Management of Interpersonal Conflict in Teacher Education Colleges in Amhara State, Ethiopia

Shibrie Jorga Tessema, Sun Jin & Melaku Mengistu

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the sources and management strategies of interpersonal conflict arising between college managers and teachers. It attempted to identify frequently observed conflicts and their sources, conflict management strategies, and whether teachers and managers have differences in their views for the sources and management strategies of conflict. To achieve this purpose survey method was employed and both quantitative via (questioner) and qualitative via (interview) in its approach. The study involved 214 survey participants and a key informant selected through simple random and purposively sampling techniques respectively. Mean and independent-samples t-test were employed to analyze the quantitative data using SPSS 23, in which the qualitative data were embedded. Results revealed that interpersonal conflict was frequently existed in teachers' education colleges, mostly (m=3.3) resulting from lack of resolving conflict as early as possible. As well as majority of teachers were handle conflict by keeping the self away (m=3.14) it. The findings also imply that college managers employ compromising and integrating as strategies of conflict management. However, in most cases the two groups diverge regarding the sources and management strategies of conflict. Hence, it can be concluded that there is a blame game between teachers and deans in the colleges. This study focused only on teachers colleges therefore, it encountered generalizability problem. Since the problem requires a contextual analysis in its nature, future researchers should apply an exploratory sequential design preceded by in-depth interviews and FGDs. The author believes that this research finding is useful to college deans and teachers to handle interpersonal conflict properly and identify to the major resolution strategies.

About Author (s)

Shibrie Jorga Tessema (First author)**,** Business school, University of International Business and Economics, Chaoyang District, Beijing, P.R. China 100029.
Professor Sun Jin (PHD), Business school, University of International Business and Economics, Chaoyang District, Beijing, China.
Professor Melaku Mengistu (PHD), lectures in Bahr Dar university, Ethiopia.

1. Introduction
1.1. *Background of the Study*

Obviously, any work activity in an organization is a function of a frequent interaction of people among each other. Conflict is inevitable in interactive work environments because, on the one hand, people working in an organization possess their own diverse and unique natures and aspires to address both common organizational goals and individual interests, on the other (Crossfield & Bourne, 2018; Msila, 2012). The diverse natures and interests of people such as antagonisms, tensions, aggressions, stereotypes, negative attitudes and the frustrations of perceived conflicting needs usually result in conflicts so far as people are working together because it is natural for conflict to occur when people with differing views and interests interact with one another (Msila, 2012). Poor communication skills, competition for resources, incompatible goals and interests drive people toward differences that give rise to conflict and tension at all levels (Aula & Siira, 2010; Brewer, Mitchell & Weber, 2002; Msila, 2012). Rahim (2002) and Swanström and Weissmann (2005), in particular, argue that conflict is a legitimate and inevitable organizational phenomenon, possessing the potential for positive growth and effective organizational management. They also contend that conflict is natural, useful and necessary. According to them, conflict is inevitable because life is uncertain, decision-making in work places may not satisfy everybody, people differ in various characteristics, there always exist contrary needs and goals, and resources are always limited. They also argue that when properly managed conflict enhances organizational improvement by stimulating innovative thinking, by challenging the status quo, by enforcing change and creating discomfort on the existing work culture. Aula and Siira (2010), similarly, viewed conflict with positive roles to play for two reasons. First, conflict is inherent and inevitable that occurs due to the fact that the supervisor-subordinate relationship is in most cases subjected to conflict. Second, conflict is triggered by the unavoidability of goal inconsistency, differences in the setting and definition of success criteria, and heterogeneity and make-up of customers. Kinard (1988) and Terry and Franklin (1999) claim that conflict is a daily occurrence because rules governing the organization seldom involve different stakeholders – managers of different levels, subordinates, customers, partners, etc. At times, these parties, particularly managers and their subordinates may see one another as adversaries, not as those working toward a common goal. Armstrong (2006) as well as Bratton and Gold (1999) also conclusively assert that conflict is a perpetual given of life because conflict-free organization has never existed and will never exist. Other many scholars of the field (e.g. Aula & Siira, 2010; Brewer, Mitchell & Weber, 2002; Rahim, 2001; 2002)), consistently, argue that conflict is not only an unavoidable ingredient but also a desirable catalyst for organizational development and effectiveness that should be changed into advantage by cautiously utilizing for the purposes of both personal and organizational ends.

Conflict has various forms that have two general dimensions (Crossfield & Bourne, 2018; Rahim, 2001, 2002; Salleh & Adulpakdee, 2012). The first dimension known as substantive conflict (also called task issue or cognitive conflict) involves disagreements over such things as goals, policies, procedures, job assignments, resource allocation, distribution of rewards and the like. The second dimension known by the name affective conflict (also called emotional or relationship conflict) results from feelings of anger, distrust, dislike, fear, resentment and other personal clashes. When managed well, both forms of conflict can be helpful in promoting creativity and innovation. Unfortunately they can have their destructive sides as well. Both forms of conflict manifest themselves at various levels. It may occur within an individual (intrapersonal), between individuals (interpersonal), between an individual and a group (intragroup), between groups (intergroup) or between organizations. Interpersonal conflict, the focus of this study, involves conflict between two or more individuals and is probably the most common and most recognized conflict. It occurs between individuals who are brought together in work places or

elsewhere. Since people often compete with each other for recognition, approval and promotion competition for resources, aspiration for promotion, concern for position, status, power etc. within the organization, any resentment or infringement can generate interpersonal conflict. According to Rashid and Archer (1983) and Kinard (1988) interpersonal conflicts is a common type of conflict that originates from differences in orientations, competition, role conflict, personality differences or struggles for power and other related incidences among two or more persons. According to Chandan (1994), on the other hand, interpersonal conflicts may be surfaced as disagreements over goals and objectives of the organization. Hunt (1979) also described interpersonal conflict occurs when attitudes, motives, values, expectations, or activities are incompatible between two or more persons and if the individuals perceive themselves to be in disagreement. Interpersonal conflict for Hellriegel and Slocum (1982) is caused by disagreements over policies, practices, plans and/or due to emotional issues involving negative feeling, such as anger, distrust, fear, rejection, and resentment. Agarwal (1982) also considers interpersonal conflict as a normal aspect in organizational life that is triggered by differences in values, perceptions, needs, attitudes, temperaments, interaction approaches and other so many differences between individual employees at any level of the organization.

Whether conflict has positive or negative or both consequences, depends largely on the management methods implemented and the nature of the solution (Msila, 2012; Rahim, 2001; 2002). Aula and Siira (2010) and Brewer, Mitchell and Weber (2002), consistently, claim that what matters whether conflict is useful or deleterious is not its form and source but the management strategy implemented given the management strategies vary according to the forms or levels of manifestation and the sources it emanated from. According to many other writers (e.g. Kehinde, 2011; Owens, 1998; Salleh & Adulpakdee, 2012; Tonder, Havegna & Visagie, 2008) the central theme with respect to conflict is the management approaches implemented to minimize its destructiveness and optimize its role to raise productivity. That is why Kinard (1988) asserts that conflict is neither good nor bad, the presence of which plays significant roles on the existence of an organization. For Kinard (1988) and Terry and Franklin (1999) the utilization of conflict towards organizational development lies in one's ability to control and channel it to ensure the progress of an organization rather than trying to eliminate it. Unless handled properly, therefore, conflicts can deter and imperil the realization of the intended objectives of an organization. Other authors (e.g. Armstrong, 2006; Aula & Siira, 2010; Bratton & Gold, 1999; Brewer, Mitchell & Weber, 2002; Rahim, 2001; 2002) in this respect alert that recognizing conflict timely and properly, identifying its potential implications and applying the proper and effective management strategy are essential remedies often prescribed by managers to utilize conflict towards organizational effectiveness, productivity and development. That is because, according to them, a proper and timely conflict resolution enables an organization to retain and motivate experienced and competent employees that otherwise leave and expose it for ineffectiveness and inefficiency due to dissatisfaction and frequent turnover. Armstrong (2006) and Bratton and Gold (1999), consequently, advocate that organizational managers should focus on controlling conflict than totally eliminating it. They also advise that understanding the fact that conflict is useful to organizational development by itself is not enough because managers also need to know that at times conflict may be harmful. That is, according to them, they have to be curious and competent enough for timely and properly recognizing what types of conflicts are instantly or gradually constructive and which are destructive in the same manner. They have to detect potentially useful conflicts that should continue and perhaps be intensified by close monitoring and evaluating. Similarly, these scholars argue, managers have to be equipped with the necessary competence to cope up with and find a means to resolve conflict, if it appears to be detrimental sooner or later. Msila (2012) also advises the need for speculating possible potential conflicts is one of the most important tasks of

managers at all steps of decision in all times because every decision that the managers make may potentially generate conflict.

1.2.   Problem Statement

In educational institutions conflicts among teachers and school heads are the most deterring problems of all conflicts that exist. Such conflicts severely smooth away interpersonal communication, erode good institutional culture, ruin school climate, and eventually obliterate school effectiveness and efficiency. Management of interpersonal conflict is, therefore, essential to make sure that the limited time and scarce resources available are not absorbed for resolving destructive interpersonal conflicts. Reportedly, nonetheless, in the current study area (in colleges of teacher education) many teachers often got into conflict with their deans and frequently appeal to state education bureau. They accuse their respective deans with the violation of securing their rights and benefits that they believe are inappropriately repudiated. Unfair selection practices for training opportunities, unnecessarily intervening or dominating deans, unfair performance appraisal practices, unfair promotion procedures and practices, etc. are the major conflict generating factors among others mentioned by teachers more often than not. In most of CTEs, consequently, deans usually spend time while addressing their differences with the staff. To make conflict and its management inept, teachers condemn deans for using traditional grievance management procedures that often leave the former a feeling of shafted and persistently affect their interpersonal relationships. The purpose of this research work is, therefore, to investigate the sources of interpersonal conflict between managers and teachers and strategies employed to manage conflict in CTEs in the State of Amhara. The following research questions spearheaded the study:

  i.   What are the frequently observed conflicts and their sources between teachers and deans in CTEs?
 ii.   What conflict management strategies do deans usually employ to manage conflicts they face with teachers?
iii.   Is there a significant difference among participants in terms of position and service year regarding the strategies deans employed to manage interpersonal conflicts?
 iv.   What are the mechanisms teachers use to handle conflicts they face with their deans?

1.3.   Significance of the Study

It is expected that this study may render the following benefits:

  i.   It helps deans to identify and manage interpersonal conflicts within their colleges before problems sour over towards worse consequences;
 ii.   It may help every partner to understand the techniques of avoiding undesirable conflicts and exploiting desirable ones towards organizational advantage;
iii.   Policy makers may also get an insight in future considerations;
 iv.   It can trigger interested researchers to execute a wider and deeper study on the topic.

2. Literature review
2.1.   The Nature and Conception of Conflict in Organizations

Vividly speaking, there is no a single and universally accepted definition of organizational conflict so far that could lead scholars to a consensus. This sheer variety of definition used in most instances creates confusion to make a uniform analysis of conflict management episodes. Nearly half a century ago, for instance, Coser (in Fleetwood, 1987, p. 3) defined conflict as "a struggle over values and claims to scarce status, power, and resources in which the aims of the opponents are to neutralize, injure, or eliminate the rivals." Deutsch (1977) also underlined that conflict exists whenever an activity or action carried out by an individual, a group, or organization is incompatible with another action or prevents, obstructs, interferes with, injures,

or in some way makes it less likely or less effective. Hocker and Wilmot (1985, p. 23), on their side, define conflict as "an expressed struggle between at least two interdependent parties who perceive incompatible goals, scarce rewards, and interference from the other party in achieving their goals." Swanström and Weissmann (2005) also defined conflict not simply in terms of violence (behavior) or hostility (attitudes) but rather provided a wide range of behavioral dimensions or incompatibilities of interests and differences in position. Conflict is inherent in society; it means that the conflict always occurs as long as the society exists so it is impossible to erase the conflict as the dictator's wishful thinking. On the contrary, it is unlikely the consensus is perpetuated continuously even in violent ways which are also the desire of authoritarian ruler. The conflict also shows the relationship between two or more parties (individual or groups) that have objectives that are not aligned Pujiati1 (2018).

2.2. Features of Conflict
While valuing conflict, scholars have identified two basic features. The first one is substantive conflict, a type of conflict that involves differences in aspects such as goals, resource allocations, performance evaluations, reward distributions and the like. The second one is known as emotional conflict. This originates from sense of distrust, annoyance, aversion, fear, resentment and other personality clashes and fights. Both of them can be helpful in the advancement and dissemination of creativity and innovation when managed well. That is why, nowadays, it is widely accepted that conflict has both negative and positive effects for organizational development and effectiveness (Aula &Siira,2010; Kehinde, 2011).

2.3. Sources of Conflict
Although very few people go looking for conflict, more often than not, conflict results because of miscommunication between people with regard to their needs, ideas, beliefs, goals, or values. Conflict is, however, an inevitable phenomenon that may be attributed to structural factors such as the physical shape of a building, the design of a career structure, or the nature of a class system. It is also integral to the nature of change. The more comprehensive and inclusive description regarding the sources of conflict comes from Agarwal (1982, pp. 184-185):

> People differ in values, perceptions, needs, attitudes, temperaments, approaches, and in so many other ways. When people interact with one another, they often run into conflict situations because of these differences. One of the reasons of conflict is that one of the two or more people in an interactional relationship feels threatened or diminished in some way. He [*sic*] may feel exposed to others, or swept off his [*sic*] feet [*sic*] by the aggressiveness, knowledge, versatility or viciousness of the other. Conflict also occurs when one finds his goals clashing with another person, as it happens. Differences in the means for goal attainment, a manager and his subordinates may run into conflict about work priorities, or determination of activities that will lead to goal accomplishment, Competition for allocation of funds or other resources may also cause conflict.

Many other scholars such as Kehinde (2011) and Tonder, Havegna and Visagie (2008) have also backed Agarwal regarding the sources of conflict.

2.4. Types of Conflict
Conflict can occur within and between persons or social units. It can also occur between two or more people or social units. In this study conflict is confined itself to that of conflict in organizations or refers to organizational life.   Different scholars have divided the types of conflict differently based on their personal views (Pelled & Adler, 1994). Owens (1998), for instance, suggests organizational conflicts involve interpersonal and intergroup conflicts. Luthan (1981) identified two types of conflict: intrapersonal conflict that emanates from frustration, goal conflict, role conflict and ambiguity; and interpersonal conflict that results from the

interaction of two or more persons to one another.

(Rahim (2001) and Schermerhorn (1989) categorized the types of conflict into four: intrapersonal, interpersonal, intragroup, and intergroup conflicts.

a. Intrapersonal Conflict: it is also known as intra-individual or intra-psychic conflict, is conflict within an individual. Conflicts that involve the individual alone are among the more potentially upsetting conflicts. The situations that give rise to such conflicts are many. Too much responsibility in an organization or role overloads, incompatibilities between roles assigned and personal characteristics, mismatch between personal ethics and organizational expectations, etc. are some of the factors that may generate this type of conflict (Murray & associates, n. d.; Rahim, 2001; Schermerhorn, 1989).

b. Interpersonal Conflict: it involves conflict between two or more individuals and is probably the most common and most recognized conflict. It occurs between individuals who are brought together in work places or elsewhere. Confrontations between individuals can occur where they have to compete for limited resources, promotion and the like. Concern for position, status, power etc. within the organization and any resentment or infringement on them can also generate interpersonal conflict because people often compete with each other for recognition, approval and promotion. According to (Crossfield & Bourne, 2018, Rashid and Archer (1983) and Kinard (1988), therefore, interpersonal conflicts originate from competition, personality differences or struggles for power.

c. Intragroup conflict: it refers to disagreements or differences among the members of a group. Rahim (2001, p. 143) defines it as "… the incompatibility, incongruence, or disagreement among the members of a group or its subgroups regarding goals, functions, or activities of the group". It is more of conflict between subgroups regarding the goals, functions, or activities of the group. There are multiple factors, which affect intragroup conflict. Among the major factors, leadership style is to be the primary source of this conflict (Anwar, Maitlo, Soomro and Shaikh , 2012).

d. Intergroup conflict: it is another common type of conflict in organizations that can either impede or facilitate the integration and coordination of activities. It refers to differences and clashes between groups. Conflicts between departments or divisions within an organization are examples in this respect. Task interdependence, inconsistent performance criteria and rewards, intergroup differences or confrontations due to promoting different interests and goals, and competition for limited resources Aula &Siira (2010).

2.5.   Styles of Conflict Management.

Although managers usually handle conflict in habitual ways, because repetition of approaches is easier and more comfortable to them, principally conflict management styles are of various in their types. In spite of the presence of different models (varying from two to five styles) of interpersonal conflict management styles, today scholars have identified five conflict management styles after synthesizing the research works of many others (Allwood, n. d.; Brandenberger, 2007; Cragan & Wright, 1986;Gatlin, Wysocki & Kepner, 2012;Kilmann& Thomas, 1975; Pace, 1983; Rahim 2001; 2002; Rashid & Archer, 1983). Momanyi, D. K. and Juma, D. (2016) in their findings institutions used strategies of accommodating, compromising, competing, collaborating and avoiding conflicts at different extent.

  a. **Integrating**: also known as collaboration, participative, confrontation or problem-solving, this style is regarded as the most effective form of conflict management. It is a style that gives high concern for both the self and others. It involves the collaboration (openness, honest discussion, creative approaches, easy exchange of information and examination of differences to come to find mutually acceptable solutions) of the contending parties.

  b. **Dominating:** also called competition, forcing or authoritative command, this style uses authority or power to resolve conflict. It is called dominating because a person, sometimes

at any means or cost, stands for his/her rights and defends the position that s/he believes to be correct because winning is the competitor's only goal. The use of force includes power, institutional authority, reward and punishment, bribery and even physical force.

c. **Obliging:** also known as suppressing, accommodation or smoothing, this is a non-assertive style associated with playing down the conflict and emphasizing shared interests. It, therefore, requires self-sacrifice and generosity to provide low concern for the self and high concern for the other party.

d. **Avoiding**: sometimes called impersonal or complying, this style of conflict management is based on denying the existence of conflict and hiding one's true feelings. It is also an attempt of avoiding major confrontation or conflict.

e. **Compromising**: this style, also called maneuverings conciliation, is usually the most preferable style of conflict management, next to integrating. The style emphasizes intermediate concern for self and others. It involves give-and-take method whereby both parties give up something to make a mutually acceptable decision and hence there is some degree of dissatisfaction after the agreement.

2.6.   Strategies of Conflict Management.

The distinction between strategies and styles of conflict management is often blurry. Some try to link conflict management strategies to conflict management styles, while others focus on strategies as discrete from styles. But the two are dissimilar characteristically. Unlike an analysis of conflict management styles which is fairly simplistic due to the fact that there are five specific categories of them, an analysis of conflict management strategies is much more complex and not that easy. This is because in spite of the existence of different categories in which conflict management strategies can be placed, there is no consistence in the categories and the strategies set (Nauta, 2001; Kilmann& Thomas 1975). Rahim (2002) proposes three strategies: minimizing affective conflicts; encouraging and maintaining substantive conflicts; and implement cautiously selected and appropriate management strategies among many.

3.   Methodology

3.1.   Research Design

This study employed a cross-sectional survey design because surveys help "to describe the attitudes, opinions, behaviors, or characteristics of the population" (Creswell, 2014, p. 376). Creswell, besides, stresses that this method is appropriate for studies such as the one under explanation with the quest to examine the underlying feelings, beliefs, views and/or practices that also compares and contrast the attitudes, beliefs, opinions and practices of teachers and their managers regarding conflict and its management. The study employed the embedded mixed approach because neither quantitative nor qualitative methods were sufficient to capture the trends, details and concepts of education quality and its determinants (Creswell, 2014). The model was opted basically to benefit from the advantages of the retrospective offsetting that one method covers up over the weaknesses of the other (Creswell, 2014; Gay, Mills, and Airasian, 2012). By this model the researchers collected and analyzed quantitative and qualitative data simultaneously in a way that the qualitative data have played a supportive role to the quantitative data.

3.2.   Participants

The target populations of this study were teachers and principals. The aggregate population size was 879. Participants for the study were determined based on Yamane's (1973) simplified formula for calculating. According to him, for a 95% confidence level and p = 0.05, a sample size n would be: $\qquad n = \frac{N}{1+N\,(e^2)}$

Where, N is the population size and e is the level of precision.

Accordingly, the sample size for the current study is 274.9 or about 275 when rounded off. To recruit participants, three sampling methods were utilized: two-stage sampling, systematic random sampling and purposive (to select the key informant) sampling methods (Creswell, 2014; Onwuegbuzie & Collins, 2007; Teddlie & Yu, 2007) because extracting participants through a mere probability sampling technique from a hierarchically structured population environment may nest some segments of the population unnecessarily and eventually affect the relevance of the conclusion to be drawn. The two-stage (or stratified) sampling technique is an appropriate method in the context of this study to recruit representative samples managers and teachers with equal proportion from all college. The following formula has been utilized to that effect:

$$n_i = n \frac{N_i}{N}$$

Where n represents sample size, N_i population size of the ith strata and N total population size.

To gather data questionnaires were distributed for 275 participants directly by the researcher. Among them, 221 (80.4%) participants have filled out and returned questionnaires all of which were found useful. Hence, the return rate of the instruments is high enough to generalize about the population because, as a rule of thumb, scholars of the field such as Cohn et al. (2018), Creswell (2014) and Gay et al. (2012) suggest that as low as 50% response rate is tolerable for survey studies to be able to generalize to the population from a samples.

Table 2.1: *Return Rate*

Participant characteristics (N = 214)		#	%	Sum
Sex	Male	27	12.6	214
	Female	187	87.4	
Qualification Level	First degree	32	15.0	214
	Second degree	182	85.0	
Occupation	Teacher	175	81.8	214
	Managers	39	18.2	
Work experience in the college	≤ 5 year	61	28.5	
	6 -10 years	89	41.6	214
	>10 years	64	29.9	

Source: software output from primary data, 2020

3.3.   Instruments
The data for this study have been collected through self-developed questionnaire and interview protocol (Creswell, 2014). Likert and attitude scales with scores between 1 and 5 were employed. In addition, one-to-one interview has been conducted with a key informant, a dean, to elicit more critical and commonly surfaced problems of interpersonal conflict and its management strategies through a one-to-one interview.

Table 2.2: *Cronbach's alpha Reliability Tests*

Composite Variables	Number of items	Cronbach's alpha
Commonly observed conflict types	4	0.723
Sources of interpersonal conflict	17	0.878
Managerial factors that stimulate conflict	11	0.865
Strategies of conflict management employed	12	0.783
Conflict handling mechanisms by teachers	14	0.813

Source: software output from primary data 2020

For employing the independent-samples t-test necessary assumptions were taken into consideration. That is, besides the implementation of probability (systematic random) sampling,

not only has the normal distribution of variables assessed through skewness and kurtosis tests but also Levene's test for equality of variances been manipulated to assess the homogeneity of variances.

Table 2.3: *Normality Test Results*

Composite variable	N	Mean	Skewness		Kurtosis	
			Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
Commonly observed types of conflicts	214	11.8785	.137	.166	-.352	.331
Sources of interpersonal conflict	212	42.5708	-.114	.167	-.387	.333
Managerial factors that stimulate conflict	212	31.3821	.544	.167	.547	.333
Deans' conflict management strategies	210	30.2667	.972	.168	1.524	.334
Teachers' conflict handling mechanisms	213	38.6620	-.147	.167	.172	.332

Source: software output from primary data 2020

3.4.   Data Analysis Methods

Before the actual data analysis is carried out the quantitative data were checked for response rates. In order to manage nonconformities arising from problems such as unreturned questionnaires or incomplete questionnaires, data have been screened to clean-up outliers, missed out items or attritions, items with two or more ticks put in a row of choices instead of only one, etc. by using SPSS-23 software. Negatively worded items have also been reverse coded. Then after, quantitative data have been analyzed by using the descriptive and inferential statistics – mean and independent samples t-test. Five percent ($\alpha = 0.05$) is taken as a standard level of significance in this study because many scholars of the field (e.g. Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2018; Creswell, 2014; Gay et al., 2012) recommend it as a standard for social science studies. Besides, effect size test has been conducted to measure the strengths of the differences between the mean scores of groups at all levels. That is, many scholars of the field (e.g. Cohen et al., 2018; Larson-Hall, 2010; Muijs, 2004) today insist that statistical significance test should not be the sole means of testing mean score differences. They argue that dependence on significance level has limitations in effectively informing the strength of relationships because it is largely determined by sample size. Rather, according to Muijs (2004) and Cohen et al. (2018), information about effect size test is highly essential, if not the most essential index of all tests in social science research, either to substantiate or replace the significance test. Hence, Cohn's *d* has been implemented to measure effect size in the current study. On the other hand, the qualitative data acquired through one-to-one interview has been analyzed qualitatively using narrative descriptions. To help refine (triangulate or complement) the quantitative data results qualitative data were analyzed thematically by embedding them in the former data. In this respect, the qualitative data was found so helpful to substantiate and tie up the loose ends of the quantitative data.

3.   Results and Discussion
3.1.   Types of Conflicts Faced between Teachers and Deans

Despite the data in Table 4.1 reveal the existence of all types of conflict in CTEs, interpersonal conflict is the one most frequently surfaced than the other types of conflicts between teachers and the deans. The mean scores for interpersonal conflicts between teachers and managers, the latter group incorporates deans and department heads, are higher (M = 3.11 and M = 3.68 respectively) than not only from the mean scores of other conflict types but also from that of the average mean (M =3). Qualitative data obtained through interviewing a dean complemented the findings from quantitative data in such a way that interpersonal conflicts such as those between teachers and the administrators, teachers and students as well as different intergroup conflicts are persistent types of conflicts in CTEs and have long-lasting effects more often than not.

Table 3.1: *Types of Conflict Observed*

Type of conflict	Teachers (N = 175)		Managers (N = 39)	
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
Intrapersonal conflict	2.93	0.980	2.92	0.912
Interpersonal conflict	3.11	1.011	3.68	1.068
Intragroup conflict	2.76	1.050	3.00	1.065
Intergroup conflict	2.93	1.177	2.97	1.127

Source: software output from primary data 2020

These findings altogether imply that interpersonal conflict between teachers and managers is the most recurrent type of conflict in CTEs. This in turn informs that focusing on interpersonal conflict between teachers and managers is a legitimate preference of study that has also widely been sensed in many schools. For instance research reports by many scholars (such as Crossfield & Bourne, 2018; Kalagbor & Nnokam, 2015) claim that interpersonal conflict is a widely surfacing type of conflict in schools that plays its own roles on the health of the teaching learning environment and school effectiveness. According to these scholars teacher-principal conflict is the most incapacitating factors schools of all conflicts that might exist in a school that is known for contaminating relationships and school climate, severely damaging good school culture with a resultant effect of student achievement. A further manipulation of data has been conducted to examine whether the two participants have differences in their views regarding the types of conflicts that frequently occur in their workplaces. As depicted by Table 4.2, the independent-samples t-test result revealed that teachers and managers have moderate difference in their perception about the prevalence of interpersonal conflict (t =.063, df = 211, $p < 0.05$, d = 0.55). This implies that despite both groups feel that interpersonal conflict is the most frequently recurring type of conflict between teachers and managers in CTEs, the two groups have differences in the intensity of interpersonal conflicts that turn up between them.

Table 3.2: *Independent-sample t-test Result on Interpersonal Conflict*

Assumption		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				Cohn's *d*
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.	Mean Difference	
Interpersonal conflict	Equal variances assumed	.545	.461	-3.119	211	.002	-.570	0.55
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.010	52.363	.004	-.570	

Source: software output from primary data 2020

3.2. Sources of Interpersonal Conflict

Obviously, the sources of workplace conflicts are innumerable. Table 4.2 has scrutinized some sources of conflict between teachers and managers that are often surfaced in CTEs. As can be seen from the table, teachers prioritized some factors despite their managers did not attribute them for interpersonal conflict. A reverse report has also been noticed. In fact, factors that have been ascribed as the major sources of interpersonal conflict by either of the participant groups are many. For instance, absence of cooperation among each other, conflict of interest as well as disagreement on teacher performance evaluation are rated stronger factors of interpersonal conflict by managers but not by the teachers. In addition, the key informant complemented that competition for resources such as payments for overloads and field work, perceived unfair treatments by managers, power struggle to replace deans and the like are the commonly observed sources of interpersonal conflict between teachers and managers. These finding align with the findings by many researchers (e.g. Aula & Siira, 2010; Ghaffar, 2010; Msila, 2012; Salleh,

& Adulpakdee, 2012) who argued that competing motives to attain scarce resources and difference in values, perceptions or ideologies on certain issues often generate conflict. Conversely, unlike the mangers, teachers reported that feeling of retaliation by managers is one of the major source of teacher-manager interpersonal conflict. According to scholars of the field (e.g. Ghaffar, 2010; Rahim, 2001, 2002; Salleh & Adulpakdee, 2012) this is a sort of affective conflict that roots from feelings of anger, distrust, dislike, fear, and resentment caused by negative emotional, social and psychological feelings that galvanizes interpersonal clashes between people and are often followed by damaging consequences. Even though it has its own destructive sides, according to those sources, at times such conflicts can be helpful in promoting creativity and innovation if managed well and timely. Although recognizing conflict timely and properly, identifying its potential implications and applying the proper and effective management strategy are essential remedies for organizational effectiveness (Armstrong, 2006; Aula & Siira, 2010; Bratton & Gold, 1999; Brewer, Mitchell & Weber, 2002; Rahim, 2001; 2002) both teachers and managers attributed lack of resolving conflict as early as possible as the major source of conflict between them. This implies that college managers did not properly understand the consequences of the timely management of conflict. Lack of resolving conflict timely results in ineffectiveness and inefficiency due to dissatisfaction and frequent turnover among the staff that ultimately prohibits colleges to retain and motivate experienced and competent teachers (Armstrong, 2006; Aula & Siira, 2010; Bratton & Gold, 1999; Brewer, Mitchell & Weber, 2002).

Table 3.3: *Sources of Interpersonal Conflict*

Possible sources of conflict	Teachers (N = 175)		Managers (N = 39)	
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
Absence of cooperation among each other	2.94	1.133	3.11	0.953
Conflict of interest	2.93	1.260	3.34	1.258
Religious difference	1.86	1.043	1.89	1.226
Age difference	1.66	0.882	1.68	0.962
Sexual difference	1.62	0.856	1.58	0.826
Ethnic difference	1.85	1.127	1.84	1.079
Difference in political outlook	2.38	1.207	2.45	1.201
Difference in qualification	1.94	0.978	1.97	1.078
Power struggle among individuals	2.47	1.010	2.50	1.247
Competition for limited resource	2.82	1.109	2.87	1.119
Due to arrogant colleagues	2.64	1.024	2.55	0.795
I know it better problems among individuals	2.60	1.038	2.55	1.155
Lack of trust one over the other	2.82	1.040	2.89	1.134
Role interdependence among teachers	2.62	0.956	2.47	1.156
Lack of resolving conflict as early as possible	3.30	1.242	3.13	1.234
Feeling of retaliation from managers for prior conflict	3.14	1.036	2.82	1.062
Disagreements on teachers' performance evaluation results	2.93	1.054	3.29	1.183

Source: software output from primary data 2020

The rest of the factors widely cited as sources of interpersonal conflict in organizations did not play their role in generating conflict between teachers and managers in CTEs. Despite different sources of literature claim that factors such as gender, socio-economic status, ethno-cultural, and racial tensions engender interpersonal conflict (Crossfield & Bourne, 2018), the current study found out that these are not strong contributors of interpersonal conflict in CTEs, given that the context of the country and the regional state are currently being shaken by diverse matters of ethnic as well as political and religious tensions. Although literature (e.g. Beheshtifar & Zare, 2013; Blaine, 2006) suggests that college teachers often bring their political, economic, religious and racial stresses into their work places, such problems have not been strong drivers of

interpersonal conflict in the current study area. An independent samples t-test has been manipulated to further fine-tune whether the two groups have significant differences in their ratings regarding the sources of conflict that either or both of them have rated above average (M = 3.0). In this respect, Table 4.4 demonstrates that college teachers and managers have a weak or little difference in their perception of the contributions of cooperation among each other (t = -.919, df = 211, *p* > 0.05, *d* = -0.16) and lack of timely resolution of conflict (t = .749, df = 211, *p* > 0.05, *d* = 0.14) on their interpersonal conflict. On the other hand, the two participant groups have a modest difference in attributing the causes of their interpersonal conflicts to conflict of interest (t = -1.849, df = 211, *p* > 0.05, *d* = -0.33), feeling of retaliation for prior conflict (t = 1.698, df = 211, *p* > 0.05, *d* = 0.30), and disagreement on teachers' performance evaluation (t = -1.723, df = 211, *p* > 0.05, *d* = -0.32).

Table 3.4: *Independent Samples t- Test on the Sources of Interpersonal Conflict*

Assumptions		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				Cohn's *d*
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.	Mean Difference	
Absence of cooperation among each other	Equal variances assumed	.570	.451	-.822	211	.412	-.162	0.16
	Equal variances not assumed			-.919	61.984	.362	-.162	
Conflict of interest	Equal variances assumed	.234	.629	-1.848	211	.066	-.416	0.33
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.849	54.314	.070	-.416	
Lack of resolving conflict as early as possible	Equal variances assumed	.008	.930	.746	211	.457	.166	0.14
	Equal variances not assumed			.749	54.517	.457	.166	
Feeling of retaliation for prior conflict	Equal variances assumed	.119	.730	1.726	211	.086	.321	0.30
	Equal variances not assumed			1.698	53.391	.095	.321	
Disagreement on teachers' performance evaluation	Equal variances assumed	2.688	.103	-1.857	211	.065	-.358	0.32
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.723	50.517	.091	-.358	

Source: software output from primary data 2020

The other source of interpersonal conflict examined was whether managerial exercises have generated interpersonal conflict between teachers and college managers. As revealed by Table 4.5, in this respect both teachers and their superiors have rated tendency of managers not to accept opinion from subordinates in conflict resolution more than average (M = 3.01 and 3.11 consecutively), which implies that this is a source of conflict between the two acknowledged by both groups. On the other hand, although managers claimed that they involve teachers in conflict resolution (M = 3.26), they have the competence to resolve conflict (M = 3.00), they are able to implement different conflict resolution mechanism (M = 3.13), and they have the propensity to discourage destructive conflicts (M = 3.24), teachers did not verify the claim. In contrast, while teachers rated the priority managers give for maintaining personal positions (M = 3.14) as one source of their interpersonal conflict with more than average score, their managers rated it much lower than average (M = 2.58). The divergence of responses between the two groups on the above mentioned factors demonstrates that managerial practices likely play stimulating roles in generating interpersonal conflict between the two. These altogether imply that conflicts that bubble up between college managers and teachers have both substantive and affective elements because the factors rated with mean scores more than average (M = 3.0) seem to have originated from negative emotional, social and psychological feelings, conflict of interest as

well as differences in ideas and opinions and value judgments among group members (Anwar, Maitlo, Soomro & Shaikh, 2012; Ghaffar, 2010; Van Tonder, Havenga & Visagie, 2008).

Table 3.5: *Managerial factors that Stimulate Conflict*

Possible management related sources of conflict	Teachers (N = 175)		Managers (N = 39)	
	Mena	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
Desire of manager to change conflict into organizational development	2.68	0.989	2.82	0.982
Lack of managers to accept opinion from teachers in conflict resolution	3.01	1.028	3.11	1.008
Desire of managers to involve teachers in conflict resolution	2.78	1.018	3.26	0.950
Communication problems among managers	2.94	1.170	2.92	0.850
Managers provocation towards distractive conflict among teachers	2.72	0.963	2.39	1.028
Competence of managers to resolve conflict	2.74	0.989	3.00	1.065
Priority managers give for maintaining personal positions	3.14	1.111	2.58	1.130
Managers' ability to implement different conflict resolution mechanism	2.98	1.017	3.13	0.777
Lack of propensity by manager to discourage destructive conflicts	2.89	0.940	3.24	1.025
Commitment and courage of managers to take corrective measures	2.82	0.972	2.87	1.143
Practice of rewarding teachers to further motivate desirable behaviors	2.56	1.059	2.50	0.980

Source: software output from primary data 2020

Despite the two participant groups have rated different managerial sources of interpersonal conflict differently, independent samples t-test reports uncovered that the two have no significant differences in their views of all those factors. That is, according to data displayed in Table 4.6, effect size test results regarding the differences between the two parties demonstrate that they have no more than modest differences in their views. For instance, the two have weak or little differences regarding the contribution of managers' reluctance to accept opinion from subordinates during conflict resolution (t = -.518, df = 211, $p > 0.05$, $d = 0.10$). Similarly, the two have weak differences regarding managers' ability to implement different conflict resolution mechanisms (t = -.881, df = 211, p > 0.05, d = 0.17) as functions of interpersonal conflict. On the other hand, the two groups have modest differences on the contribution of desire of managers to involve teachers in conflict resolution (t = -2.822, df = 211, p < 0.05, d = 0.49), competence of managers to resolve conflict (t = -1.373, df = 210, p > 0.05, d = 0.25), priority managers give for maintaining personal positions (t = 2.768, df = 211, p < 0.05, d = 0.50), and managers' propensity to discourage destructive conflicts (t = -1.942, df = 211, p > 0.05, d = 0.36) in stirring conflict between teachers and managers in colleges. The implications of these factors vary, although modest differences have been observed. That is, higher mean scores in teacher involvement, manager competence, and discouragement of destructive conflict are meant lower possibility of generating conflict whereas higher mean score in managers' efforts to maintain personal position is just stirring interpersonal conflict between the two groups.

Table 3.6: *Independent Samples t-Test on Managerial Factors that Stimulate Interpersonal Conflict*

Assumptions		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				Cohn's d
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig	Mean Difference	
Tendency of managers to accept opinion from teachers in conflict resolution	Equal variances assumed	.014	.905	-.512	211	.609	-.094	0.10
	Equal variances not assumed			-.518	55.021	.606	-.094	
Desire of managers to involve teachers in conflict resolution	Equal variances assumed	.025	.874	-2.699	211	.008	-.486	0.49
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.822	57.012	.007	-.486	
Competence of managers to resolve conflict	Equal variances assumed	.519	.472	-1.440	210	.151	-.259	0.25
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.373	51.857	.176	-.259	
Priority managers give for maintaining personal positions	Equal variances assumed	.390	.533	2.799	211	.006	.558	0.50
	Equal variances not assumed			2.768	53.648	.008	.558	
Managers' ability to implement different resolution mechanism	Equal variances assumed	3.913	.049	-.881	211	.379	-.154	0.17
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.046	67.641	.299	-.154	
Propensity of manager to discourage destructive conflicts	Equal variances assumed	1.234	.268	-2.054	211	.041	-.351	0.36
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.942	51.382	.058	-.351	

Source: software output from primary data 2020

3.3. Strategies Employed by Deans to Manage Conflict

Despite its inevitability and desirability, conflict hinders organizational as well as individual goal achievement, not to mention other multifaceted consequences that tear apart relationships if it is not handled effectively and timely. In view of this, the key informant strongly argued that many college managers often exacerbate conflict rather than solving it by intervening into it without understanding the source of conflict, the organizational culture of the staff, and the right time to resolve it. According to him, this often generated far-reaching consequences by eventually developing a sense of retaliation on the side of the loser. In this respect, both parties delivered different responses when requested to judge as how many managers try to employ viable conflict management strategies. As can be seen from Table 4.8, managers claim for practicing participative decision making (M = 3.08), although the score is only around average besides not being complemented by the teachers. Both teachers and managers alike, however, valued more than average regarding managers' transparency in conflict management, fairness for teachers' benefits, and unnecessary intervention on teachers' tasks. This implies that college managers in the current study area tend to apply integrative and compromising approaches. Although these styles may compromise standards, quality and other important values of education (Crossfield & Bourne, 2018; Kalagbor & Nnokam, 2015), they convey a sort of neutrality and ethical symmetry of managers in resolving conflict (Van Gramberg & Teicher, 2005). The rating of the rest strategies described in the table below average by both parties inform lack of exercising those activities properly, which in turn implies those deficiencies perhaps have become sources of conflict between the two groups.

Table 3.7: *Strategies of Conflict Management Employed by College Managers*

Description of commonly observed strategies	Teachers (N = 175)		Managers (N = 39)	
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
Application of scientific conflict resolution method	2.10	1.010	2.45	1.108
Practiced participative decision making	2.59	1.029	3.08	0.957
Transparency among managers in managing conflict	3.22	1.199	3.54	1.211
Practice coercive decision making	2.67	1.147	2.63	1.282
Fair application of rules and regulations	2.91	1.136	2.92	1.282
Timely resolution of conflict	2.58	1.105	2.89	1.203
Resolve conflict once and for all	2.45	1.128	2.55	1.058
Promoting conflict as a means of change and innovation	2.42	1.024	2.50	1.225
Fair management of teachers benefits	3.46	1.158	3.76	1.218
Intervention of managers on teachers' tasks	3.55	1.143	4.18	0.970
Utilization of conflict for safeguarding own position	2.65	1.208	1.82	1.111
Utilization of conflict as a tool for relieving the challenges	2.49	1.139	2.13	0.991

Source: software output from primary data 2020

An independent samples t-test has also been manipulated to gauge whether teachers and managers have significant difference on their ratings the strategy of conflict management by managers. The data analyses results in Table 4.9 demonstrate differences between the two groups on variables that either both or one of them rated more than average. To begin with, the two groups have a weak difference regarding managers transparency in conflict management (t = -1.475, df = 212, $p > 0.05$, $d = 0.27$) and fairness in managing teachers benefits (t = -1.553, df = 212, $p > 0.05$, $d = 0.28$). In addition, the two groups have a modest difference regarding the practice of participative decision making (t= -2.843, df = 212, $p < 0.05$, $d = 0.49$) and a moderate difference regarding the intervention of managers on teachers' tasks (t = -3.518, df = 212, $p < 0.05$, $d = 0.60$). The findings altogether imply that college managers employ compromising and integrating as strategies of conflict management. The finding supplements findings of other different research reports in different contexts (e.g Balay, 2006; Chen & Tjosvold, 2002; Tjosvold, Hui & Law., 2001). The studies conducted by these people indicate that relationship between people and their organizational commitments may be strengthened when they discuss and compromise their competing views openly and cooperatively. In compromising, according to them, conflict is considered as a mutual problem-solving process because conflicting parties use conflict to promote mutual goals for mutual benefits. At the same time, according to those sources, integrating emphasizes on openness, exchange of information, and discussion on differences to reach to a solution acceptable to both parties, which involves problem-solving that has the potential to lead to constructive resolution of differences. Whatsoever it is, an effective conflict management competence, especially of interpersonal conflict, is essential to ensure that the limited resources available in CTEs are not wasted through destructive interpersonal conflicts and their management.

3.4. Teachers' Conflict Handling Strategies

Just like their superiors, teachers have a wide range of stake in managing interpersonal conflicts they face from different sources. Table 4.11 incorporates major strategies teachers may alternatively employ to manage conflicts. According to the views of teachers keeping the self away from conflict and its sources is the mechanism that they rated above average (M = 3.14) as a means of managing interpersonal conflicts. Although they rated below average, understanding the other persons' point of view, identifying what to agree or disagree, and leaving the affair for the time being and retaliating when conditions are suitable are the next three consecutive mechanisms that teachers employ to manage interpersonal conflict. In line with study findings

by different scholars (such as Crossfield & Bourne, 2018; Ghaffar, 2010; Salleh & Adulpakdee, 2012), accordingly, teachers perceive that they are inclined towards avoiding and compromising in managing conflict. That is because, they claim, they keep away from conflict and sacrifice something to reach an amicable solution by understanding the other persons' point of view and by identifying what to agree or disagree. By leaving the issue for the time being and retaliating when conditions are suitable, accordingly, teachers are using is as a temporary means of conflict management because by avoiding People simply pretend that conflict does not really exist and hope that it will disappear on its own (Chen & Tjosvold, 2002; Schermerhorn et al., 2000; Skjorshammer 2001). Since scholars such as Huang (2010) and Rupcic and Svegar (2018) argue that conflicts could not be resolved by avoiding, the action is simply an intention of participants to maintain harmony. Hence, the strategy teachers employ to handle conflict is utilized to buy time as they seek cooperation towards keeping mutual interests without open recognition of actual or perceived conflicts.

Table 3.8: *Independent Samples t-Test Strategies of Conflict Management Employed by College Managers*

Assumptions		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				Cohn's *d*
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.	Mean Difference	
Practice participative decision making	Equal variances assumed	.895	.345	-2.713	212	.007	-.488	0.49
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.843	59.284	.006	-.488	
Transparency among deans while managing conflict	Equal variances assumed	.009	.925	-1.484	212	.139	-.316	0.27
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.475	55.859	.146	-.316	
Fair management of teachers benefits	Equal variances assumed	.115	.734	-1.604	212	.110	-.332	0.28
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.553	54.388	.126	-.332	
Intervention of managers on teachers tasks	Equal variances assumed	2.039	.155	-3.170	212	.002	-.625	0.60
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.518	63.819	.001	-.625	

Source: software output from primary data, 2020

Table 3.9: *Teachers' Conflict Management Strategies*

Possible conflict handling mechanisms	Teachers (N = 175)		Managers (N = 39)	
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
Avoid the person or the agenda	2.82	1.088	2.90	1.188
Change the subject to cool it down	2.82	0.965	2.92	0.900
Understand the other persons' point of view	2.97	1.093	3.46	1.144
Let another person to decide who is right	2.78	1.078	3.00	1.235
Fight it out to the end	2.44	1.022	2.85	1.226
Give in or surrender	2.27	1.008	2.15	1.065
Apologize those with bad feeling	2.59	1.029	2.97	1.038
Identify what to agree or disagree	2.95	1.010	3.05	0.944
Whine or complain to get my way	2.79	0.936	2.49	0.970
Pretend to agree	2.75	0.962	2.87	1.105
Turn the conflict to a joke	2.54	1.021	2.10	0.754
Work toward mutual solution	2.81	1.107	2.77	0.931
Keep the self away from conflict and its sources	3.14	1.060	2.72	1.213
Leave for the time being and retaliate when conditions are suitable	2.93	1.155	2.67	1.084

Source: software output from primary data 2020

Nonetheless, managers have a mixed perception, partly supporting teachers' views and partly not, regarding the way teachers handle the interpersonal conflict with them. On the one hand, managers sense that teachers not only try to understand the other persons' point of view (M = 3.46) but also let another person to decide who is right (M = 3.00) during their conflict management. By this perception, it seems that managers are not alert enough that teachers not only keep the self away from conflict and its sources but leave issues for the time being and retaliate when conditions are suitable as well. Most of the managers think that teachers use avoiding the person or the agenda, changing the subject to cool it down, or do apologize those with bad feeling. It all implies that conflict management strategies employed by managers themselves is more of a futile exercise because their styles did not resolve teachers' dissatisfaction as can be learnt from the latter's conflict management exercise. The independent-samples t-test was examined to further gauge the differences between teachers and their managers regarding their perception for mechanisms teachers employ to manage conflict. To that effect, mean scores rated above average by both or one of the participant groups has been treated in this respect. In this respect, while the two groups have modest differences regarding the employment of understand the other persons point of view ($t = -2.468$, $df = 212$, $p < 0.05$, $d = 0.44$) and keeping the self away from conflict ($t = 2.023$, $df = 212$, $p < 0.05$, $d = 0.37$) they have a weak difference regarding the utilization of letting someone to decide who is right ($t = -1.042$, $df = 212$, $p > 0.05$, $d = 0.19$) and identifying specially what to agree or dis agree ($t = -0.572$, $df = 212$, $p < 0.05$, $d = 0.10$). This implies that teachers mostly opt avoiding and compromising mechanisms to resolve conflict.

Table 3.10: Independent Samples t-Test on *Teachers' Conflict Management Strategies*

Assumptions		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				Cohn's *d*
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.	Mean Difference	
Understand the other persons point of view	Equal variances assumed	1.006	.317	-2.541	212	.012	-.496	0.44
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.468	54.548	.017	-.496	
Let another person to decide who is right	Equal variances assumed	.647	.422	-1.136	212	.257	-.223	0.19
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.042	51.672	.302	-.223	
Identify specially what to agree or dis agree	Equal variances assumed	.001	.970	-.548	212	.584	-.097	0.10
	Equal variances not assumed			-.572	59.017	.569	-.097	
Keep the self away from conflict	Equal variances assumed	2.610	.108	2.204	212	.029	.425	0.37
	Equal variances not assumed			2.023	51.705	.048	.425	

Source: software output from primary data 2020

4. Conclusion

As many scholars pointed and based on this study findings Conflict occurs when different perceptions or opinions are contradictory in nature and it conflict brings stress and discomfort due to the fear of the unknown. The most distinct trend noticed by this study is that there are both convergence and divergence views among teachers and managers about the sources and management strategies of interpersonal conflicts on the one hand and each have mixed responses on the other. To begin with, both know that lack of timely conflict resolution is the main source of conflict. On the other hand, while managers feel that conflict of interest and disagreement on teacher appraisal are sources of interpersonal conflict, teachers perceive that

feeling of retaliation by managers for prior conflict is the key source of conflict. With respect to conflict management, similarly, both parties agree that managers are fair in resolving conflict. After claiming that they employ participative conflict resolution methods, managers contrast themselves by supporting teachers' view that the latter often keep away from conflict and its sources or leave for another person to decide when they face conflict. Similarly, teachers who complained the retaliatory behaviors of managers in contrast supported managers' fairness in conflict resolution. Hence, it altogether informs to conclude that teachers and their managers have mixed views regarding the sources of conflict and the management strategies both apply so much so that there is a sort of blame game between the two that may produce far-reaching consequences on the health and effectiveness of CTEs.

4.1 Contribution
Since conflict is natural in any organization and it requires contextual resolution mechanism, the managers must rationally deal with it so as to create ways which maximize its benefits and minimize its dysfunctional costs. Therefore, this study mainly important to college deans by giving some insight about sources and handling strategy of conflicts that arises in between them and their staffs' in the teachers colleges' context. This study finding also reveals that whenever the types and sources of conflicts were varied managers should install different handling strategy. For instance, from this study result interpersonal conflict were persistently occur in teachers college and the recommended resolution strategy is college managers employ compromising and integrating as strategies of conflict management. So these are new for teachers college.

5. Limitation and Feature Research Direction
Like all evidence in all research this paper are not free from limitation. This helps to indicate future research direction. Primarily, this study investigated only the sources of interpersonal conflict among managers and teachers in CTEs and the strategies employed to manage them by both parties. It also focused only on specific teachers colleges. Therefore, this research encountered generalizability problem. Thus, researchers in the future might cover all types of conflict (intra group, intergroup and intrapersonal) and addressee other types of college like technical and vocational college, agriculture and health colleges. This study used a time sere data. Future researcher also focus to undertaken a longitudinal study to assess the magnitude of impact of interpersonal conflict on work performance. Nonetheless, the aggressive invasion of COVID-19 highly traumatized everybody including the researchers that requested lock downs or quarantines that prohibited easy communication. This might have hindered the chance to investigate the problem more deeply than it is. Hence, since the problem requires a contextual analysis in nature, future researchers who attempt to examine the same problem shall give more attention for examining the problem deeper by applying an exploratory sequential design preceded by in-depth interviews and FGDs.

References
Anwar, N., Maitlo, Q., Soomro, M. B. & Shaikh, G. M. (2012).Task conflicts and its relationship with employee's performance. In *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 3(9), 1338-1343.
Armstrong, M. (2006). *A handbook of human resource management practice (10th ed.)*. London: Kogan Page.
Aula, P. & Siira, K. (2010).Organizational communication and conflict management systems: *A* social complexity approach. In *Nordicom Review* 31 (1), 125-141.
Balay, R. (2006). Conflict management strategies of administrators and teachers. In *Asian Jouurnal of Management Cases*, 3(1), 1-24.

Beheshtifar, M. & Zare, E. (2013). Interpersonal conflict: A substantial factor to organizational failure. In *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 3(5). 400-407.

Blaine, D. (2006). What are the sources of workplace conflict? Retrieved from http://www.mediate.com/

Bratton, J. & Gold J. (1999). Human resource management: Theory and practice (2nd ed.). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Brewer, N., Mitchell, P. & Weber, N. (2002). Gender role, organizational status, and conflict management styles. *The international Journal of Conflict Management*, 13(1), 78 -94.

Chen, G. and Tjosvold. D. (2002). Conflict management and team effectiveness in China: The mediating role of justice. In *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 19, 557–72.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education (8th ed.)*. London: Taylor & Francis Group.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (4thed.)*. Boston: Pearson Education Ltd.

Crossfield, D. & Bourne, P. A. (2018). Management of interpersonal conflict between principals and teachers in selected secondary schools in Bermuda. In *International Journal of Research in Business Studies and Management*, 5(1), 19-36.

Eko Pujiati and Ahmad Sonhaji (2018) The Effectiveness of Conflict Management in Private University Management Efforts: *IOP Conf. Ser.: Earth Environ. Sci.* **175** 012073 Doi :10.1088/1755-1315/175/1/012073

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E. & Airasian, P. (2012).*Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications. (*9thed.). London: Pearson Education Ltd.

Ghaffar, A. (2010). Conflict in schools: Causes and management strategies. Qurtuba University of Science and Information Technology, Preshawar campus, Pakistan.Retrieved from ProQuest. Retrieved from www.researchgate.net

Kalagbor, L.D. & Nnokam, N.C. (2015). Principals' and teachers' use of conflict management strategies on secondary students' conflict resolution in Rivers State – Nigeria. In *Journal of Education and Practice*, 15(13), 148-151.

Kehinde, A. O. (2011). Impact of conflict management on corporate productivity: An evaluative study. In *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 1(5), 44-49.

Kinard, J. (1988). *Management.* Lexington: D.C. Heath and Company.

Larson-Hall, J.(2010). *A guide to doing statistics in second language research using SPSS*. New York: Routledge.

Luminita, C. (2017). Conflicts between teachers: Causes and effects. *Conference paper*. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313580991

Momanyi, D. K. & Juma, D. (2016). The influence of conflict management strategies on employee satisfaction: A case study of KCB Bank Kenya limited, head office. *International Academic Journal of Human Resource and Business Administration, 2* (2), 130-144

Msila, V. (2012). Conflict management and school leadership. In *Journal of Communication*, 3(1), 25-34.

Nikolaou, Paraskevi (2018) Effective strategies for human resource management in educational organizations. Conflict management case studies - In: Journal of Contemporary Education 2.s, 30-34. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.3598645

Onwuegbuzie, A.J. & Collins, K.M.T. (June 2007). A typology of mixed methods sampling design in social science research. In *The Qualitative Report*, 12(2), 281-316.

Owens, R.G (1998). *Organizational behavior* (6thed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Rahim, M. A. (2001). *Managing conflict in organizations (3rded.)*. London: Quorum Books.

Rahim, M.A. (2002). Toward a theory of managing organizational conflict. In *The International Journal of Conflict management*, 13(3), 206-235.

Ramani, K. &Zhimin, L. (2010). A survey on conflict resolution mechanisms in public secondary schools: A case of Nairobi province, Kenya. In *Educational Research and Reviews,* 5 (5), 242-256.

Rupcic, N. & Svegar, D. (2018). Determinants of conflict management behavior: Does the choice of major and study progress play a role? In *International Management Research*, 244-263.

Salleh, M. J. & Adulpakdee, A. (2012). Causes of conflict and effective methods to conflict management at Islamic Secondary Schools in Yala, Thailand. In *International Interdisciplinary Journal of Education*, 1(1), 1-8.

Schermerhon, J.R., Hunt J. G. & Osborn. R. N. (2000). *Organizational Behavior (*7th ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Skjorshammer, M. (2001). Co-operation and Conflict in a Hospital: Inter-professional differences in perception and management of conflicts. In *Journal of Inter-professional Care*, 15(1): 7–18.

Swanström, N. L.P. & Weissmann, M. S. (2005). Conflict, conflict prevention, conflict management and beyond: A conceptual exploration. *Central Asia – Caucasus Institute Silk Road Studies Program.* Retrieved from www.silkroadstudies.org

Teddlie, C. & Yu, F. (January 2007). Mixed methods sampling: A typology with examples. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(1), 77-100.

Terry, G. R. &Franklin,S. G. (1999). *Principles of management (8thed.).* Delhi: Nice Printing Press.

Tjosvold, D., Hui ,C. and Law, K.S. (2001). Constructive conflict in China: Cooperative conflict as bridge between East and West. In *Journal of World Business*, 36(2), 166–83.

Van Gramberg, B. & Teicher, J. (2005). Managing neutrality and impartiality in workplace conflict resolution: The dilemma of the HR manager. In *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 44(2), 197–210.

Van Tonder, C., Havenga, W. & Visagie, J. (2008). The causes of conflict in public and private sector organizations in South Africa*. In Managing Global Transitions,* 6(4), 373-401.

Cite this article:

Published by