationship conflict, emotional conflict, intrapersonal conflict, or psychological conflict (Pelled et al, 1999). They defined it as a condition in which group members have interpersonal clashes characterized by anger, frustration, and other negative feelings.

Substantive conflict, this type of conflict has also been referred to as task conflict (Pelled et al, 1999), cognitive conflict (Amason, 1996), and issue conflict (Hammer and Organ, 1978). Jehn (1977b) described this conflict as a disagreement between the ideas and opinions of group members about the task being performed.

Conflict of interest is defined as inconsistency between two parties in their preference for the allocation of a scarce resource. This type of conflict occurs when two parties, sharing the same understanding of the situation, prefer an incompatible way of sharing the resource (Duckman and Zechmeister, 1973).

Conflict of values, this conflict has also been labeled as ideological conflict. It occurs when two social entities differ in their values or ideologies on certain issues (Duckman et al, 1988).

Realistic versus Nonrealistic conflict, Realistic conflict refers to incompatibilities that have rational content, while the later occurs as a result of a party's need for realizing tension and expressing hostility, ignorance, or error. Whereas realistic conflict is associated with mostly rational or goal oriented disagreement, non-realistic conflict is an "end in itself having little to do with group or organizational goals" (Rose and Ross, 1989)

Goal conflict occurs when an intended outcome of two social entities is inconsistent. In rare cases. “It may involve divergent preferences over all of the decision outcomes, constituting a zero sum game.” (Cosier and Rose, 1977)

Institutional versus Non-institutional conflict, Institutional conflict is characterized by situations in which actors follow explicit rules, and demonstrate predictable behavior, and their relationship has continuity, as in the case of line staff conflict or labor-management negotiations. Racial conflicts are examples of non-institutionalized where these three conditions are absent (Rahim, 2001).

Retributive conflict is characterized by a situation where the conflicting entities feel the need for a drawn out conflict to punish the opponent (Saaty, 1990)

Misattribute conflict is related to the incorrect assignment of causes like behaviors, parties or issues to conflict (Deutsch, 1977). For example, employees may wrongly attribute their supervisor a cut in the employees’ department budget, which may have been done by higher – level managers over the protest of the supervisor.

Displaced conflict, this type of conflict occurs when the conflicting parties either direct their frustrations or hostilities to social entities that are not involved in conflict or argue over secondary, not major issues (Deutsch, 1977).

It has been stated that conflict may also be classified on the basis of the level of analysis in organizations: individual, group, etc. at which it may occur. Organizational conflict may be classified as intra organizational and inter organizational conflicts. Intra organizational conflict, based on the level of analysis, may again be classified into four types. The following section details the four types of intra organizational conflict.

2.3. Intra Organizational Conflict

Intra organizational conflict may also be classified on the basis of organizational levels at which it may occur. Accordingly, intra organizational conflict is classified into four types, intra personal, interpersonal intragroup, and intergroup conflicts.

Intrapersonal Conflict

Intrapersonal conflict is also known as individual or intra-psychic conflict. Intrapersonal conflict occurs when there is incompatibility among an individual's cognitive elements which implies that a new cognitive element is at variance with a prior expectation Rolof (1987). When individuals are in intrapersonal conflict they have difficulty in making decisions because of uncertainty since they have both attractive or uncertainty alternatives.

Perceived intrapersonal conflict usually occurs when members of an organization are required to perform certain tasks that do not match their expertise, interests, goals, and values. This type of conflict also occurs, if there is a significant mismatch between the role that a person expects to perform and the role that is demanded of the person by the organization (Rolof, 1987)

Intrasender conflict occurs when a role sender requires a role receiver to perform contradictory or inconsistent roles. Intersender conflict is experienced by a person when a role behavior demanded by one role sender is inconsistent with the role behavior demanded by another role sender. Interrole conflict occurs when a person occupies two or more roles whose expectations are inconsistent. For instance, school teachers are expected, in that role, to take part in some activities to promote the image of the school. This may be in conflict with their role as a teacher, in which they are expected to spend more time with their students to be an ideal teacher. Intra role conflict occurs when the role requirements are inconsistent with the focal person's values, attitudes and professional behavior. For instance this type of conflict occurs when organizational members are required to perform roles that are incongruent with their ethical standards.

According to French and Caplan (1972) there are two types of role overload, quantitative and qualitative role overload. Quantitative role overload occurs when role receivers are required to perform more work than they can within a specific time period. Qualitative role overload is a situation in which role occupants believe they do not possess the skills or competence necessary to perform an assignment.

Rahim (2001) suggests that management of conflict involves diagnosis of and intervention in conflict. The same author recommends that intrapersonal conflict can be performed by self-report, observation, and interview methods. Comprehensive diagnosis of intrapersonal conflict involves the measurement of the amount of intrapersonal conflict, the source of such conflict,

and the learning and effectiveness of the individual employees (Rahim, 2001). However, this study attempts only to measure the amount of intrapersonal conflict. The next section deals with the issue of interpersonal conflict.

Interpersonal Conflict

This conflict is also labeled as dyadic conflict. It refers to conflicts that occur between two or more organizational members (Rahim, 2001). Most of the literature of organizational conflict deals with the superior subordinate type of conflict.

The management of interpersonal conflict involves changes in the attitudes, behavior, and organization structure with a view to enabling organizational members work with each other effectively for attaining their individual and organizational goals. The management of interpersonal conflict essentially involves teaching organizational members the style of handling interpersonal conflict to deal with different situations effectively and setting up appropriate mechanisms so that unresolved issues are dealt with properly.

The diagnosis of interpersonal conflict can be performed by such methods as self-reports, observations and interviews. Conflict models may be used to measure how an organizational member handles interpersonal conflict with superiors, subordinates and peers.

A comprehensive diagnosis of interpersonal conflict involves the measurement of the style of handling interpersonal conflict by the organizational members to deal with different situations, factors that affect the styles of handling conflict, and the effectiveness of the individual members of an organization (Rahim, 2001).

On the analysis of the above diagnostic should provide information on: the style of handling interpersonal conflict utilized by various units, departments or divisions, whether organization members are using appropriate behavior styles to deal different situations effectively and on the relationship of the styles to situations and individual effectiveness

Depending on the results of the diagnostic and the analysis, intervention is necessary when the organizational members have difficulty in dealing with different situations with appropriate behavioral styles. The behavioral and structural intervention strategies for the management of interpersonal conflict include process and structural parts of activities. The process and

structural interventions for the management of interpersonal conflict are transactional analysis, appeal to authority, and ombudsman. In using the styles of conflict management, the factors that affect are personality, bases of power, organizational culture, referent role, and gender (Rahim, 2001).

Intragroup Conflict

This conflict is also known as intradepartmental conflict. Intragroup conflict refers to the incompatibility or disagreement among the members of a group or its subgroups regarding to the goals, tasks and procedures of the group (Rahim, 2001).

The study of groups in organizations has received special attention, mainly for three reasons. According to Rahim (2001), groups in the first place are building blocks of an organization. Second, groups provide the primary mechanism for the attainment of organizational goals. Third, groups provide psychological and other support to the individual members. The same author suggests that the definition of group should include the following elements for meaningful discussion: 1. A group must consist of two or more members, 2. A group must possess a stable structure, 3. The members should be interdependent, 4. The members should interact with each other, 5. The members should work toward the attainment of a common goal.

Managing Intragroup conflict

The diagnosis of intragroup conflict involves the measurement of the amount of intragroup, the style of handling intragroup conflict, sources of conflict and the effectiveness of the group. The analysis of the diagnostic data should indicate the amount of intragroup conflict and the styles of handling such conflict in each group, department, unit and so on, relationship between conflict and its sources, and the relationship between conflict and group effectiveness and learning.

There are various antecedent conditions or sources of intragroup conflict, such as leadership style, task structure, group composition, cohesiveness and groupthink, and external treats. Organization development techniques, such as team building may be used to manage intragroup conflict effectively. Structural intervention designed to manage intragroup conflict include changing group composition; increasing or reducing the size of the group; transferring or exchanging group members and bringing new membership into the group; redefining and

restructuring tasks; altering the reward system; and altering rules and procedures and appeals system (Jehn, et al, 1999; Pelled, et al, 1999).

Intergroup Conflict

It is also known as interdepartmental conflict. It deals with conflicts between units or groups within an organization. Examples are conflicts between production and marketing, conflicts between management and labor. In general intragroup conflict refers to the collective incompatibility or disagreement between two or more division, department, or sub systems in connection with tasks, resources, information, and so on. Intergroup conflict implies that each member of the group is in conflict with those of another. However, it is quite often that actual dispute is carried out between representatives. For instance, it can be between department heads or labor management negotiators (Rolof, 1987).

The process of intergroup conflict follows certain pattern that may not be found in other types of organizational conflict. The management of intergroup conflict requires the diagnosis of, and intervention in conflict. The diagnosis should indicate whether intergroup conflict is at a moderate level, the functional and dysfunctional aspects of such conflict, and the styles of handling conflict of the intergroup with out-group members (Rahim, 2001).

The sources of intergroup conflict are systems differentiation, task interdependence, dependence on scarce resources, jurisdictional ambiguity, and the relationship between line and staff. Process intervention, such as problem solving, confrontation and organizational mirroring, have been presented for managing conflict between groups. Structural intervention such as the analysis of task independence may be used to manage inter group conflict. Other structural interventions involve hiring, transferring, or exchanging group members, clarifying and formulating rules and procedures, developing an appeal system, altering the system of communication and providing valid information when the perceptions of the in-group about the out-group are distorted (Blake and Mouton, 1964).

2.4. Conflict Management

Conflict management involves designing effective strategy to minimize the dysfunctions of conflict in order to enhance learning and effectiveness of an organization.

The contingency theory of conflict management suggests that all five styles of handling conflict are useful depending on situations. According to situational or contingency theories of leadership, effective leaders select and use the style of handling conflict depending on the situation. It is suggested that an integrative or participative style is appropriate for complex problems that require input and commitment from subordinate for effective formulation and implementation of solutions. A dominating style may be appropriate when tasks or problems are simple or routine (Rahim, 2001).

Fisher and Ury (1981) argue that everybody is a negotiator. They suggest that negotiation skills are essential for managing interpersonal, intergroup, and intragroup conflicts. The same authors recommend that a method called principled negotiation or negotiation on merits can be used to manage any conflict. They have devised four principles of negotiation that are related to people, interests, options, and criteria. The first principle suggests that people should be perceived separately from the problem. The second principle dictates that negotiators shall focus on interests rather than on positions. The third principle requires the adoption of creative solutions. It states that negotiators should invent options for mutual gain. The final principle requires negotiators to insist on using objective criteria.

2.5. Stimulating Functional Conflict

The two commonly used ways of stimulating functional conflict are devil's advocacy and the dialectic method (Kreitner and Kinicki, 2004). There are two programmed techniques, which proved to be effective in stimulating functional conflict. Programmed conflict is usually conflict that arises different opinions regardless of the personal feelings of managers. It encourages different opinions without protecting management's personal feelings. The purpose of programmed conflict is to get contributors to either defend or criticize ideas based on relevant facts rather than reflecting personal preferences or political interests. The two ways of stimulating functional conflict are described below.

Devil's advocacy, this involves assigning someone the role of critic. The intention of this approach to programmed techniques is to generate critical thinking as well as reality testing. Periodic devil's advocacy role playing serves as a training mechanism for developing analytical and communication skills as well as emotional intelligence.

The dialectic method, this approach to programmed conflict calls for managers to foster a structured debate of opposing viewpoints before making a decision. It is intended to better understand an issue (Goitom, 2012).

2.6. Styles of Handling Interpersonal Conflict

The literature of organizational conflict has developed four different models through time to suggest styles that are appropriate for handling interpersonal conflict. These models suggest various styles of behaviors to handle interpersonal conflicts. These models of styles are described as follows:

The model of two styles, are of two types. The first of which was developed by Deutch (1949). Deutch suggested the cooperative-competitive model to handle conflicts and conduct researches in social conflict. According to Schelling (1960), the purely competitive conflicts are equivalent to a “zero sum games”, in which the positive outcomes to one party are directly and equally matched by the negative outcomes to the other party. The other two factor model was suggested by Kuledson et al (1980). But this model did not receive any prominence both in theories and researches of conflict (Rahim 2001). The model of two styles does not recognize other styles. However, in reality one can hardly encounter purely cooperative or purely competitive conflict situations. Most conflicts are characterized by both cooperative and competitive features of conflict.

The model of three styles, the model of three styles of behavior to handled interpersonal conflicts was first suggested by Putnam and Wilson (1982). The three styles were non-confrontation (obliging), solution orientation (integrating), and control (dominating). Weider-Hatfied (1988) and Hocker and Wilmot (1991) concluded from their literature review that there are three clusters of conflict styles. On the other hand, Rahim (2001) argued that the conclusions of Weider-Hatfied and Hocker and Wilmot are misleading as their reviews were restricted to communication studies.

There were also another two models, one developed by Billingham and Scack (1987), with three styles: reasoning, verbal aggression, and violence and the other by Rands et al (1981) with conflict styles of attack, avoid and compromise. However, researchers on the three factor models did not provide evidence on how the three styles influence organizational behavior and

management. Thus, it appears that the model of three styles has not progressed much over the years. This model, like the model of the two styles, does not recognize compromising as a distinct style (Hocker and Wilmot, 1991).

The Model of four styles, the four styles of handling conflict in this model are yielding, problem solving, inaction, and contending. This model was first developed by Pruitt (1983). The three styles were based on the two dimensional model that consists of concern for self (high or low) and concern for others (high or low). The model of the four styles like the previous two models does not recognize compromising as a distinct style. The other four-factor model was the one developed by Kurdek (1994), with conflict styles of problem solving, conflict engagement, withdrawal and compliance. This model particularly received some attention in the conceptualization and operationalization of marital conflict.

The model of five styles, the model of five styles was first conceptualized in 1926 by Follet (1940). However, Follet suggested domination, compromise and integration as primary styles of handling organizational conflict while she considered avoidance and suppression as secondary ways. Blake and Mouton (1964) first suggested a five-factor style to handle conflict: forcing, withdrawal, smoothing, compromising and problem solving. These classifications were based on the attitude of managers towards production and people. Thomas (1976) reinterpreted the schemes of Blake and Mouton by considering two intentions of one party, cooperativeness and assertiveness towards another party. Rahim (1983a) differentiated the styles of handling interpersonal conflicts based on two dimensions, concern for self and concern for others. The dimension of concern for self describes the degree to which persons attempt to satisfy their own concern. The dimension of concern for others describes the degree to which persons want to satisfy the concern of others. According to Rahim, combinations of the two dimensions provide five specific styles of handling interpersonal conflict integrating, obliging, dominating, avoiding and, compromising. The components of the model of the five styles of handling interpersonal conflict that are adopted by Rahim (1983a) are described below.

Integrating, this style is known as problem solving. Integrating style displays high concern for self and others. The basic principles of this style are openness, exchange of information, and examination of differences to reach a solution that is acceptable to both parties (Gray, 1989). According to Prein (1976), cited in Rahim (2001), this style has two distinct aspects:

confrontation and problem solving. Confrontation involves open communication which is a technique to identify the root causes of the conflict. Open communication, a prerequisite for problem solving.

Obliging, this style is also known as accommodating or smoothing. This style demonstrates low concern for self and high concern for others. Obliging did not have a unique contribution to outcomes within the ladder of effectiveness (Van De vliert, 1997). Obliging is not likely to produce much substantive outcomes, as the quality of decision making decreases with increasing smoothing behavior by one or both of the parties (Mastenbroek, 1989).

Dominating, this style displays high concern for self and low concern for others. This style is also known as competing or forcing. It is a style that seeks to prevail at the expense of the adversary. It is characterized by a forcing behavior to win one's position (Van De vliert, 1997). Dominating supervisors are likely to use their position or power to impose their will on the subordinates and command their obedience (Rahim, 2001).

Avoiding, this style is also known as suppression. It indicates low concern for self and others. It may take the form of postponing an issue until a better time or simply withdrawing from a threatening situation. This style is often characterized as an unconcerned attitude towards the issues or parties involved in conflict. Such people usually refuse to admit in public that there is a conflict that should be dealt with (Rahim, 2001). Avoiding is most often associated with negative substantive outcomes, as issues are not resolved and usually become more serious over time (Hocker and Wilmot, 1991).

As a dominant style, avoiding always results in chilling, with disputes becoming increasingly cold and withdrawn. In combination with other conflict behavior, avoiding of specific issues can contribute to effectiveness (Van De vliert, 1997).

Compromising, this style represents an intermediate concern for self and others. It is characterized by give and take or sharing where by both parties give up me something to make a mutually acceptable decision. This style is mostly the philosophy of people who place medium value on goals and relationship. Such people are moderately assertive and cooperative and spend time looking for solution but are not looking for perfection (Van De vliert, 1997). An attempt to reclassify the five styles of handling interpersonal conflict based on the terminologies of game

theory, compromising can be reclassified to a mixed style with no win or no lose. Similarly integrating style can be reclassified to a positive sum or non-zero sum with a win-win effect, while obliging, dominating and avoiding to zero sum or negative sum (Rahim, 2001)

Each of the five styles of handling interpersonal conflict may be appropriate depending on the situation. In general, integrating and to some extent, compromising styles can be used for effectively dealing with conflicts involving strategic or complex issues. The remaining styles can be used effectively to deal with conflicts involving tactical, day-to-day or routine problems. Thus, the selection and use of each style can be considered as a win-win style provided that it is used to enhance individual, group, and organization effectiveness.

2.7. Conflict Management Strategy

Managers must have clearly defined strategy. Since conflicts can have a positive side, there should also be a clearly defined strategy for stimulating conflicts. Managers can follow three strategies for solving conflict (Petkovic, 2008, cited in Spaho, 2013).

Strategy of Negotiation, This is the most common strategy for solving conflicts and it is successful when interests of opposite sides are partly common and partly different. The negotiation is a process in which different tactics can be applied. Those tactics include face to face tactic, persuading tactic, deceitfulness tactic, threat tactic, promise tactic and concession tactic.

Strategy of superior goal, this is one of the best ways for a solving conflict situation is to define a superior goal. The point of this strategy is to define a goal above the individual goals, causing the conflict

Strategy of the third party intervention, if a negotiation strategy does not show results, it is recommended to apply a strategy of the third party intervention. In this situation management hires an external consultant to solve the problem, or an arbitrator, whose task is to impose a solution. Practical experience shows that the third strategy is least used. On the other hand, the other two strategies must be under control of first line managers, because it is their task to solve conflicts. If they cannot, or do not want to solve the conflict, this must be done by upper level managers.

2.8. Empirical Studies

Conflict is one of the important aspects of organizational life. Schermerhorry et al (1998) reported that managers spend up 20% of their time in dealing with conflict or its aftermath. Researchers have given special attention to conflicts that occur between managers and employees. Such conflicts should be managed properly; otherwise they can undermine labor relations and productivity of organizations (Tjosvold and Chia 1998). The study by Mayer (2004) confirmed that cooperative styles generally, result in beneficial outcomes in the workplace, whereas uncooperative styles produce negative outcomes.

Weider-Hatfied and Hatfuld (1996) and Thomas and Kilman (1974) investigated the relationship of conflict management styles of manager with various outcomes of employees and concluded that conflict management styles are directly related with job satisfaction, satisfaction with supervision, supervisor employee relationships, long term cooperation and attitudinal and behavioral compliance.

Styles of leaders seem to depend largely on cultural traditions of societies. The beneficial outcome of cooperative conflict management style in improving work attitude of employees is an accepted fact in the western culture and in conflict management literature. For instance the leadership style in the east particularly in China is heavily influenced by cultural traditions which are based on father son relationship. These traditions may allow leaders to maintain strong authority over employees whereas employees are obliged to obey. Since china has a large power distance culture that predisposes people to take the inequality between the leaders and the followers for granted, it is likely that followers be tolerant of uncooperative conflict management styles and may not confront with their managers in conflict situations (House et al, 2004). Therefore, the proportion that uncooperative conflict management style is directly related with negative subordinate attitudinal outcomes may not be supported.

Based on factor analysis of items Putnam and Wilson (1982) developed an instrument on organizational communication conflict and provided empirical evidence that there are three styles of handling interpersonal conflict: obliging, integrating and dominating. Lawrence and Lorsch (1967a) selected 25 traditional proverbs to measure 5 modes of conflict resolution, but their factor analysis identified only three: forcing, smoothing and confrontation. Rahim (2001)

argues that both the Putnam and the Lawrence models are not meaningful since these analyses were not based on past theories and researches. Moreover, Rahim argues that multiple factor analysis must have been computed with different sets of items in different samples in order for the analysis to be meaningful.

Pruit (1983) suggested a model of four styles of handling conflict: yielding problem solving, inaction and contending. Moreover, pruit provided evidence that problem solving style is the best for managing conflicts effectively. Pruit came to this conclusion based on laboratory studies.

Valentine (2001) used Thomas -Kilma conflict instrument mode to examine public preference of conflict management styles in terms of gender. Her findings show that conflict management styles of avoiding and compromising are significantly used by all categories of nurses. Khanaki and Hassanzadch (2010) suggested that selection of management style can be considered to be based on gender perspective. Their suggestion was based on the belief that nursing is a woman dominating profession. However, the researcher of this study argues that taking the use of avoidance and compromising styles as a gender perspective attribute may mislead people since preference of conflict management styles is considerably influenced by cultural settings. Valentine (2001) has compared the style preference of nurse managers and deans with that of staff nurses. Valentine found that staff nurses were much more reluctant to collaborating than nurse managers and deans. This shows implicitly that being placed in a higher level in an organization may increase to the dimension of assertiveness.

Another study by Sportsman and Hamilton (2007) compared prevalent conflict styles between nursing students and students of allied health profession by using Thomas-Kilman conflict mode instrument. The result of the study indicated that nursing students have a great tendency towards compromise and then avoidance, while alien health profession students prevalently chose avoidance followed by compromise and accommodation. Moreover, competing style was the least preferred common conflict management style among all participants.

On the other hand, a recent study by Thomas et al (2008) investigated 400 fully employed people in each six different organizational level, half women and half men. They found that competing and collaborating styles (assertiveness) increase continually at progressively higher levels of

organization, while avoiding and accommodating (unassertiveness) decrease. However, compromising correlates with organizational level curve linearly, decreasing in highest and lowest organizational levels. Regarding gender perspective, men showed much more tendency to competing styles at all six organizational levels compared to women. Thus, they claimed that conflict management styles of men and women are not converging at higher organizational level, in contrast to a traditional view. The study of Thomas et al (2008) therefore, has reflected the impact of organizational level and gender on preference of conflict management styles.

Peterson et al (1995) investigate the nature of role ambiguity across 21 nations. They reported that there is a lower role ambiguity in Asian and African countries, which are considered to be high on power distance and low on individualism, than in many western countries which are low in power distance and high in individualism.

Several earlier studies have examined the effect and the nature intragroup conflicts some of them are reviewed as follow. It is expected that the outcome of interpersonal conflict which fully satisfies the expectations of both parties to be functional for an organization. Many previous studies indicate that a problem solving or integrating style by members of an organization leads to greater satisfaction and effectiveness of the organizational members.

According to Esbeck et al (1971), team collaboration was positively related to satisfaction of individual's needs, but not organizational performance. Misquita (1988) concluded that when subordinates understand that their bosses were handling conflict with an integrating style, their organizational commitment increases. Organizational commitment of subordinates reduces if they perceived that their supervisors were using avoiding and dominating styles. Wieder – Hatfield and Hatfuld (1995) conducted two studies to examine the relationships between the five styles of handling conflict and their perception of organizational effectiveness. They reported that subordinates use of integrating style was positively associated with six individual and organizational outcomes: job satisfaction, global equity, system outcomes, performance outcomes, and interpersonal outcomes. Moreover, the compromising style was positively associated with interpersonal outcomes, while the dominating style was negatively associated with job satisfaction. Dominating style was negatively associated with interpersonal outcomes.

Likert and Likert (1976) provided evidence that implies that an organization that encourages participation and problem solving behavior attains a higher level of effectiveness. According to the report of Lawrence and Lorsch (1976a), confrontation style was used to deal with intergroup conflict to a significantly greater degree in higher than in lower performing organizations. Wall and Galanes (1986) indicated that the use of integrating style results in a high joint benefit for the parties, better decisions and greater satisfaction of the partner.

A study by Backer et al (1988) confirmed that project managers who used both cooperative and confirming approaches to conflict received high marks from project team members on a conflict constructiveness measure and on a management effectiveness measure.

A field study by Schnake and Cochran (1985) investigated the effect of goal clarity and goal difficulty as two goal-setting dimensions on intra and interdepartmental conflicts and the effects of these conflicts on internal work motivation and intrinsic job satisfaction. Results indicate that lower levels of goal difficulty and goal clarity are associated with higher levels of intra and interdepartmental conflict and that higher level of conflict are associated with lower levels of internal work motivation and intrinsic job satisfaction.

Amason (1996) reported that affective conflict negatively influences group performance, group loyalty, work group commitment, job satisfaction and intent to stay in the present organization.

2.9. Theoretical Framework

This study attempts to describe conflict in an organization. It assumes that organizational conflict can be described by analyzing the types of conflict, the style of handling conflicts, and conflict management strategies. Moreover, the study describes these aspects of conflict with the help of certain theories that are appropriate for the study of conflict variables in organizations. Following are theories on conflict types, handling styles, and strategies.

Theories on conflict types, there are two major theories to classify types of conflict: the theory of an antecedent condition and the theory of the level of analysis. The theory of antecedent conditions states that types of conflict can be identified by classifying them on the basis of their bases of antecedents or cause. Cause could be tasks, values, goals and so on. The antecedent theory classifies conflicts into 10 types. The theory of level of analysis states that conflict may

be classified on the basis of levels of organization at which it may originate. According to the theory of the level of analysis, there are four types of organizational conflict: intrapersonal, interpersonal, intragroup and intergroup conflict (Jarobe and Witteman, 1996).

Theory of conflict handling styles, several researchers have presented theoretical works on the styles of handling conflicts. There are four types of theories of conflict handling styles: the model of two factors, the model of three factors, the model of four factors and the model of five factors. Each model suggests ways of handling conflict depending on its factors. For instance the two factor model proposes two ways; the three factor model proposes three ways of handling. This study uses the five-factor model to describe conflict handling styles. However, there are different forms of the five-style model. This study describes conflict handling within the framework of the five-factor style of Rahim (2001): integrating, obliging, avoiding, dominating, and compromising.

The theories of conflict management strategy, There are number of strategies suggested by different researchers depending on situations. However, this study describes conflict management strategy with reference to the theory of Petkove (2008) cited in Spaho (2013). This theory suggests that managers can use three strategies to resolve conflicts: the theory of the strategy of negotiation, the theory of the superior goal, and the theory the third party intervention.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

This study involved a large population who were working in secondary and preparatory schools of Yeka Sub City in Addis Ababa City Administration. In light of the size of the population, the sample size was also reasonably large. This study was conducted through a sample survey and descriptive method. A self-administered questionnaire was filled out by respondents to generate the required data without any interference. Quantitative approach was employed to summarize, organize, and analyze the data gathered through the self-administered survey questionnaire.

3.2. Study Area and Population

The study was conducted on government secondary and preparatory schools in Yeka Sub-City of Addis Ababa. The Sub-City consists of six secondary and two preparatory schools. This study involved three secondary and two preparatory governmental schools. The total population of the study accounted for 611 teachers, leaders and supporting staffs. In each school, the population was classified into three strata, teaching staff, school leadership, and support staff. The purpose of classifying the population was based on the belief that these different sections of the population could have different perceptions and self-reports regarding conflict in their organization because of the different roles they were assigned to play in their respective organizations.

3.3. Sources of Data

The study employed primary sources of data; the primary source of data was obtained from responses of participants.

3.4. Samples and Sampling Techniques

In Yeka Sub City, there were six secondary and two preparatory schools. Among these, the three secondary schools were selected by a random lottery system and two preparatory schools were made to be included in the study using availability method. In the sample, schools there were a

total of 611 individuals. From this, the sample participants were 242. These participants were selected using stratified and simple random sampling techniques.

Table 1: Stratified Random Sampling for survey

No	Types of the schools and strata of the population	Number of members	Sample size
1	Teaching staff	382	151
2	School leadership	30	12
3	Support staff	199	79
Total		611	242

Source: School document 2016

3.5. Sample Size

The sample size has been determined by using the statistical formula adopted by Yamane (1967).

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + Ne^2}$$

where N = total population

n = total sample

e = an error term of 5%

$$n = \frac{611}{1 + 516(.05)^2} = \frac{611}{1 + 1.5275} = \frac{611}{2.5275} = 242$$

Thus, the total sample size is 242.

3.6. Data Gathering Instruments

The study used quantitative method, and closed ended questionnaire to collect responses. Statements of the questionnaire were made to be short and clear, being free from technical terms. The questionnaire items were presented in two parts. Part one dealt with demographic variables. Part two was concerned with conflict variables. The demographic variables include five items while the conflict variables consist of 33 items. Thus, a total of 38 quantitative questionnaire items were adopted in the study; The conflict variables were measured by a five point Likert types of scales.

3.7. Data Collection Procedures

In each school data from each stratum were collected through questionnaires separately. Questionnaires were disseminated and collected with the help of school principals or vice principals as facilitators.

Respondents were allowed to administer the questionnaire by themselves without the interference of facilitators. Only volunteers were made to provide responses through questionnaires. The data collected through the questionnaire was summarized and analyzed with the help of statistical software called SPSS- version 21.

3.8. Validity and Reliability

Part two of the questionnaire consists of 33 conflict variable items. Out of which 16 were those used previously by Rahim and Manger (1995). These questions were designed to provide answers only for the research questions that focused on conflict management styles. The construct validity of these measures was tested by using a confirmatory factor analysis statistical technique on the five factor model conflict management style (Rahim and Manger, 1995). The result provided support for the convergent and discriminant validity of the scales measuring the five styles. Rahim and Manger have also tested the reliability coefficients of the scales. It was found to be ranged from 0.65 to 0.76.

The other 14 items of the 33 variables were previously developed to describe types of conflict by rating intrapersonal, intragroup, and intergroup conflict variables and conflict management strategies. The scales of intrapersonal conflict variables were tested by Pondy and Kumar (1997) for validity and reliability and they were found to be satisfactory. The scales of intragroup conflict variables were tested for validity and reliability by Jarobe and Witteman (1996), and the results were satisfactory.

The scales for the intergroup conflict variable were tested for validity and reliability by Berger and Chaffe (1987), and the results were satisfactory. However, slight modifications have been made on the 27 previously used items in order to place them within the Ethiopian context.

For the purpose of building scales to measure conflict management strategies, the researcher of this study has developed 3 items. Regarding construct validity, the researcher has attempted to place the scales on strong literature foundations.

Reliability statistics

Mckinley et al (1997) state that for comparing groups Cronbach’s alpha values of 0.7 to 0.8 are regarded as satisfactory though lower thresholds are sometimes used in literature. Nunaly (1978) has stated that 0.5 is a sufficient value, while 0.7 is a more reasonable Cronbach’s alpha.

Table 2: Reliability statistics

Variable	Cronbach’s Alpha	No of items
Intrapersonal Conflict	0.692	5
Intragroup Conflict	0.809	3
Intergroup Conflict	0.743	3
Integrating Style	0.871	4
Obliging Style	0.804	3
Dominating Style	0.659	3
Avoiding Style	0.634	3
Compromising Style	0.624	3
Conflict Management Strategy	0.599	6

Source: Survey 2015

3.9. Methods of Data Analysis

The study used descriptive statistical methods to analyze and interpret data. Descriptive analysis was used to analyze general characteristics of the respondents and to assess the types of conflict and conflict management styles of the organization. The data collected through the questionnaire was summarized and analyzed with the help of statistical software called SPSS- version 21. Descriptive statistics includes frequency distribution, mean, standard deviation and tables for summarizing, analyzing and presenting results the predictors of dependent variables.

Mean score comparison technique was commonly used to analyze and compare levels of quantitative measures (Zaidotal and Bagheri, 2009). This study also applied this technique. According to Zaidotal and Bagheri (2009), mean score values are classified into three ranges.

Table 3: Mean score comparison basis for five point Likert scale instrument

Mean score	Description
< 3.39	Low
3.40-3.79	Moderate
> 3.80	High

Source : Zaidotal and Bagheri, 2009).

3.10. Ethical Consideration

To make the research process professional, ethical consideration were made. The researcher informed the respondents about the purpose of the study i.e. purely for academic; the purpose of the study was also introduced in the introduction part of the questionnaire and subjects confidentiality was protected. In addition to this they were informed that their participation in the study was based on their consent. The research has not personalized any of the respondents response during data presentations, analysis and interpretations. Furthermore, all the materials used for this research have been acknowledged.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1. Demographic Characteristics

Gender

All demographic information were presented by cross tabulating respondent categories with demographic factors. Table 4 displays gender wise distribution of respondents.

Table 4: Gender distribution of respondents

Gender * Occupation Cross tabulation				
Gender	Occupation			Total
	School leadership	Teaching Staff	Support Staff	
Male	10	113	22	145
	6.9%	77.9%	15.2%	100.0%
	83.3%	74.8%	27.8%	59.9%
Female	2	38	57	97
	2.1%	39.2%	58.8%	100.0%
	16.7%	25.2%	72.2%	40.1%
Total	12	151	79	242
	5.0%	62.4%	32.6%	100.0%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source survey 2016

Table 4 displays 145 males and 97 females constituted the 242 participants of the study. That is, majority of the respondents 59.9% were males while 40.1% were females. Category wise consideration shows that majority of the female respondents 58.8% came from the support staff category. Majority of the support staff 72.2% were females, while males constituted 27.8% of the category. On the other hand, males constituted the majority in both the category of the leadership and the teaching staff. In the category of the leadership 83.3% were male while females were 16.7%. This situation implied that the leadership category of respondents was dominated by males. It seems that females were not encouraged to take part in the leadership. Similarly, out of 151 respondents of the teaching staff, 74.8% were males where females constituted 25.2% of the category.

Age

Age wise distribution of respondents was presented by performing a cross tabulation between age groups and occupational categories. Table 5 demonstrates the distribution of age groups across the three categories of respondents.

Table 5: Category wise distribution of age group.

Age * Occupation Cross tabulation				
Age Group	Occupation			Total
	School leadership	Teaching Staff	Support Staff	
18-22	0	2	7	9
	0.0%	1.3%	8.9%	3.7%
23-27	0	43	19	62
	0.0%	28.5%	24.1%	25.6%
28-32	1	49	21	71
	8.3%	32.5%	26.6%	29.3%
33-39	7	31	16	54
	58.3%	20.5%	20.3%	22.3%
40-46	2	15	6	23
	16.7%	9.9%	7.6%	9.5%
47 and above	2	11	10	23
	16.7%	7.3%	12.7%	9.5%
Total	12	151	79	242
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source survey 2016

The age of all respondents of school, the leadership is above 27. Majority of the respondents, 58.3%, in the school leadership category were in the age group between 33 to 39, Next to this 33.4% of them were above 40. Only 8.3% of the school leaders were within the age group between 28 to 32. It could be concluded that there were few young people in the school leadership. Majority, of the school leaders were old enough that they could deal with possible conflicts. On the other hand, 28.5% of the teaching staff and 27.1% of the support staff belonged to the age group between 23 to 27, while 32.5% and 26.6% of them respectively were between 28 to 32. Regarding the categories of the teaching and the support staff it was observed that majority of the respondents in both categories belonged to the age group 28 – 32.

Qualification

The qualification of respondent was described by six categorical scales. Table 6 presents qualification wise distribution of respondents.

Table 6: Qualification of Respondents

Qualification * Occupation Cross tabulation				
Qualification	Occupation			Total
	School leadership	Teaching Staff	Support Staff	
MA and above	6	14	0	20
	50.0%	9.3%	0.0%	8.3%
First Degree	6	131	26	163
	50.0%	86.8%	32.9%	67.4%
Diploma	0	6	25	31
	0.0%	4.0%	31.6%	12.8%
Certificate	0	0	6	6
	0.0%	0.0%	7.6%	2.5%
12th Complete	0	0	12	12
	0.0%	0.0%	15.2%	5.0%
Below grade 12	0	0	10	10
	0.0%	0.0%	12.7%	4.1%
Total	12	151	79	242
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source survey 2016

It was observed that 50% of the school leader, and 9.3% teachers were with MA and above while none of the support staff respondents was qualified with this level. The other 50% of the school leaders were qualified with first degree, while 86.8% of teachers and 32.9% of the support staff were qualified with this level. None of the school leaders were below first degree while 4.0% of teachers, and 31.6% of the support staff respondents were with a diploma level. None of the teachers were below diploma level. From the support staff 7.6% were certificate holders, 15.2% completed grade 12 and the rest 12.7% were below grade 12 in their level of education. Majority of the teaching staff were first degree holders where as 67.1% of the support staff were below the level of first degree. As compared to the other two categories, support staff respondents were characterized with low level of education.

Work Experience

Work experience of respondents was also expressed in six categorical interval scales. Table 7 displays distribution of work experience of respondents.

Table 7: Work Experience

Work Experience * Occupation Cross tabulation				
Work Experience (in Year)	Occupation			Total
	School leadership	Teaching Staff	Support Staff	
0-4	0	23	26	49
	0.0%	15.2%	32.9%	20.2%
5-9	1	49	29	79
	8.3%	32.5%	36.7%	32.6%
10-14	3	38	9	50
	25.0%	25.2%	11.4%	20.7%
15-21	4	17	3	24
	33.3%	11.3%	3.8%	9.9%
22-28	2	11	5	18
	16.7%	7.3%	6.3%	7.4%
29 and above	2	13	7	22
	16.7%	8.6%	8.9%	9.1%
Total	12	151	79	242
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source survey 2016

It was observed that 8.3% of the school leader had experience that was below 10 years, whereas 58.3% of them had experience between 10 – 21 years, 16.7% from 22 –28 and the rest 16.7% more than 28 years. On the other hand, 47.7% of the teachers had experience of below 10 years, while 15.9% have served for 10 to 21 years and 15.9% above 21 years, classifying the service of the teaching staff into two shows that 52.4% of them had experience of more than 10 years.

4.2. Types of Conflict

Types of conflict included the dimensions of intrapersonal, intragroup and intergroup types of organizational conflict. The level of each type of conflict was measured by their mean score values across the respondent categories.

Intrapersonal conflict

This type of conflict has been described by 5 items that measure self-reports on a 5 point Likert scale.

Table 8: Mean score values of intrapersonal conflict variables

No	Item	School leadership N = 12		Teaching staff N = 151		Support staff N = 79		Overall	
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
211	Your task match your expertise	1.67	0.89	1.81	1.18	1.87	1.10	1.78	1.06
212	Your tasks match your interest	2.75	1.29	2.64	1.48	2.28	1.51	2.56	1.43
213	Task and personal goals	3.5	1.31	2.91	1.44	2.57	1.46	2.99	1.4
214	Organizational culture and personal values	2.5	1.00	2.62	1.19	2.3	1.23	2.47	1.14
215	Taking part in nonprofessional engagements	3.08	1.56	3.09	1.36	2.76	1.39	2.98	1.44
	Overall	2.70	-.71	2.62	-.88	2.36	-.89	2.56	-.82.67

Source survey 2016

Based on the mean score level comparison technique, it was observed that the overall mean score values for the school leadership 2.70, the teaching staff 2.62 and the support staff 2.36 were all less than the reference mean score 3.39. This means that each of the respondent categories exhibited a low level of intrapersonal conflict. It can be deduced that the secondary and preparatory schools of Yeka Sub-City were characterized by low level of intrapersonal conflict.

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure was used to establish whether there was a statistically significant difference in the mean scores among the three groups. To accomplish this task the average value of intrapersonal conflict items was taken as a single dependent variable over which the three group means were to be compared.

Table 9: One-Way ANOVA on scores of intrapersonal conflict at $\alpha = 0.05$ levels

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3.787	2	1.893	2.381	.095
Within Groups	190.022	239	.795		
Total	193.808	241			

Source survey 2016

In conducting the one-way ANOVA procedure, the null hypothesis was that there was no statistically significant difference among the three mean scores. (i.e. school leaders, teachers and support staff). The result, as shown in Table 9, indicated that $F(2,239) = 2.381$ at 5% level, there were no statistically significant difference among the three mean scores. Of course, this result might come from problems of reliability measures. However, it was indicated that Cronbach alpha for the scales of intrapersonal conflict was 0.692. This value is satisfactory for the reliability. Therefore, there was no statistically significant difference among the three mean scores. This shows the existence of agreement of responses among the three groups.

Intragroup conflict

This conflict was described with 3 items that measure the perception of respondents with a 5 point Likert scale. The mean score values of intragroup conflict variables are shown below.

Table 10: Mean Score values of intragroup conflict.

No	Items	School leadership N = 12		Teaching staff N = 157		Support staff N = 79		Overall	
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
221	Conflict in work unit groups regarding task goals	3.75	1.06	3.52	1.21	3.19	1.47	3.49	1.02
222	Conflict in work unit groups regarding function	3.33	1.16	3.32	1.17	3.24	1.38	3.30	0.99
223	Conflict in work unit group regarding activities	3.75	1.29	3.54	1.09	3.2	1.32	3.49	1.16
	Overall	3.61	1.02	3.46	0.99	3.21	1.16	3.38	1.06

Source: survey 2016

The mean score of intragroup conflict on the leadership was 3.61. This implies the level of perception of intragroup conflict in the respondent category of the leadership was of a moderate level. Similarly, the mean score of intragroup variable across the teaching staff was 3.46. This means that there was also a moderate level of perception of intragroup conflict in the respondent category of the teaching staff. On the other, hand the mean score of intragroup conflict perception of the support staff was 3.21. This implies that there was a low level of intragroup conflict as perceived by respondents of the support staff. Finally, the level of the intragroup conflict was taken as the average of the perception of mean scores of the three respondent

groups. The average mean score was 3.38 with a standard deviation of 1.06. Thus, respondents perceive that there was a low level of intragroup conflict in the target organizations. It was confirmed that there was a low level of intragroup conflict in secondary and preparatory schools of Yeka sub-city.

A one-way analysis of variance had been conducted to establish whether there was a statistically significant difference or not.

Table 11: One way ANOVA on intragroup conflict at $\alpha = 0.05$ level

intragroup					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3.788	2	1.894	1.702	.184
Within Groups	265.917	239	1.113		
Total	269.705	241			

Source survey 2016

The ANOVA result in Table 11 indicates that $F(2,239) = 0.184$ was not statistically significant at 0.05 level. The calculated significance $P = 0.184$ was greater than 0.05. Therefore, there was no statistically significant difference among the mean scores of intragroup conflict as perceived by the three groups of respondents. Here also the statement that there was no statistically significant difference may mean there was a problem in the reliability of the scales. But in chapter three the reliability coefficient for intragroup conflict was 0.809. This was a more satisfactory reliability coefficient. Therefore, it could be concluded that there was no statistically significant difference among the perceptions of the three groups on intragroup conflicts.

Intergroup conflict

The dimension of intergroup conflict was described by 3 items that measure the perception of respondents towards intergroup conflict through a 5 point Likert scale. Table 12 displays the mean score of responses of the three groups on intergroup conflict.

Table 12: Mean Score values of inter group conflict

No	Items	School leadership N = 12		Teaching staff N = 151		Support staff N = 79		Overall	
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
231	Dispute between management and department heads	3.83	1.12	3.51	1.13	3.53	1.29	3.53	1.78
232	Dispute between management and support staff	3.42	0.9	3.96	1.14	3.2	1.29	3.06	1.18
233	Conflict between teaching staff and management	3.92	0.9	3.67	1.26	3.65	1.29	3.67	1.25
	Overall	3.72	0.84	3.38	0.92	3.46	1.10	3.42	0.98

Source survey 2016

As perceived by the respondents of the school leadership and the support staff the mean scores were 3.72 and 3.46 respectively. This implies that respondents of the support staff and the leadership perceive the existence of a moderate level of intergroup type of conflict. On the other hand, participants of the teaching staff perceived a low level of intergroup conflict with a mean score value of 3.38. However, on the average respondents recognize a moderate level of intergroup conflict with a mean score value of 3.42.

A one way analysis of variance at 5% significance level has been conducted to establish whether there was a statistically significant difference in the perceived mean scores among the respondent groups.

Table 13: One-Way ANOVA on intergroup conflict at $\alpha = 0.05$ level

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.465	2	.733	.764	.467
Within Groups	229.150	239	.959		
Total	230.616	241			

Source survey 2016

Table 13 indicates that $F(2,239) = 0.467$ is significant at 0.467 level, which is greater than 0.05. Therefore, there was no statistically significant difference among the perceived mean scores of the three groups. This result might also come from problems of reliability in the measurement scales. But the reliability coefficient for the scales of intergroup conflict was 0.743. therefore there was no statistically significant difference among the perceptions of the three groups on intergroup conflict.

Table 14 below displays the overall mean score values of the three types of conflict.

Table 14: Overall mean score comparing of conflict types

Types of Conflict	Mean Score	Description
Intrapersonal conflict	2.56	Low Level
Intragroup Conflict	3.38	Low Level
Intergroup Conflict	3.42	Moderate Level

Source: Survey 2016

Comparing the mean scores implied that intergroup conflict was more prevalent in the secondary and preparatory schools of Yeka Sub- City. Intrapersonal conflict was confirmed to prevail least.

Table 15 below compares the types of conflict among the three groups of the study.

Table 15: Mean scores of types of conflict respondent groups

Types of Conflict	School leadership	Teaching staff	Support staff
Intrapersonal conflict	2.70	2.62	2.36
Intragroup Conflict	3.61	3.46	3.21
Intergroup Conflict	3.72	3.38	3.46

Source: Survey 2016

Accordingly, intrapersonal conflict was more prevalent in the leadership 2.70 than in the teaching staff 2.62 and the support staff 2.36. Intragroup conflict and intergroup conflict were also more prevalent in the leadership than in the teaching and the support staff. This shows that intrapersonal and intragroup conflicts were more exercised by school leaders; next to this was the teaching staff. While the support staff was least exercise. Intergroup conflict was more exercised by school leaders, next supporting staff and lastly the teaching staff.

4.3. Conflict management styles

Conflict management style was measured by five independent sub dimensions of interpersonal conflict handling styles: integrating, obliging, dominating, avoiding and compromising. The instrument used self-report of respondents for measuring the styles of handling of interpersonal

conflicts of respondents with their peers, superiors and subordinates. The styles of handling conflicts were measured with statements that were to be filled out on a 5 point Likert scale. The extent of use of a particular style was represented by mean scores of responses.

Integrating style

This style has been measured by four statements. Mean scores of the three respondent groups are shown in Table 16 below.

Table 16: Mean score values of integrating style.

No	Item	School leadership N = 12		Teaching staff N = 151		Support staff N = 79		Total	
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
311	Investigating issues with a supervisor for acceptable solution	4.17	1.12	4.11		4.35	0.83	4.19	0.91
312	Integrating ideas with a supervisor for a joint decision	4.25	0.96	4.05	0.93	4.33	0.87	4.15	0.96
313	Exchanging accurate information with a supervisor	4.00	1.21	4.07	0.91	4.27	0.93	4.13	0.93
314	Bringing out all concerns in the open	4.08	0.90	4.12	0.87	4.33	0.69	4.19	0.82
	Total	4.12	1.05	4.08	0.74	4.32	0.67	4.16	0.73

Source: Survey 2016

It was observed that the mean score of the leadership 4.12, the teaching staff 4.08 and the support staff 4.32 were all greater than 3.80. It could be induced that integrating style of conflict management was greatly used by all the respondent groups in conflict situations. It could be induced that integrating style of conflict management was more exercised by secondary and preparatory schools of Yeka Sub-City.

Table 17: One way ANOVA on integrating style at $\alpha = 0.05$ level

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2.887	2	1.444	2.713	.068
Within Groups	127.166	239	.532		
Total	130.053	241			

Source survey 2016

A one-way ANOVA procedure had been used to establish whether there was a statistically significant difference in the mean scores among the three groups. Table 17 shows that the result that $F(2,239) = 2.713$ at 5% level of significance indicated that there was no statistically significant difference among the means. The calculated significance level 0.068 was greater than 0.05. Here also the absence of statistically significant difference may come from errors of reliability coefficient. But the reliability coefficient for the scales of integrating style was 0.871. Therefore there was no statistically significant difference among the self-reports of the three groups on integrating style.

Obliging style

This style was measured by three statements on a 5 point Likert scale. Table 18 presents the summary of the findings.

Table 18: Mean score values of obliging style

No	Item	School leadership		Teaching staff		Support staff		Total	
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
321	Satisfying needs of supervisor	3.58	0.67	3.74	1.13	3.80	1.16	3.75	1.12
322	Giving in to the wishes of supervisor	3.00	0.95	3.26	1.09	3.43	1.18	3.31	1.12
323	Satisfying the expectation of supervisor	3.75	0.62	3.68	1.02	3.89	1.01	3.75	1.00
	Obliging overall	3.44	0.51	3.56	0.86	3.71	0.89	3.60	0.86

Source: Survey 2016

Based on the self-reports on obliging the mean scores of the school leadership 3.44, the teaching staff 3.56, and the support staff 3.71 all lie in the interval between 3.40 and 3.79. Thus, the three groups of the respondents used a moderate level of an obliging conflict management style. A one way ANOVA has been conducted to establish whether these three means have statistically significant differences among the three respondent groups. Tables 19 demonstrate the ANOVA results.

Table 19: One-way ANOVA on obliging at $\alpha=0.05$ levels

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.360	2	.680	.915	.402
Within Groups	177.668	239	.743		
Total	179.028	241			

Source survey 2016

It was observed that the calculated significance level 0.402 is greater than 0.05. Thus, there was no statistically significant difference among the mean scores of the three respondent groups on obliging. This difference might come from errors of reliability in the scales of obliging style. However, the reliability coefficient for the scale was 0.804. Therefore secondary and preparatory schools of Yeka Sub-City were characterized by the use of moderate level of obliging style.

Dominating style

This conflict management style was measured by three statements. The finding is presented in Table 20 below.

Table 20: Mean score values of dominating style

No	Item	School leadership N = 12		Teaching staff N = 151		Support staff N = 79		Total	
		Mean	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
331	Use of one's influence to get one's ideas accepted	3.25	1.22	3.56	1.02	3.08	1.41	3.39	1.19
332	Use of one's expertise	4.17	0.88	3.95	1.12	3.91	1.28	3.95	1.16
333	Perusing one's side of an issue firmly	3.25	1.36	3.11	1.22	2.80	1.42	3.01	1.29
	Overall dominating	3.55	0.78	3.54	0.79	3.26	1.02	3.45	0.8

Source: survey 2016

The mean score for the use of dominating style by the leadership was 3.55, while it was 3.54 for the teaching staff. In both respondent groups the use of dominating style in conflict situations was a moderate level. The results were almost equal. However, the use of dominating style by the school leadership seems slightly greater than the teaching staff. On the other hand the mean score in using dominating style by the support staff was 3.26. This implied that there was a low level of using the dominating style by support staff. The overall use of dominating style by all

respondent groups was described by a mean score of 3.45. This implied the behavior of respondents in using a dominating style was of a moderate level.

To establish whether the three mean scores of the respondent groups had statistically significant differences in using the dominating style, a one way ANOVA at 95% confidence interval had been applied. The finding is presented in Table 21 below.

Table 21: One way ANOVA on dominating style at $\alpha = 0.05$ level.

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	4.184	2	2.092	2.725	.068
Within Groups	183.499	239	.768		
Total	187.683	241			

Source: survey 2016

Table 21 indicates that the result of the analysis of variance for the three mean scores had no statistically significant difference at 0.05 level since 0.068 was greater than 0.05. This difference might result from errors of reliability of scales. However, the reliability coefficient for the scale of dominating style was 0.659, which was a satisfactory result (Nunaly1978). Thus secondary and preparatory schools of Yeka Sub-City were characterized by the use of a moderate level 3.45.

Avoiding style

This style of conflict management was measured by three statements on a 5 point Likert scale. The findings are summarized in Table 22.

Table 22: Mean score values on the use of avoiding style

No	Item	School leadership N = 12		Teaching staff N = 151		Support staff N = 79		Total N = 242	
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
341	Avoiding open discussion	3.17	1.47	2.88	1.43	3.04	1.48	2.93	1.44
342	Staying away from disagreement	3.42	1.38	2.73	1.39	3.52	1.25	3.02	1.39
343	Keeping ones disagreement with one self	3.17	1.34	2.72	1.39	3.30	1.44	2.8	1.43
	Total	3.25	1.37	2.77	1.32	3.29	1.18	2.96	1.30

Source: Survey 2016

Table 22 depicted that the mean scores in the use of avoiding style for the school leadership 3.25, the teaching staff 2.77, and the support staff 3.29 were all less than 3.39. Therefore, all the three respondent groups used a low level of avoiding style in conflict situations. It was observed that the support staff uses avoiding style more frequently than the other two respondents groups. Furthermore, the school leadership respondents were observed to exercise avoiding style more than the teaching staff. It could be deduced that respondents of the teaching staff used avoiding style in a more or less frequent manner than the respondents of the school leadership and the support staff. The overall behavior of respondents was represented by an overall mean score of 2.96. This implied that the three respondent groups use a low level of avoiding style in conflict situations.

A one-way ANOVA at $\alpha = 0.05$ level has been conducted to establish whether there was a statistically significant difference in the mean score values among the three respondent groups in the use avoiding style. Table 23 displays the ANOVA result at a level of $\alpha = 0.05$.

Table 23: One –way ANOVA on avoiding at $\alpha = 0.05$

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	15.006	2	7.503	4.578	.011
Within Groups	391.745	239	1.639		
Total	406.751	241			

Source: Survey 2016

Table 23 indicates that the one-way analysis of variance on the overall avoiding had a significance level of 0.011. It could be concluded that there was a significant difference among the respondent groups. The null hypothesis that there was no statistically difference between the groups was rejected since $P = 0.011$ is less than 0.05. Post hoc tests have been performed to detect whether two or three of the respondent groups have significant differences. Table 24 displays the result of the Post hock multiple comparison tests.

Table 24: Post Hoc Tests

Multiple Comparisons						
Dependent Variable: Avoiding						
LSD						
(I) Occupation	(J) Occupation	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
School leadership	Teaching Staff	.482	.384	.211	-.27	1.24
	Support Staff	-.037	.397	.926	-.82	.74
Teaching Staff	School leadership	-.482	.384	.211	-1.24	.27
	Support Staff	-.519*	.178	.004	-.87	-.17
Support Staff	School leadership	.037	.397	.926	-.74	.82
	Teaching Staff	.519*	.178	.004	.17	.87

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Source: Survey 2016

It was observed that the mean difference between the teaching staff and the support staff was significance at $P = 0.004$. This means the mean difference between these two respondent groups was also significant at $\alpha = 0.05$ level, since $p=0.004$ is less than 0.05. In spite of the slight difference in the degree for the use of avoiding style between the teaching and the support staff, secondary and preparatory schools of Yeka Sub-City could be explained by the use of a low level of avoiding style.

Compromising style

This style had been measured by three statements on a five point Likert scale. The mean score value for the use of this style among the three groups is shown in Table 25.

Table 25: Mean score values on the use of compromising style among three respondent groups.

No	Item	School leadership N = 12		Teaching staff N = 151		Support staff N = 79		Total N = 242	
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
351	Opposing a middle ground to breaking dead locks	3.00	1.48	2.19	1.11	2.96	1.39	2.48	1.28
352	Negotiation with supervisors	2.58	.99	2.38	1.13	2.86	1.40	2.55	1.24
353	Give and take	2.42	1.16	2.28	1.22	2.89	1.50	2.48	1.34
	Total	2.67	0.91	2.28	0.82	2.90	1.18	2.50	0.99

Source: Survey 2016

It was observed from Table 25 that the mean score of promising, 2.67 for the school leadership, 2.28 for the teaching staff, and 2.90 for the support staff were all below the reference level 3.39. This implied all the three respondent groups exercise a compromising style in conflict situations at a low level.

The support staff exercised the compromising style in a more frequent way than the other two groups. The experience of the teaching staff was least in terms of using compromising style. As the use of conflict management styles was expected to parallel with the level of education, the style of using compromising by teachers should have been greater than the support staff. But the reverse was observed in this particular study.

The statistical procedure ANOVA at $\alpha = 0.05$ level has been performed to determine whether there was a significant difference among the mean scores of the respondent groups in the use of compromising style. The result of the ANOVA is presented in Table 26 below.

Table 26: One Way ANOVA on compromising at $\alpha = 0.05$ significant level

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	20.296	2	10.148	11.115	.000
Within Groups	218.200	239	.913		
Total	238.496	241			

Source: Survey 2016

It was observed that the F ratio was significant at 0.000 calculated levels. Since $P = 0.000$ was less than 0.05, there was a significant difference among the mean scores of the three respondent groups. This implied that the null hypothesis that the mean scores of the three groups were the same was rejected at $\alpha = 0.000$.

To establish whether two or all three of the mean scores of the respondent groups had statistically significant difference, Post hoc multiple comparison tests have been conducted at a 95% interval of confidence. Table 27 presents the result of the Post hoc tests.

Table 27: Post Hoc Tests

Multiple Comparisons						
Dependent Variable: COMPRO						
LSD						
(I) Occupation	(J) Occupation	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
School leadership	Teaching Staff	.38411	.28658	.181	-.1804	.9486
	Support Staff	-.23629	.29604	.426	-.8195	.3469
Teaching Staff	School leadership	-.38411	.28658	.181	-.9486	.1804
	Support Staff	-.62039*	.13268	.000	-.8818	-.3590
Support Staff	School leadership	.23629	.29604	.426	-.3469	.8195
	Teaching Staff	.62039*	.13268	.000	.3590	.8818

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Source: Survey 2016

Table 27 demonstrated that there was a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the teaching staff and the support staff since the calculated value of the significance level $P = 0.000$ is less than the pre-established level 0.05. Though there was a slight difference among the group, considering the overall mean score 2.50 implied that secondary and preparatory schools of Yeka Sub-City were characterized by the use of compromising style.

Table 28: Overall mean score comparing of conflict management styles

Conflict Management Styles	Mean Score	Description
Integrating Style	4.16	High Level
Obliging Style	3.6	Moderate Level
Dominating Style	3.45	Moderate Level
Avoiding Style	2.96	Low Level
Compromising Style	2.50	Low Level

Source: Survey 2016

In Table 28 above of comparing the prevalence of the conflict management styles in the school systems under study, it was observed that there was a high level practice in the use of integrating style 4.16 while there was a moderate level of practice in the use of obliging 3.60 and

dominating style 3.45. On the other hand, there was a low level practice in the use of avoiding style 2.96 and compromising style 2.50.

The more prevalent conflict management style was integrating while compromising was the least. In managing organizational conflict the high level of prevalence of integrating style wa a practice to be encouraged. Nevertheless, like integrating style the style of compromising should also be developed in order to enhance organizational performance (Rahim, 2001). On the other hand obliging & dominating styles which were being practiced at a moderate level in systems of Yeka Sub-City were styles to be encouraged. Obliging and dominating styles undermine organizational performance (Kurder, 1994).

One of the research questions of this study asks that ‘’which management styles characterize the leadership, the teaching staff or the supporting staff?’’. Table 29 below shows the comparative levels of practices of management styles against the three categories of respondents

Table 29: Mean scores of conflict management styles of respondent groups

Conflict Management Styles	School leadership	Teaching staff	Support staff
Integrating Style	4.12	4.08	4.32
Obliging Style	3.44	3.56	3.71
Dominating Style	3.55	3.54	3.26
Avoiding Style	3.25	2.77	3.29
Compromising Style	2.67	2.28	2.90

Source: Survey 2016

In the above Table 29 It was observed that integrating style was a characteristic feature of all the three groups of respondents, while the support staff displays the greatest use. The leadership was characterized by the use of a high level of integrating style, a moderate level of obliging and dominating style, as well as by a low level of avoiding and compromising styles. The teaching staff displayed the use of a high level of integrating style and a moderate level of the practice of obliging and dominating style and least described by the use of avoiding and compromising styles. In the support staff the use of a moderate level of obliging style came next to integrating style. This group used a low level of compromising, dominating and avoiding styles.

The use of dominating style was the lowest in the support staff than in the other two groups. Contrary to this the use of obliging style was the highest in the support staff than in the other two groups. In the support staff, females constituted 72.2% of the group. The greatest use of obliging style might be due to the high number of female in the group. Many studies describe that females are characterized by the use of avoiding conflict management style (Rahim, 2001).

4.4. Conflict Management Strategy

Conflict management strategy was examined by three independent sub dimensional measures of analysis: negotiation strategy, superior goal strategy, and the strategy of the third party intervention. The dimension of superior goal strategy was measured by statements of self-reports while negotiation and third party intervention strategy statements were measured by perception reports. Perception levels of respondents were captured by statements filled out on a five point Likert scale.

Strategy of negotiation

This strategy was measured by two items; Table 30 demonstrates perception responses of negotiation strategy.

Table 30: Mean score values of perception on the use of negotiation

No	Items	School leadership N = 12		Teaching staff N = 151		Support staff N = 79		Total N = 242	
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
411	Organizational culture of resolving conflicts through negotiations	2.42	0.99	2.4	1.09	2.38	1.14	2.39	1.1
412	Negotiation results in solution through concession	3.67	1.07	3.09	1.23	2.97	1.32	3.08	1.26
	Total	3.04	0.49	2.75	0.86	2.68	0.87	2.74	0.85

Source: Survey 2016

Regarding the use of negotiation strategy in resolving organizational conflicts Table 30 depicted that the perception of the school leadership was with a mean score of 3.04, while the score for the teaching and support staff were 2.75 and 2.68 respectively. These scores were considered to be in a low level. The overall mean score of negotiation strategy, 2.74, also lies in the low-level

range. This means that the level of exercising negotiation as a resolving strategy was very low as perceived by the three respondent groups.

To detect whether there was a statistically significant difference among the scores one-way ANOVA had been performed. Table 31 below present the result of the one way ANOVA tests on the three sub dimensional measures of conflict management strategy.

Table 31: One way ANOVA on dimensions of conflict management strategy at $\alpha = 0.05$

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Negotiation	Between Groups	1.406	2	.703	.973	.379
	Within Groups	172.68	239	.723		
	Total	174.09	241			
Superior goal	Between Groups	.15	2	.075	.075	.928
	Within Groups	237.52	239	.994		
	Total	237.67	241			
Third party	Between Groups	5.39	2	2.695	2.227	.110
	Within Groups	289.18	239	1.210		
	Total	294.57	241			

Source: Survey 2016

The calculated significance level for the overall negotiation was $P = 0.379$. This indicated that $P = 0.379$ is greater than 0.05 which means that there was no significant difference between the mean scores of negotiation among the three respondent groups. The result that there was no significant difference may arise from errors of reliability of measurement scales. However the reliability coefficient for the scales of conflict management strategy was 0.599. This result could be taken as satisfactory reliability coefficient, (Nunally 1978). Therefore there was a low level of negotiation strategy 2.74 being practiced in secondary and preparatory schools of Yeka Sub-City.

Strategy of Superior Goal

The second sub dimension of conflict management strategy was the superior goal strategy. It was measure by two statements across the three respondent groups; the result is shown in Table 32.

Table 32: Mean score values on the perception of superior goal strategy

No	Items	School leadership N = 12		Teaching staff N = 151		Support staff N = 79		Total N = 242	
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
421	You believe that the goals of your organization are superior to your personal goal.	2.00	0.95	2.17	1.18	1.97	1.13	2.1	1.15
422	Your personal goal match with your organizational goal	2.75	1.05	2.43	1.20	2.56	1.23	2.49	1.20
	Total	2.38	0.77	2.30	1.03	2.27	0.96	2.29	0.99

Source survey: 2014

The mean scores of the leadership 2.38, the support staff 2.27 and the teaching staff 2.30 were all in the range of the low level. All respondent groups perceive that the goal of their organization was not superior to their personal goals. Furthermore, it implied that they perceive a mismatch between their personal goal and the goal of their organization. The scores 2.38, 2.30 and 2.27 were almost similar in numerical values. The overall mean score 2.29 was also in the low level range.

A one – way analysis of variance procedure had been conducted to establish whether there was a statistically significant difference between the mean scores among the three respondent groups. The result of the test was shown in Table 31 above. The table indicated that $P = 0.928$ was greater than $\alpha = 0.05$. So it means there was no significant difference between the scores among the three groups. To detect whether this result came from errors of reliability, the reliability coefficient was tested and then it was found to be 0.590. Thus secondary and preparatory schools of Yeka Sub-City demonstrate a low level 2.29 perception on the use of superior goal as conflict management strategy.

Strategy of the Third Party Intervention

The last sub dimension of conflict management strategy was the strategy of the third party intervention. This sub dimension was measured by two statements. Findings are shown below in Table 33.

Table 33: Mean score values on third party intervention

No	Items	School leadership N = 12		Teaching staff N = 151		Support staff N = 79		Total N = 242	
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
431	Your organization invites external consultants when negotiation does not show results in solving internal conflict.	2.92	0.90	3.15	1.19	2.89	1.26	3.05	1.21
432	Your organization resolves conflicts through arbitration	3.50	1.09	3.8	1.30	2.81	1.39	3.07	1.33
	Total	3.21	0.78	3.16	1.12	2.85	1.10	3.06	1.16

Source: Survey 2016

Table 33 depicted that the mean scores of the school leadership, the teaching staff, and the support staff were 3.21, 3.16 and 2.85 respectively. While the overall mean score was 3.06. It was observed that all the mean scores were in the low level range. They all perceived that the culture of their organization in inviting consultants or arbitrators to resolve conflicts that had not been dealt with negotiation was not satisfactory.

To establish whether there was a statistically significant difference among the scores, a one-way ANOVA had been conducted. The one-way ANOVA at $\alpha = 0.05$ was shown in Table 31 above. The one-way ANOVA is significant at $P = 0.110$ which was a value greater than the pre-established significance level $\alpha = 0.05$. This implied that there was no significant difference between the mean scores among respondent groups on the use of the third party intervention by their organization. The absence of significant difference might come from errors of reliability scales. However, the reliability coefficients for the scale was 0.683. Thus it could be concluded that secondary and preparatory schools of Yeka Sub-City demonstrated a low level of practice on the use of third party intervention as conflict management strategy.

Table 34 displays the overall mean score values for the three sub dimensions of the conflict management strategy.

Table 34: Overall mean score comparing of conflict management strategy

Conflict management strategy	Mean Score	Description
Strategy of Negotiation	2.74	Low Level
Strategy of Superior Goal	2.29	Low Level
Strategy of the third party Intervention	3.06	Low Level

Source: Survey 2016

The above Table 34 implied the third party intervention mechanism used more frequently than the other two mechanisms. It was observed that the use of setting superior organizational goal, as a conflict management strategy was least exercised in secondary and preparatory schools of Yeka Sub-City.

In normal cases, it was expected that the use of negotiation is more frequent than the use of a third party intervention as a conflict management strategy (Rahim, 2001). However, the case of Yeka Sub-City Secondary and preparatory schools were contradictory. Therefore, it could be concluded that the conflict management strategy of the secondary and preparatory schools of Yeka Sub-City are not so effective.

Table 35 demonstrates the summary of response conflict management strategy.

Table 35: Mean scores of types of conflict respondent groups

Conflict management strategy	School leadership	Teaching staff	Support staff
Strategy of Negotiation	3.04	2.75	2.68
Strategy of Superior Goal	2.38	2.30	2.27
Strategy of the third party Intervention	3.21	3.16	2.85

Source: Survey 2016

In the above table it was observed all negation, superior goal and third party intervention were more exercised by the leadership than by the teaching and the support staff. Furthermore, the leadership was more characterized by the use of third party intervention than negotiation.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1. Summary

The main purpose of this study was to examine the nature of conflict and conflict management practices at organizational level of analysis. Types of organizational conflict have been used to explore the nature of conflict while conflict management styles and conflict management strategies were adopted to describe conflict management practices. Appropriate research questions have been posed to enquire the thematic elements of the study within the scopes of conceptual and theoretical frameworks. The main research questions were: To what extent do intrapersonal, intragroup and intergroup conflicts exist in the target school system? Which dimensions of interpersonal conflict handling styles are more prevalent? Which conflict management styles characterize the school leadership, teaching and supporting staff? What strategies have been designed to manage conflicts in the target schools? What are the Strategies designed to stimulate functional conflicts? Sufficient review of literature has been conducted from the perspective of both theoretical and empirical aspects.

There were three groups of respondents selected from employees of secondary and preparatory schools of Yeka Sub City in Addis Ababa. The three groups were members of the teaching staff, the school leadership and the support staffs of the school systems under consideration, that account for a total of 242 individual participants (i.e. 151 from teaching staff, 12 from school leaders and 79 from supporting staff). Quantitative approaches have been employed to collect and analyze data.

In the process of data analysis, both descriptive and inferential statistical procedures have been performed to analyze responses from the three respondent groups. This study included all the mean scores of the three groups by adopting one way ANOVA and post hoc multiple comparison tests. Following are the major findings of the study.

Intrapersonal conflict in general was considered to be in the range of a low level with an overall score of 2.56. However, intrapersonal conflict was more prevalent in the school leadership respondents than in the teaching and the support staff.

Intragroup conflict with respect to task goals, activities and function are organizational conflict that can be considered functional conflict (Rahim, 2001). However all categories of respondents exhibited a low level of intragroup conflict.

There was a moderate level of intergroup conflict in respondents of the school leadership and the support staff members. However, the respondents of the teaching staff perceived that there was a low level of intergroup conflict. On the average, the three categories of respondents perceived the existence of a moderate level of intergroup conflict regarding tasks and the use of resources. The target school systems were explained by a moderate level of intergroup conflict and low levels of intrapersonal and intragroup conflicts.

Respondents of school leadership, teaching staff and support staff were confirmed to use a moderate level of integrating style in handling conflicts. The use of integrating style of handling was more frequent in the support staff than the other two respondent groups

The self-report of the three respondent groups confirmed that they all used a moderate level of obliging style of handling conflicts while the support staff was found to practice this style in a greater way than the teaching staff and the school leadership.

Respondents of teachers, school leaders and support staff workers were found to use a moderate level of dominating style in handling conflicts more frequently in their organizations. School leaders were confirmed to use this style in a greater way than the other two groups, teachers and support staff works.

Sample respondents of teachers, support staff members and school leader were all reported to use a low level of avoiding style in conflict situations. Nevertheless, the use of this style was more prevalent in respondents of supporting staff.

Respondents of teachers, school leaders and support staff members were identified for their use of a low level of compromising style in conflict situations, in a frequent manner. The target school systems were characterized by the use of a high level of integrating style, a moderate level of obliging and dominating styles as well as a low level of compromising and avoiding styles. It was confirmed that the third party intervention conflict management strategy was more exercised than negotiation.

5.2. Conclusion

Only findings that were related to the research question drawn as ideas of conclusion. Thus, in secondary and preparatory schools of Yeka Sub-City intergroup organizational conflict was more prevalent, next to this came intragroup conflict. Intrapersonal conflict was least prevalent in the school systems under the study.

In secondary and preparatory schools of Yeka Sub-City integrating style was practiced more frequently, next to this obliging and dominating styles were used frequently and the use of avoiding and compromising were least exercised.

In secondary and preparatory schools of Yeka Sub-City respondents were confirmed that the third party intervention was more exercised than the use of negotiation and superior goal strategy and strategy of superior goal was least exercised. Therefore, the conflict management strategy of the secondary and preparatory schools of Yeka Sub-City were not so effective.

5.3. Recommendation

The moderate level of intergroup conflict type needs to be kept to remain at the same level, whereas the low level of intragroup conflict was suggested to transform to a moderate level.

The use of high level of integrating style of conflict management to be encouraged. Moreover, a moderate or a high level of compromising style was also necessary. Therefore, the low level of compromising style confirmed by the study seems to be improved to a high level.

The third party intervention type of conflict management strategy might be beneficiary. However, the negotiation strategy needs to be more practiced than others. Thus, the low level of negotiation strategy confirmed by the study seems to be practiced in a more frequent way.

Future research direction Future researchers regarding the nature and conflict management practices in secondary and preparatory school may focus on use of more dimensions of conflicts variable to investigate conflicts in a better way.

Research may also explore the status of stimulation of functional conflicts which has not been covered in this study in secondary and preparatory school furthermore, future researches may adopt a more appropriate and effective way of analysis in exploring conflict variables.

Reference

- Amason, A.C (1996) “Distinguishing the effects of functional and dysfunctional conflict on strategic decision making: Resolving a paradox for top management teams”. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 123-148.
- Backer, Andrews, et al (1988) “Conflict approaches of effective and ineffective project managers: A field study in a matrix organization”. *Journal of management studies*, 25, pp. 167-178.
- Balsvik, R.R. (2007) *The Quest for Expression: The State and the university in Ethiopia under Three Regimes, 1952 – 2005*. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University Printing press.
- Berger and Chaffee (1987) Eds. *Hand book of communication science*. California; Sage
- Berhanu, T. (2014) conflict and its management styles: teachers, students and principals perceptual: The case of KolfeKeranyo sub city government secondary schools of Addis Ababa. A thesis for the degree of master of arts in educational leadership. Addis Ababa university: Addis Ababa.
- Billingham, R.E and Sack A.R (1987 “Conflict tactics and the level of emotional commitment” *Human Relations*, 40, 59-74
- Bison, H. (1988). *Managing conflict*. California: sage.
- Blake, R.R. and Mouton, J.S. (1964). *The managerial Grid*. Houston. Tx. Gurf.
- Cosier, R, and Rose, D (1977) “Positive effects of conflict: A field assessment”, *International Journal of conflict Management*, 1, pp. 81-92.
- Dawson, C. (2007). *A Practical Guide to Research Methods: A User Friendly Manual for Mastering Research Techniques and Projects*. 3rd Ed. United Kingdom: Howtobooks.
- Deutch, M (1977) *The Resolution of conflict*. New Haven: Yale University press
- Deutch, M (1949). “A theory cooperative and competition” *Human Relations*, 2, 129 – 152.
- Dimo, D (2014) Conflict generating factors between teachers and school leader in secondary schools of Wolaita zone.MA thesis. Addis Ababa university, Addis Ababa.
- Druckman, Koper, et al (1988) “Value differences and conflict resolution: Facilitation or delinking?” *Journal of conflict Resolution*, 32, pp. 489-510.

- Druckman, S. and Zechmeister, K (1973) conflict of interest and value dissensus: Propositions in Psychology of conflict. *Human Relations*, 26, pp 449-466.
- Esbeck et al (1971). "The cultural assimilator: An approach to cross – cultural training". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 55, pp 95-102.
- Fayol, H(1916), *General and Industrial Management*. London: Pitman.
- Fekru, w. (1993)A strategy for managing conflict in the primary teachers training institutes of Ethiopia. MA thesis. Addis Ababa university, Addis Ababa.
- Fisher, R & Ury, W (1981) *Getting to eyes: Negotiating agreement without giving in* and edn. New York: Penguin Book.
- Follet, M.P. (1940). *Constructive conflict*. In HC Metaclef and L. urwick (eds), *Dynamic Administration the collected papers of marry parker follet*. New York: Harper and Row (Originally published 1926) .
- French, J.R.P and Caplan, R.D (1972) *Organizational stress and individual strain*. I A J. Marrow (ed) the failure of success. New York: AMACOM.
- Gebretensay, T (2002) Factors generating conflict between teachers and school managers secondary schools of Addis Ababa. MA thesis, Addis Ababa university, Addis Ababa.
- Goitom, A (2012) *Introduction to Management*. Addis Ababa: Saint Mary's University College Printing Press.
- Gonie, T. (1998) Teacher. Principal conflicts in Amhara Regional state secondary schools, MA thesis, Addis Ababa university, Addis Ababa.
- Gray. B. (1989) *Collaborating finding common ground for multiparty problems*. San Diago: Jossey Bass.
- Gray, J.L and stracke, F.A. (1984) *Organizational behavior concepts and applications*. 3rd ed. Boston: Ally nard Backon.
- Hammer, W.C and Organ,D.W (1978) *Organizationsl Behaviour: An applied psychology approach*. Texas: Business Publications.
- Hocker, J.L and Wilmot, W.W (1991). *Interpersonal conflict*. (3rd edn). Dubuque: Wm.C. Brown.

- House, Dorfman et al (2004) *Culture, Leadership and Organizations a cross nations*. Thousand oaks, CA: Sages.
- Jarobe, s.c and Witteman, H.R (1996) “Intragroup conflict management in task oriented groups,” *Small group research*, 27, pp. 316 – 333.
- Jehn, K.A. (1977b) “A qualitative analysis of conflict types and dimensions in organizational groups”. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42, pp. 530-557.
- Jehn, North Craft, et al (1999) “Why differences make a difference: A field study of diversity, conflict and performance in work groups”. *Administrative science quarterly*. 44, pp. 741-763.
- Khanaki, H. and Hassanzadch, N. (2010) “Conflict Management styles: The Iranion General preference compared to the Swedish”, *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*, 4(1), PP. 419 – 426
- Kreitner, R. And Kinicki (2004). *Organizational Behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Kurdek, L.A (1994). Conflict resolution styles in gay, resbian, heterosexual non parent and heterosexual parent comples. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 56, 705-722
- Lawrence, P.R and Lorsch, J.W (1967a) “Differentiation and integration in complex organizations”. *Administrative science Quarterly*, 12, pp. 1-7.
- Lewin, K. (1948). *Resolving social conflict selected papers on group dynamics*. Ed. G.W. Lewin New York Harper and Row.
- Likert, R. and Likert, J.G. (1976). *New ways of managing conflict*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Litterer, J.A (1966). Conflict in organization: Are examination. *Academy of Management Journal*, 9, pp, 128-186.
- Mastenbrock, W.F.G (1989). *Negotiate*. Oxford: Basir Black well.
- Mayer, S. (2004) “Organizational response to conflict: Future conflict and work outcomes” *Social Work Research*, 28, pp 183-190.
- Mayo, E (1933), *The Human Problem of and industrial civilization*: New York: MacMillan.
- Mckinley et al, (1997) “Reliability and validity of new measure of patient’s satisfaction with out of hours primary medical care in the United Kingdom”. *Development of a patient questionnaire – British Medical Journal* 314, 193-198

- Misquita, V.C (1998) Exploration of Factors Leadeang to Organizational Commitment Un published Doctorial Desgertaiton. Illinos institute of Technology, Chicago.
- Mulatu, M. (2007) Assessment of conflict management praclices: A case study of Admas university college. MBA, Addis Ababuniversity, Addis Ababa.
- Nunaly, J (1978). *Psychometric Theory*. New York: McGraweHill
- Pelled, Eisenhardt et al (1999). “Exploring the black box: An analysis of work group diversity, conflict and performance,” *Administrative science Quarterly*, 44, pp. 1-28.
- Peterson et al (1995) Role conflict ambiguity, and overload A 21 nation study. *Academy of management Journal*, 38, pp, 429 – 452.
- Plunkett, W.R and Attner, R.F (1989). *Introduction to Management*, Boston: PWS-Kent publishing .
- Pondy, L.R (1967). “Organizational conflict: concepts and models”. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 12, pp. 296 – 320.
- Pondy and Kumar (1997) “Organizational Conflict”. *Administrative science quarterly*, 12, pp. 296 – 320.
- Pruit, D.G (1983) Negotiation and social conflict, Backing hun: Open university press.
- Putnam, L.L. and Wilson, C.E (1982) *Communicative strategies in organizational conflicts: Reliability and Validity of measurement Scale*. In M. Burgood (Ed), communication year book 6, Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Rahim, M.A. (2001) *Managing conflicts in organizations*. 3rd edn. London: Quorum Books.
- Rahim, M.A. (1983a) “A measure of styles of handling Interpersonal conflict.” *Academy of management Journal*, 26, pp 368 – 376.
- Rahim, M.A and Magner, N.R (1995) “Conflict factor analysis of the styles of Handling Interpersonal conflict first order factor model and its invariance across groups,” *Jouranal of Applied psychology*, 80(1), pp. 122 – 132.
- Rahim, M.A. & Bonoma, T.V. (1979) “Managing organizational conflict”. *Psychological report* 44, pp 1323 – 1344.

- Rands.M et al (1981) "Patterns of conflict Resolution and Marital satisfaction". *Journal of Family Issues*, 2, 297 – 321
- Robbins, S.P (1974). *Managing organizational conflict: A contradictional approach*. Englewood cliffs, NJ: Prenticc-Hall
- Rolof, M.E (1987). "Communication and Conflcit." In c. R Berger and S.H Chaffee (eds), *Handbook of communication science*. Newbury Park CA: Sage.
- Ross, R.S, and Ross,JR (1989) *Small groups in organizational settings*. Englewood New Jersey: Prentice – Hall.
- Saaty, T.L. (1990). "The analytic hierarchy process in conflict management". *International Journal of conflict Management*, 1, pp. 47-68
- Schanke, M.E and Cochrand, D.S (1985) "Effect of two goal dimensions of perceived intra organizational conflict". *Group and organization studies*, 10, pp. 168 – 183.
- Schellenberg, J.A. (1996). *Conflict resolution: Theory, research, and practice*. Albany. State university of New York Press.
- Schelling, T.C. (1960) *The strategy of conflict*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Schermerhorry Hunt et al (1998). *Basic organization Behaviour*. New York: Wiley.
- Spaho, K. (2013) "Organizational communication and conflict management". Professional paper UDC: 65,01; 316.65.
- Sportsman, S. and Hamilton, p (2007) "Conflict management styles in the Health professions," *Journal of professional nursing*, 23(3), pp. 157 – 166.
- Taylor, F.W (1911) *The principles of scientific Management*. New York: Haper and Row.
- Tizalu (2014) *The effect of conflict management styles on organizational performance*. MBA thesis, Gonder University.
- Tjosvold, D., and Chia, E. (1998) "Conflict between managers and workers: The role of cooperation and completion." *Journal of social psychology*, 129, pp. 235-245.
- Thomas, K.W. (1976). *Conflict and conflict management in Md- DUnnette (ed), Handbook of Industrial and organizational psychology*. Chicago Rand Mc Nally.

- Thomas, K.W and Kilman, R.H (1974) *The Thomas–Kilman Conflict MODE instrument*. Tuxedo, New York: Xicom
- Thomas, Shallbhut et al (2008) “Conflict styles of men and women at 6 organization levels,” *International Journal of conflict management*, 19(2), pp. 148-166.
- Thompson, L. (1998). *The mind and Heart of the Negotiator*. New jersey prentice – hall.
- Valentine, P.E. (2001). “Gender perspective on conflict management strategies of nurse,” *Journal of Nursing scholarship, Healthy policy and systems first quarter*, pp 69 – 74.
- Van De Vliert, E (1997). *Complex interpersonal conflict behavior*. London: psychological press.
- Wall, V.D and Galance, G. (1986). “The symlog dimensions and small group conflict”. *Central States Speech Journal*, 37, pp. 61-28.
- Weider-Hatfield, D and Hatfield, J.D (1996) “Superior’s conflict management strategies and subordinate outcomes.” *Management Communication Quarterly*, 10, pp. 189-208.
- Wieder-Hatfied. D(1988). “Assessing the Rahim organizational conflict inventory II (Roci – II).” *Management communication Quarterly*, 1, pp. 350-366.
- Wieder-Hatfield, D. and Halfield (1995) “Relationship among conflict management styles, levels of conflict and reaction to work”. *Journal of social psychology*, 135, pp. 687-698.
- Yamane, Tarno (1967). *Statistics: An Introductory Analysis*. 2nd ed. New York: Harper and Row.
- Zaidotal, AL and Bagheri, A (2009). “Entrepreneurship as a career choice: An analysis of Entrepreneurial self-efficacy and intention of university students”. *European journal of social science* 9(2), Pp, 338-346

Appendix A

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL
STUDY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT
(MSCL Program)**

Dear respondents,

Attached herewith is a questionnaire to collect data that will be used for the pursuance of a master thesis research on the topic “**conflict management practices in governmental secondary and preparatory schools in Yeka sub-city**” as partial requirement for the fulfillment of MA in School leadership. Its purpose is purely academic and hence no part of your information would be disclosed to anyone else or can be used for businesses other than academic purpose. To realize the objective, your response to the items in this questionnaire is very important. I therefore request your kind cooperation to that end. Thank you for your time and cooperation.

PART I

Background information

Please put a tick (✓) mark on the space provided

1. Occupation:

1.1. School Leadership 1.2. Teaching staff 1.3. Support staff

2. Age:

2.1. 18- 22 2.3. 28 – 32 2.5. 40 – 46

2.2. 23 – 27 2.4. 33 – 39 2.6. 47 and above

3. **Gender:** 3.1. Male 3.2. Female

4. Education

4.1. MA and above 4.3. Diploma 4.5. 12th complete

4.2. First Degree 4.4. Certificate 4.6. Below grade 12

5. Work experience

5.1. 4 years and below 5.3. 10 – 14 years 5.5. 22 – 28 years

5.2. 5 – 9 years 5.4. 15 – 21 years 5.6. 29 and above

PART II

Organizational conflict and conflict management practices

Instructions: Please indicate how much you agree with each of the following statements by using Strongly Agree; Agree; Neutral; Disagree; Strongly Disagree. Work as quickly as you can, do not stop to think too deeply about any one question, but mark down your first thought. Please answer all of the questions.

2. Types of conflict

S. No	Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
2.1	Intrapersonal Conflict					
2.1.1	Your tasks match your expertise.					
2.1.2	Your tasks match your interest.					
2.1.3	Your tasks match your personal goals.					
2.1.4	The culture of your organization matches with your personal values.					
2.1.5	You are expected to take part in non-professional engagements					
2.2.	Intragroup Conflict					
2.2.1	Majority of the members of your work unit group are involved in conflict regarding task goals.					
2.2.2	Most of the members of your work unit group are involved in disputes regarding functions.					
2.2.3	Majority of the members of your work unit group are often involved in disputes regarding activities.					
2.3	Intergroup Conflict					
2.3.1	Quite often dispute is carried out between management and department heads in connection with tasks.					
2.3.2	The management and support staff members often carry out disputes in connection with resources or tasks.					
2.3.3	Teaching staff and management often carryout conflicts.					

3. Conflict Management Styles

S. No	Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
3.1	Integrating Style					
3.1.1	I try to investigate an issue with my supervisor to find a solution acceptable to us.					
3.1.2	I try to integrate my ideas with those of my supervisor to come up with a decision jointly.					
3.1.3	I exchange accurate information with my supervisor to solve a problem together.					
3.1.4	I try to bring all our concerns out in the open so that the issues can be resolved in the best possible way.					
3.2	Obliging Style					
3.2.1	I generally try to satisfy the needs of my supervisor.					
3.2.2	I give in to the wishes of my supervisor.					
3.2.3	I try to satisfy the expectations of my supervisor.					
3.3	Dominating Style					
3.3.1	I use my influence to get my ideas accepted.					
3.3.2	I use my expertise to make a decision in my favor.					
3.3.3	I am generally firm in pursuing my side of the issue.					
3.4	Avoiding Style					
3.4.1	I usually avoid open discussion of my differences with my supervisor.					
3.4.2	I try to stay away from disagreement with my supervisor.					
3.4.3	I try to keep my disagreement with my supervisor to myself in order to avoid hard feelings.					
3.5	Compromising Style					
3.5.1	I usually oppose a middle ground for breaking deadlocks.					
3.5.2	I negotiate with my supervisor so that a compromise can be reached.					
3.5.3	I use “give and take” so that a compromise can be made.					

4. Conflict Management Strategy

S. No	Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
4.1	Strategy of Negotiation					
4.1.1	It is normal for your organization to resolve conflicts through negotiation.					
4.1.2	Most often negotiations in your organization result to a solution through concession					
4.2	Strategy of Superior Goal					
4.2.1	You believe that the goals of your organization are superior to your personal goal.					
4.2.2	Your personal goal match with your organizational goal					
4.3	Strategy of the Third Party Intervention					
4.3.1	Your organization invites external consultants when negation does not show results in solving internal conflict.					
4.3.2	Your organization resolves conflicts through arbitration					

Thanks for your cooperation!