

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

AN INVESTIGATION INTO CONFLICT MANAGEMENT
MECHANISMS IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE
FACULTIES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

DERRICK NII SACKEY

2009

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

AN INVESTIGATION INTO CONFLICT MANAGEMENT
MECHANISMS IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE
FACULTIES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

BY

DERRICK NII SACKEY

Thesis Submitted to the Institute for Educational Planning and
Administration of the Faculty of Education, University of Cape
Coast, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for award of
Master of Philosophy Degree in Educational Administration

MAY 2009

DECLARATION

Candidate's Declaration

I hereby declare that this thesis is the result of my own original work and that no part of it has been presented for another degree in this university or elsewhere.

Candidate's Signature: Date.....

Name: Derrick Nii Sackey

Supervisor's Declaration

We hereby declare that the preparation and presentation of the thesis were supervised in accordance with the guidelines on supervision of thesis laid down by the University of Cape Coast.

Principal Supervisor's Signature: Date:

Name: Mr. S. K. Atakpa

Co-Supervisor's Signature: Date:

Name: PROF. A. Amuzu-Kpeglo

ABSTRACT

The study was an investigation into conflict management mechanisms in the administration of the faculties of the University of Cape Coast. The population was made up of Senior Members and Senior Support Staff of five faculties of the University of Cape Coast. In all, the study had a population of 695 respondents. Purposive sampling was used to select a sample of 189 respondents representing 27% of the population. The study was guided by five research questions which centered on the causes of conflict, types of conflict, conflict management mechanisms and the effectiveness of the conflict management mechanisms in the faculties of the University of Cape Coast.

The study revealed that personality differences, competition over limited resources, differences in perceptions and task interdependence were the prevailing causes of conflict in the faculties. Also, relationship conflict and structural conflict were the prevailing types of conflicts that occurred in the faculties. In addition, the collaboration and compromise styles of conflict management were the prevailing and the most preferred conflict management mechanisms employed. The study recommended that there should be periodical seminars or workshops on conflict management mechanisms organized for the staff of the University of Cape Coast.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My greatest appreciation goes to my Supervisors, Mr. S. K. Atakpa and Prof. Amuzu-Kpeglo both of the Institute for Educational Planning and Administration for their suggestions and concern without which this study would not have been a successful one. I also thank the following people for their immense contributions towards the completion of this study. Mr. Philip Arthur Gborsong of the Communicative Skills Unit, University of Cape Coast for proof reading the scripts and offering suggestions, Mr. Prosper Nyatuame of the Faculty of Arts, University of Cape Coast, Mr. David Larbi, Mr. Samuel Enguah and Miss Joana Mensah for their encouragement and material support. My appreciation again goes to Mr. & Mrs. Arthur Gborsong and Mrs. Priscilla Quarcoopome Sackey for their financial and spiritual support in the course of the study.

DEDICATION

To my wife, Mrs. Priscilla Quarcoopome Sackey and my son Derrick Nii Ansah Sackey.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DECLARATION	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
DEDICATION	v
LIST OF TABLES	ix
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xi
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	
Background to the Study	1
Statement of the Problem	9
Purpose of the Study	10
Research Questions	11
Significance of the Study	11
Delimitation	12
Limitation	12
Definition of Terms	13
2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	
Meaning of conflict	15
Normative conflict management theory	18

	Page
Philosophies of conflict	22
Survival requires change	29
Paradox of conflict	30
Dimensions of conflict	34
Categories of conflict	39
Causes of conflict	41
Conflict and organization effectiveness	49
Types of conflict management styles	51
3 METHODODOLOGY	
Research Design	59
Population	61
Sample and Sampling Procedure	63
Pre-test	70
Instruments	67
Data Sources	71
Data Collection Procedure	71
Data Analysis	72
4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	
Findings of the Study	74
Discussion of Findings	125

5	SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION	Page
	Summary of the Study	130
	Conclusion	134
	Recommendation	135
	Area for Further Research	136
	REFERENCES	137
	APPENDICES	
A	Research Questionnaire	150
B	Interview Guide	158

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Population Distribution	63
2 Sample selected for the Study	66
3 Existence of Conflict between Dean and Faculty Officer, Heads of Departments, Lecturers, Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff and Senior Administrative Staff	75
4 Existence of Conflict between Faculty Officer and Heads of Departments, Lecturers, Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff and senior Administrative Staff	82
5 Existence of Conflict between Heads of Departments and Lecturers, Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff and Senior Administrative Staff	87
6 Existence of Conflict between Lecturers and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff and Senior Administrative Staff	91
7 Existence of Conflict between Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff and Senior Administrative Staff	94
8 Causes of Conflict	96

9	Types of Conflict	105
10	Conflict Management Mechanisms	111
11	Effectiveness of Conflict Management Mechanisms	117

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

SMT	Senior Members Teaching
SMNT	Senior Members Non-teaching
SA/AS	Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff
SAS	Senior Administrative Staff
Soc. Sci	Social Sciences
H.O.D.	Head of Department
F.O.	Faculty Officer
S.A/A.S.	Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff
S. A. S.	Senior Administrative Staff
S. times	Sometimes
C.O.L.R.	Competition over limited resources
D.G.	Differences in Goals
D.P.	Differences in Perceptions
S. C.	Status Conflict
P.D.	Personality Differences
Soc. Sci.	Social Sciences
T. I.	Task Interdependence
R. A.	Role Ambiguity
C. B.	Communication Barrier
R. C.	Relationship Conflict

D. A.	Data Conflict
I. C.	Interest Conflict
S. C.	Structural Conflict
V. C.	Value Conflict
Coll	Collaboration
Com	Compromise
Avoi	Avoidance
Acc	Accommodation

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background to the Study

Whether conflict within an organization is viewed as desirable or not, the fact is that conflict exists. As human beings interact in organizations, differing values and situations create tension. Conflict can be viewed as a situation in which two or more individuals operating within a unit appear to be incompatible. When such a conflict is recognized, acknowledged and handled properly, personal and organizational benefits accrue. An effective manager uses this situation as an opportunity for growth for both the organization and individuals (Darling & Walker, 2001).

Effective managers use conflict creatively to stimulate personal development, to address apparent problems, to increase critical vigilance and self-appraisal and to examine conflicting values when making decisions (Blome, cited in Darling & Walker, 2001). In the past, management theorists used the term “conflict avoidance”, but in recent times this phrase is increasingly being replaced with the concept of “conflict management”. Conflict management recognizes that while conflict is associated with costs,

it can also bring with it great benefits. Today's managers seek not to avoid, but to manage conflict within the organization (Nurmi & Darling, cited in Darling & Walker, 2001).

Conflict is a stubborn fact of organizational life. Although it is a familiar part of the experience in organizations, its value and centrality to organizational theory and functioning has waxed and waned over time. These changes have followed the changing winds of managerial ideology and social theory. Early social theorists, such as Marx and Weber (cited in Kolb & Putnam, 1992) viewed group conflict as inevitable outgrowth of social class and organization hierarchy. Threats of conflict and its management were woven into early managerial thought, particularly in the well known tenets of the 'classical' management and human relations theories (Kolb & Putnam, 1992). Brown (cited in Sheppard, 1992) remarked:

I hope that events like this symposium and the formation of the Interest Group on conflict management within the Academy of Management will encourage more interactions between parochial sub communities because I believe that improvements in the management of our academic and intellectual conflict will be very stimulating and productive in the creation of new conflict management theory and technology. But I remain skeptical, for I am continually

impressed with the power of parochialism to undercut good intentions (p.325).

After several decades of dormancy, the theme of conflict resurfaced in the late 1960's as a major area of organizational research. Works by many writers including Walton & Mckersie (1965), Pondy (1967) and Thomas (1976), have contributed to a changing view of conflict in organizations. No longer seen as dysfunctional, conflict is now a healthy process, but one that needs to be managed and contained through negotiation, structural adaptation and other forms of intervention (Kolb & Putnam, 1992).

During the late 1980's and early 1990's, organizations experienced another significant turn in the development of conflict theory and practice. Kolb & Bartunek (1992) suggested that the scope of conflict and its management as enacted in organizations extend beyond previously existing models. Organizational conflicts are not always dramatic confrontations that achieve high visibility and publicity such as strikes, walkouts or firings. Nor is conflict usually bracketed into discrete public events and sequences, where parties formally negotiate or involve officially designated third parties in the resolution of their differences. Rather, disputes and their ongoing management are imbedded in the interactions among organizational members as they go about their daily activities. Even though some differences may be

publicly aired, the vast majority occurs informally and is not observable. Therefore, the formal definition of what constitutes conflict, the variety and sometimes contradictory form it takes, and the interactions between its forms and processes requires an extension of the examination of conflict into the routine and mundane activities that comprise life in organizations (Kolb & Putnam, 1992).

Traditionally, conflict within an organization has been viewed as a sign of a problem. Conflict meant there were differences of opinions, individual goals, expectations, values and proposed courses of action, to mention a few. Today, conflict signals these same attributes, and is often seen as a sign of a good organization. Some managers may feel uncomfortable with conflict. Many see it as something to be suppressed in all situations. However, a more realistic, practical view of discord presents a very different picture. While traditionally managers have seen their role as being to keep peace at all costs, a more enlightened view is that managers view conflict as an indication that something needs their attention. Just as a physical discomfort may signal a more serious personal physical problem which needs attention, conflict may signal a potentially serious developing situation for the organization (Darling & Walker, 2001).

In the vast body of scientific literature, there is no consensus on a specific definition of what constitutes conflict. There is a general concurrence, however, that two things are essential for conflict to arise: first, there must be divergent or apparently divergent views and second, these views must be incompatible. According to Deutsch (1973), conflicts exist whenever incompatible activities occur. Conflict can be seen as “a process in which an effort is purposely made by ‘A’ to offset the efforts of ‘B’ by some form of blocking that will result in frustrating ‘B’ in attaining his goals or furthering his interest”. Mazrui (1960) in his book “World culture and the search for human consensus” viewed conflict as a “concomitant of social interactions”. What Mazrui meant was that where two or more people meet to interact, there is bound to be conflict because of their differences, interests, ambitions etc. which may be incompatible.

Mary Parker Follett, one of the proponents of the Human Relations Movement which started in the 1920s, is noted for two of her most powerful and frequently cited ideas of conflict as diversity and her call for the integrated solution to replace compromise as a solution. Follett (1940) viewed conflict as “differences”, not a negative occurrence to be avoided but simply the interacting of different desires. “What people often mean by

getting rid of conflict”, she wrote in *Creative Experience*, “is getting rid of diversity”. We must face life as it is and understand that diversity is its most essential feature. It is possible to conceive conflict as ... a normal process by which socially valuable differences register themselves for the enrichment of all concerned.

The ability to understand and correctly diagnose conflict is the first step in managing conflict. Tjosvold (1991) identified diagnostic processes, inter personal styles, negotiating strategies and structural interventions that are designed to avoid unnecessary conflict as some of the effective conflict management mechanisms. This means gathering all possible data related to the situation, formulating hypotheses on the nature of the problem, generating relevant alternatives, creating series of crisis management teams with personnel with special expertise for rapid deployment.

For conflict to occur, it must be perceived by the parties to it that an effort is being made by one party to offset the efforts of the other party by some form of blockage. Thus, whether conflicts exist or not is an issue of perception. It is generally believed that if the parties to a conflict are not aware of the conflict, then no conflict exists. On the other hand, perceived conflict may not be real; it may be imaginary or an illusion. Conflict arises through a number of ways. It can come about as a result of competition over limited resources. That is when the various departments of an

organization compete for a fair share of the organization's limited resources. It can also come about as a result of either individual or departmental differences in goals, ambitions or achievements in an organization. Again, conflict can come into being as a result of ambiguity over responsibility and authority. Thus, where an organization is structured in a way that there are no clear lines of authority – where the chain of command is not clearly defined – conflict is likely to occur. Furthermore, poor communication is undoubtedly a source of conflict in an organization. When the right form, media, channel or skills of communication is not employed, conflict inevitably would occur (Robbins, 1974).

Breaking an organization down into smaller units, in order to cope adequately with the diversity of tasks that face it creates opportunities to develop task interests and special know-how, but at the same time it also creates rivalries and competing interests which can be damaging to the organization's mission (Cole, 2004). The fact that complex institutions expect people who share different goals, time orientations and management philosophies to integrate their efforts into a cohesive whole directed towards the accomplishment of organizational objectives conflict is inevitable (Kinard, 1988).

The University of Cape Coast has five faculties i.e. Faculty of Agriculture, Faculty of Arts, Faculty of Education, Faculty

Science and Faculty of Social Sciences. The Deans, Faculty Officers, Heads of Departments/Units/Centers, the various Senior Administrative Staff and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff play a role in the administration of the faculties. The Dean is considered as the Chief Executive Officer of a faculty and some of his functions are as follows. Firstly, the Dean of a faculty is responsible to the Vice-Chancellor for providing leadership to the faculty and for maintaining and promoting the efficiency and good order of the faculty in accordance with policies and procedures prescribed by the law or as may be determined from time to time by Council, the Academic Board and the Faculty Board. Secondly, the Dean is the Chairperson of the Faculty Board and Head of the Faculty. Thirdly, the Dean in consultation with the Heads of Departments has a responsibility for postgraduate training of the faculty's own graduates and lecturers on study leave. Also, the Dean coordinates the work of the departments or units or centers within the faculty. In addition, the Dean consults with the Heads of Departments or Units or Centers in the faculty in the execution of his/her duties. The Dean also chairs meetings of the Heads of Departments or Units or Centers meetings to disburse the Academic Facility User Fee (AFUF) and can approve of any expenditure up to the amount of six hundred Ghana cedis (GH C 600) for a department/unit/center within the faculty. Any

expenditure above this amount must be approved by the Procurement Advisory Committee (PAC).

The Senior Administrative Staff is responsible to the Head of Department or Unit or Center and the Faculty Officer for maintaining students' records, retrieving of information and the day-to-day/routine administrative duties. The Senior Administrative Staff also assist in ensuring that recommendations and other information from the faculty are duly conveyed to the appropriate individuals and that the university decisions and policies are brought to the attention of departments and individuals. Again, the Senior Administrative Staff supervise and give direction to other Junior Staff in the department/unit/center. In addition, the Senior Administrative Staff assist with students' registration and preparation of students' records for graduation ceremonies. Moreover, he/she may perform other duties as may be considered appropriate by the Head of Department/Unit/Center and the Faculty Officer.

Statement of the Problem

Issues of status and authority, ambiguity of responsibility as well as limited resources in any institution create competition which sometimes creates conflict. The potential for conflict to occur in a bureaucratic institution like the University of Cape Coast, exists. Consequently, there is a concern for administrators

of the faculties of the University of Cape Coast to evolve appropriate mechanisms to manage conflict by all stakeholders. This is because failure to manage conflict effectively could impact negatively on goal attainment of the faculties of the university.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to find and analyze conflict management mechanisms in use in the administration of the faculties of the University of Cape Coast. Specifically, the study investigated

- (i) the common types of conflict that occur in the administration of the faculties,
- (ii) the causes of conflict in the administration of the faculties,
- (iii) the nature of conflict management mechanisms employed by the administrative heads to manage conflict in the faculties and
- (iv) the effectiveness of the conflict management mechanisms employed in the administration of the faculties.

Research Questions

The study was guided by the following questions

1. What are the common types of conflict that occur in the administration of the faculties?
2. What are the causes of conflict in the administration of the faculties?
3. In what ways are conflicts managed in the administration of the faculties?
4. How effective have the conflict resolution mechanisms been in the administration of the faculties?
5. What are the differences in the use of conflict management techniques of the faculties?

Significance of the Study

The occurrence of conflict and its management is of great concern to all stakeholders especially administrators of institutions. This study is an attempt to make a modest contribution to the on-going process of finding the causes of conflict in institutions and finding ways of managing the conflict effectively to benefit both the individual employees and the institution.

The study is important because its findings will generate useful information for administrators, lecturers, and all other people in leadership positions on how to manage conflict in educational institutions effectively. It is the hope of the researcher that this

study will create the desired awareness on how to manage conflict so that more appropriate efforts will be made by all concerned to address conflict effectively. This work will also serve as a useful literature for other research on conflict management in the field of educational administration.

Delimitation of the Study

The study was limited to Senior Members (Teaching and Non-Teaching) and Senior Staff (Senior Administrative Staff and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff) of five faculties of the University of Cape Coast. The study was limited to these respondents because the researcher was interested in investigating into the conflict management mechanisms in the administration of the faculties of the University of Cape Coast. Hence, delimiting the study to these respondents who were involved in running the faculties would enable the researcher to collect relevant information and draw useful conclusion from the study.

Limitation of the Study

A major limitation of this study was that there existed very little research materials on conflict management mechanisms in the administration of tertiary institutions in Ghana generally and in the faculties of the University of Cape Coast in particular to guide this research. A further limitation was that some of the respondents

were reluctant to complete the questionnaire. This might have affected the responses they provided. Moreover, the study pertained specifically to Senior Members and Senior Non-Technical Staff of the faculties of the University of Cape Coast hence, the generalization of its findings would be limited. The data collection exercise which was anticipated to last for 3 weeks lasted for 6 weeks. These limitations notwithstanding, it is believed that views collected are a fair representative of the entire population.

Definition of Terms

Senior Members: any member of the faculties of the University of Cape Coast of the Rank of Lecturer and above.

Senior Support Staff: any member of the faculties of the University of Cape Coast of the rank of Senior Administrative Assistant and above. Also included are the Senior Accounting Assistant and Senior Auditing Assistant of the Finance and Audit Sections in the faculties.

Conflict: when there are divergent views which are incompatible.

Conflict management: the mechanisms to ensure peace building, conflict resolution and peaceful co-existence.

Mechanism: a method or process for getting something done within an organization.

Intra faculty conflict: when incompatible activities occur within a faculty.

This research was organized into five chapters. Chapter one dealt with the background to the study, the statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, and significance of the study. The chapter also dealt with the delimitation of the study, limitation of the study, definition of terms, and the organization of the study. Chapter two looked at the review of related literature for the study. Chapter three focused on the research design, the population, the sample size and sampling procedure, pre-testing of the instruments, the instruments used, data collection procedure and the data analysis plan. Chapter four dealt with the presentation and analysis of the data. Chapter five gave an overview of the research problem and methodology, a summary of findings and an evaluation of the findings and their implications with respect to the current theoretical position on the issue.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The literature was reviewed under the following sub headings. Meaning of conflict, normative conflict management theory, philosophies of conflict, survival requires change and paradox of conflict. The rest include dimensions of conflict, categories of conflict, causes of conflict, conflict and organization effectiveness and types of conflict management styles.

Meaning of Conflict

There are as many meanings of conflict as there are occasions for its occurrence. Studies by Lawrence & Lorsch, (1967); Thompson, (1967); Walton & Dutton, (1969); Abel, (1982); and Deutsch, (1973), caution against trying to define conflict without taking account of contextual circumstances. Wrong (1979) suggested that it was always difficult to draw a line between episodes of 'conflict' and the normal give and take of social interaction. According to Felstiner, Abel & Sarat, 1981; Mather & Yngvesson, 1980-1981, the definition of conflict must be fluid in any situation, as different parties bring their

interpretations to both perceptions and behavior. On their part, Kolb & Putnam (1992) saw conflict as “when there are real or perceived differences that arise in specific organizational circumstances and that engender emotion as a consequence” (p. 2).

Mazrui (1960) viewed conflict as a “concomitant of social interaction”. What Mazrui meant was that where two or more people meet to interact there is bound to be conflict because of their individual differences, interests, ambitions, values etc. which may be incompatible and clash as they interact. For example, as the staff of one department such as the Finance Department interacts with the staff of another department perhaps the Audit Department, there is bound to be conflict since both departments speak the same language (money) but pursue different goals, different targets and have different roles to play in the same organization.

Conflict occurs when one party decides that the way things are is not acceptable and seeks change, but that change is not agreed to by the other party. It is important to realize that despite the old saying that “it takes two to tango”, in reality it takes only one party to declare a conflict. At that point, the other parties are drawn into the conflict whether they want to be in it or not, unless they have the option to leave the relationship (www.directservice.org/cadre/section2.cfm).

On their part Hellriegel, Slocum & Woodman, (1992) saw conflict as any situation in which there are incompatible goals, thoughts, or emotions within or between individuals or groups that lead to opposition. Hellriegel, et al., contend that attitudes and conflict styles play an important role in determining whether a conflict will lead to destruction or mutually beneficial outcomes.

Conflict can also be seen as a disagreement through which the parties involved perceive a threat to their needs, interests or concerns. Within this simple definition there are several important understandings that emerge. First, there is a level of difference in the positions of the two (or more) parties involved in the conflict. But the true disagreement versus the perceived disagreement may be quite different from one another (Webne-Behrman, 1998). Second, there are often disparities in our sense of who is involved in the conflict. Sometimes, people are surprised to learn they are a party to the conflict, while at other times we are shocked to learn we are not included in the disagreement (Lax & Sebenius, 1986). Again, people respond to the perceived threat, rather than to the true threat, facing them. Thus, while perception doesn't become reality per se, people's behaviors, feelings and ongoing responses become modified by that evolving sense of the threat they confront (Wright & Noe, 1996). Last but not the least, there is a tendency to narrowly define "the problem" as one of substance, task and near-

term viability. However, workplace conflicts tend to be far more complex than that, for they involve ongoing relationships with complex, emotional components (Schein, 1985).

Conflict manifests itself in an organization in a number of ways. First, two or more parties compete with each other to cause the conflict. Second, the parties begin to conceal vital information from each other, or pass on distorted information. Again, each group becomes more cohesive and strict conformity is expected. Deviants who speak of conciliation are punished. Also, contact with the opposite party is discouraged except under formalized restricted conditions. In addition, while the opposite party is negatively stereotyped, the image of one's own position is boosted. The last but not least, on each side, more aggressive person who is skilled at engaging in conflict may emerge as leader (Johns, cited in Mankoe, 2007).

Normative Conflict Management Theory

Early conflict management theory took the position that collaboration was the answer. In essence, Thomas (1976) and some of his predecessors Blake, Shepard & Mouton (1964); Blake & Mouton (1964) argued that collaboration was the best way to deal with conflict, and those other alternatives were either less useful or outright obnoxious. In his presentation today, Thomas has taken a more moderate position that is currently widespread among

conflict management researchers (Gray 1989; Pfeffer & Salancik 1978; Susskind & Cruikshank 1987) that collaboration is one answer to diversity and interdependence, but not the only nor always the most useful one. The shift to a more contingent perspective on conflict and collaboration has been encouraged by forces inside and outside of social science. In part, the shift stems from academic challenges to excessive claims for collaboration. Many scholars, particularly industrial relations researchers including Freeman (1984); Raiffa (1982); and Gray (1989) have criticized over-emphasis on collaboration when in fact conflicts of interest shape the behavior of parties (Walton and Mckersie, cited in Brown, 1992). Within organization theory, the perspective has been elaborated by theories from Marxian and managerial perspectives. At the same time, the pure collaboration perspective has been overwhelmed by external events. The view that collaboration will solve most problems of conflicting interests has been difficult to maintain in the face of police dogs savaging civil right demonstrators in Alabama and the popular challenge to the United States government adventures in Vietnam and Iraq. Collaboration across some of the chasms evident in the larger social structure has been extremely difficult. So alternatives to collaboration have been forced on all but the most ideologically committed of conflict management theorists (Brown, 1992).

A second attribute of early conflict management theory is an emphasis on interpersonal and inter group levels of analysis. Most of the early analysis (Walton & Mckersie, 1965; Braverman, 1974; and Emery, 1965) focused on relations between individuals or groups over how best to accomplish organizational tasks. There is more concern today with inter organizational and inter level relations. Interpersonal and inter group relations have not disappeared as sources of conflict or objects of research attention, but many researchers including Ury, Brett & Goldberg (1988); Trist (1983); Crowfoot & Wondelleck (1990); now emphasize relations among organizations and conflict complicated by power differences. This trend is also related to changes inside and outside of social science. Within organizational behavior, for example, the rise of open systems model of organizations has focused attention on relations between organizations and their environments. As attention shifts to transactions at organizational boundaries, the level of analysis necessarily shifts to the organization in its environment and to relations among organizations. Simultaneously, there has been more empirical warrant for concern about the impact of environmental forces on organizational events. The intrusion of government into organizational life expanded dramatically in the 1960s and 1970s, in part because of the increased activism of external pressure groups. At the same time,

long-term trends toward increased organizational activity expanded and intensified interdependencies between organizations and their environments. So pressure from the environments on organizational events combined with new theoretical perspectives to expand the levels utilized in conflict management theories.

A third aspect of early conflict management theory is its emphasis on process interventions as the primary mode for shaping dynamics. Early works (for example, Blake & Mouton, 1964; Blake, Shepard & Mouton, 1964; and Habermas, 1971) described workshop processes and interpersonal interventions to resolve conflicts. There is much more emphasis today on a combination of process and structural interventions to manage conflict, and a movement foreshadowed by Thomas (1976) emphasized both. Within the organization development tradition of organizational analysis, increased attention to organizational design helped to promote this shift. Concern with organizational structures entered the field in association with the rise of open systems theory and attention to more sociological variables in organizations. Attention to innovations in organizational structures and coordination mechanisms paved the way for better understanding the structural forces that shaped conflict among different departments and for inventing new interventions to handle such problems. External pressures and reorganization to meet environmental demands also

encourage conflict management theorists to pay attention to structural as well as process issues. Structural innovation to deal with external pressures often led organizations to invent conflict management practices well in advance of research (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978).

A fourth aspect of early conflict management theories was the assumption of a managerial perspective that analyzed conflict situations from the point of view of organizational managers. This perspective implicitly assumed that conflict resolutions which are good for the organization will be good for its elements. This managerial perspective remains relatively unchallenged in most present conflict management research. Most normative conflict management theory and research today continue to analyze organizations from a managerial perspective. It is not that there are no alternative traditions in social science or even organizational research. On the contrary, there is widespread interest in critical analysis and non-managerial perspectives on organizations. But that tradition has not penetrated the conflict management arena (Brown, 1992).

Philosophies of Conflict

When it is accepted that unanimity does not exist in complex organizations, it is acknowledged that friction is part of the administrator's job. Katz & Kahn (1966) perceived this

adjudicating of conflicting demands to be one of the main functions of top management, while Gross (1964) refers to this fiction as the factor that differentiates the real administrator from an administrator on paper. Just as decision-making comprehensively permeates planning, organizing, leading and evaluating, managing conflict is an overriding concept that pervades the four basic functions (Garret & William, 1966). Disappointingly, this new view of conflict management is not widespread. Only recently have the ideas expressed by Kahz & Kahn and Gross gained acceptance among students of conflict. It is possible to differentiate three philosophies that reflect managerial attitudes towards conflict. The three philosophies are the traditional, behavioral (which are descriptive because they represent predominant views espoused in the management literature) and interactionist (which is normative, demonstrating what Robbins (1974) believed should be management's direction today).

The Traditionalist View

The prescription of the early management theories, the traditionalist, towards conflict was simple. Conflict should be eliminated. Thus, all conflicts were seen as destructive and it was the manager's duty to rid the organization of conflict (Deutsch, 1969). This philosophy dominated the management literature of

the late nineteenth century and continued into the mid 1940's (Robbins, 1974).

Conflict in the Ancient World

In times long past, conflict was likely to have life or death consequences (Deutsch, 1969). Whether under the attack from a marauding tribe or being stalked by a saber-toothed tiger, our ancestors had to be constantly ready for action in order to survive. When faced with a perceived threat, these humans of old responded immediately and automatically with a package of hormonal output designed to enhance survival. At the first sign of danger, signals from the amygdale (located deep within the emotional brain), triggered the release of epinephrine from the adrenal glands. This immediately raised the heart rate, elevated breathing and diverted blood flow from the stomach and the areas near the skin into large muscle groups. The body was ready to do what it took to live; fight, or if necessary, flee. Of course, there were also times when fighting or fleeing was useless, and the best alternative was to play dead. Playing dead at least gave the ancient one a chance to survive.

<http://www.directionservice.org/cadre/section2.cfm>).

The Behavioral View

The behaviorists' philosophy can best be described as "acceptance" of conflict (Robbins, 1974). They have accurately perceived that complex organizations by their very nature have built-in conflicts. Disagreements over goals clearly exist, sections may compete for recognition and other groups may compete to increase their boundaries (Kelly, 1969). The behaviorists' view of conflict seeks to rationalize the existence of conflict. Bennis, Benne & Chin (1969) did not believe that the elimination of conflict is invariably or even typically the desirable goal in wise management of conflict as many who identify consensus with agreement tend to do. According to Boje & Rosile (2001) conflict arises basically from differences among persons and groups. Elimination of conflict management is, thus, better conceived as the acceptance and enhancement of differences among persons and groups. The behaviorists, in their efforts to "build a case" for conflict, are rationalizing; sure there is conflict, but it's good for the organization. In terms of "managing" conflict, the behaviorists demonstrate their uncertainty in its positive value by engrossing themselves entirely in the development of conflict-resolution techniques. If conflict is truly of value to an organization, a more positive approach is needed (Robbins, 1974).

The Interactionist View

The Interactionist philosophy differs from the behavioral view in that; it recognizes the absolute necessity of conflict, explicitly encourages opposition, defines conflict management to include stimulation as well as resolution methods and considers the management of conflict as a major responsibility of all administrators (Rico, 1964). A review of managerial practices found few administrators employing the interactionist philosophy of conflict management (Maslow, 1965). Researchers appear to have made little progress since Ephron (1961) made a comment that “insofar as administrators have been troubled by conflict within their organizations, they have sought not so much to understand its origins as to find ways of reducing it” (p. 53).

Conflict in the Modern World

The rapid pace of change in our society over the last few hundred years has far outstripped the human body’s natural evolutionary change rate. As a result, we as humans find that even as we live in today’s world, the ancient physiological survival mechanisms are alive and well inside each of us. However, it is rare to have to confront threats to our lives in our school buildings (although the recent disturbances in some Senior Secondary Schools in the country have led to a general increase in fear and insecurity among staff and students). In recent times, the type of

threats usually experience in school settings are not physical threats but psychological ones. They are threats to our self-esteem, threats to relationships we value, and threats to our success. Many people also experience a sense of threat when they encounter conflict or a problem that seems unsolvable. From the point of view of the emotional brain, these psychological threats are considered identical to physical threats. At the first sign of trouble the amygdale licks in and triggers the same ancient packet of survival hormones and chemicals. Our cheeks may flush, heart rate increases, palms become cold and sweaty. We experience a classic stress response and we are ready for action (<http://www.directionservice.org/cadre/section2.cfm>).

However, it is not considered a proper response to conflict to run away down the street and certainly people can not play dead. Like it or not, people will have to adapt to the incivility of the workplace. The adaptations people make, still based on ancient responses, have led to common styles of resolving conflict that is observed in societies today. Understanding these styles can help people to see what skills and strategies are present, as well as begin to think about additional learning that can help round out dispute resolution (www.directionservice.org/cadre/section2.cfm).

Values of Conflict

The interactionists readily accept and encourage conflict. They have expanded the term “conflict management” through recognition that it is a two-sided coin (Pondy, 1969). They acknowledge that few have recognized its stimulation counterpart, whereas, much has been made of the resolution side. The interactionist believes that just as the level of conflict may be too high and require a reduction it is also often too low and in need of increased intensity (Assael, 1969). The interactionists believe organizations that do not stimulate conflict, increase the probability of stagnant thinking, inadequate decisions and at the extreme, organizational demise (Robbins, 1974).

Additionally, the interactionists find strong evidence to support their claims. Hall and Williams (cited in Robbins, 1974) concluded “... established groups tended to improve more when there was conflict among members than when there was fairly close agreement ...”. Hall and Williams observed that when groups were formed to further analyze decisions that had been made by individuals, the average improvement by groups that exhibited high conflict was 73 percent greater than in those characterized by low conflict conditions. Several relevant real-life examples will dramatize the results from inadequate low levels of conflict.

Reports on top-level discussions in the early 1960s concerning America's role in Vietnam indicate that those individuals who privately questioned the views of the majority of the presidential advisors refrained from openly questioning some obviously weak assumptions and poor logic (Kahn & Boulding, 1964). The environment created by both President Kennedy and Johnson was not one to support minority disagreement. Complex organizations may be in need of techniques for stimulation far more frequently than they require techniques for resolution. Constructive conflict is both valuable and necessary (Assael, 1969). Without conflict, there would be few new challenges; there would be no stimulation to think through ideas; organizations would be only apathetic and stagnant Pondy (1969). Rico (1964) further elaborates that the absence of conflict may indicate autocracy, uniformity, stagnation and mental fixity. The presence of conflict may be indicative of democracy, diversity, growth and self-actualization. Conflict is therefore seen as the vital seed from which growth and success germinate (Robbins, 1974).

Survival Requires Change

There are but few things we can predict with certainty. One of these is that change will occur. A major responsibility of an administrator is to guide his/her organization to react to change.

External factors in the society are dynamic in nature and those organizations that do not adapt will not survive. The truth of the Hegelian dialectic still appears to hold. Hegel recognized that all changes develop from conflict or through the clash of opposites (Robbins, 1974).

The interaction in this clash postulated that for every thesis there existed an anti thesis (Robbins, 1974). Out of this confrontation develops a synthesis stronger than either the thesis or the antithesis. This confrontation or conflict is the root of personal and social change (Deutsch, 1969). The belief that conflict is both a source and result of change is not universally accepted. Social change involves a redistribution of power and privilege therefore it will be resisted by some and sought by others hence conflict (Kelly, 1969). The interactionist philosophy acknowledges that change develops from dissatisfaction, from the desire for improvement and from creative development of alternatives. Changes do not just happen, but are inspired by conflict. Sherif (cited in Robbins, 1974) described a 1965 study of desegregation decisions in ten of the largest cities in the southern part of United States of America. Changes were found to follow a pattern of crisis initiating from various forms of open conflict.

Managing conflict is the nucleus of successful administration. An organization and its administrators must be

primarily concerned with survival, which can only result from adaptive changes. Because change is an output of conflict, an understanding of conflict should be a significant part of the study of administration (Deutsch, 1969).

Paradox of Conflict

The purpose of openly challenging ideas and philosophies is to force re-evaluation. Where there is an environment that supports conflicts, perceived differences can be discussed and analyzed (Boje & Rosile, 2001). The additional thought and discussion generated by conflict only act to reinforce the merit of a person that is the strongest of the available alternatives. A paradox is created because tolerance of conflict is counter to most cultures in Ghana. Ghanaian cultures have successfully engendered in their inhabitants a “fear of conflict”, and a desire for at least tacit agreement. Most organizations today reinforce this sentiment. This has been so because from the early years of our development when we are most susceptible to influence we have been inculcated with the value of getting along with other people and avoiding conflicts. The home, school and church are the three major institutions that share the responsibility for reinforcing anti-conflict values during the development years of a child (Robbins, 1974).

The home has historically reinforced the authority pattern through the parent figure. Parents know what is right and children complied. Conflict between children and between parents and children have generally been actively discouraged. The traditional school systems in developing countries as well as developed countries have reflected the structure of the home. Teachers had the answers and were not to be challenged. Disagreements at all levels were viewed negatively (Katz & Kahn, 1966). The last major influencing institution, the church, also has supported anti-conflict values. Church doctrines, for the most part, advocate acceptance without questioning. The religious perspective emphasizes peace, harmony and tranquility. Such dogma has discouraged questioning the teachings of the church (Janis, 1971).

Also, countries such as the United States of America and Ghana have further fostered an anti-conflict image by developing a national pride as a peace-loving nation. Billions of dollars and cedis are spent on defense, not offense each year. Preparation to fight is made because others may initiate force and therefore, protection is justified. If it is survival of the fittest, America will be prepared, although the striving for the attainment of peace dominates the thinking of the nation's people (Robbins, 1974).

Administrators are still operating under the influence of traditional philosophical teaching. Conflict of any type or form is

bad. The vast majority of administrators have been influenced at home, in school and through the church to eliminate, suppress or avoid conflict. Further, it has made administrators uncomfortable to be in its presence. Maslow (1965) expressed this view vividly in describing societies as one where there generally exists ... a fear of conflict, of disagreement, of hostility, antagonism, and enmity. There is much stress on getting along with other people, even when it seems impossible.

The term conflict has a negative connotation for many in our society. The semantic problem has resulted in viewing conflict only from a negative perspective – as destructive. As it has already been pointed out, conflict has a positive side that is repressed in our culture. We are inculcated with anti-conflict views from childhood and as a result most administrators grow up with mores sanctioning unquestioned authority. Disagreement is considered unacceptable and all conflicts are bad. Bergen & Haney (1966) report an American Management Association study that supports this contention. From the report an overwhelming majority of 200 managers agreed that the most important single skill of an executive is his/her ability to get along with people.

Only a few administrators accept and almost none attempt to stimulate conflict (Robbins, 1974). It is true that conflict is uncomfortable and that it can be a source of problems. But also

true is the fact that, conflict is absolutely necessary in organizations if they are to maintain their viability and to increase the probability of their surviving (Deutsch, 1969). One may speculate that the reason why administrators are paid the highest salaries in organizations is to compensate for their supposed acceptance of conflict. A good part of their remuneration may be viewed as “combat pay” to work in an environment that is, and must be, constantly uncomfortable (Pondy, 1969).

It seems entirely likely that many, if not most, organizations need more conflict, not less. Most organizations are dying from complacency and apathy than are dying from an over abundance of conflict (Assael, 1969). The unsuccessful have failed to perceive alterations in society’s values, in the community and in their employees. Organizations must therefore adapt to the rapid change in their environment and this requires a change. Those administrators who naively succeed in eliminating conflict dramatically increase the probability that their organizations will not survive (Robbins, 1974).

Dimensions of Conflict

In a research, Jehn (1997) suggested the presence of four conflict dimensions. These are negative emotionality, importance, acceptability, and resolution potential. Each of these dimensions applies to all types of conflicts.

Negative Emotionality

The dimension of emotionality refers to the amount of negative effects exhibited and felt during the period of the conflict. Past literature shows that the effect includes a wide range of negative feelings and emotions (Lazarus, 1982; Fiske & Taylor, 1984; Zajonc, 1984; Park, Sims, & Motowidlo, 1986). According to Russel & Fehr (1994), emotion includes anger, which includes rage, annoyance, and all other sub categories of anger. Other negative emotions found in the data from the research indicate that the emotionality level in conflicts are consistent with past theory including frustration (Guetzkow & Gyr, 1954), uneasiness, discomfort, tenseness, resentment (Stearns, 1972), annoyance, irritation, fury, rage (Russel, 1978), reproach, scorn, remorse, and hatred (Allport, cited in Jehn 1997). While many other emotions can be felt during a conflict episode, guilt, sadness, joy, and delight are those specifically demonstrated in an organizational setting during conflict episodes. Behavioral manifestations of emotion by work members in the study of Jehn included yelling, crying, banging fists, slamming doors and having an angry tone. The data indicated that, regardless of the type of conflict, all emotions exhibited in response to conflict were negatively affective.

While it is easy to imagine the emotional component in relationship conflict, task and process conflicts can also contain

high levels of emotion. Interestingly, during task and process conflict, this level of negative effect is often present without interpersonal animosity. For instance, a manager might be angry because his idea does not get selected. He becomes frustrated and hostile. This emotion is not necessarily aimed at other individuals within the team but is focused on the process of selection or the task to which the idea is related (Jehn, 1997).

Importance

Other predictors of group performance, beyond the frequency or number of time conflict episode occur within groups are the size or scope of a conflict and its duration (Deutsch, 1969; Bagozzi, 1993; Russel & Fehr, 1994). Jehn labeled this dimension of conflict as its importance to the group. Group members often assessed whether the conflict pertained to an important issue. They would often state that the conflict was “a big deal” or important and distinguish between a “big fight” and “a little tiff”. This often depended on the severity of the conflict’s anticipated consequences. It did not depend on whether the consequences of the conflict were constructive or destructive, but whether the importance of the outcome to the group was great or small. If the conflict was about something of little importance, or a low level of magnitude, it was described as something that could be forgotten or remedied with little effort. If the issue was of great importance,

it was described as vital to the life and success of the group. A manager in the Government Contract Unit of the Household-gods-moving organization where Jehn (1997) undertook a study described one important conflict about defense material transfer by saying, “we have a problem here and we have to deal with it. This is our life”.

Acceptability

The acceptability dimension of conflict refers to group norms about conflict and communication between group members. Group norms are standards that guide group members’ behavior. Jehn (1997) found that when there were norms about the acceptability of conflict in a unit, it was acceptable to talk about conflict occurring. Jehn found that in groups with acceptability norms about conflict, members willingly discussed problems and openly displayed feelings of conflict. In groups where norms suggested that conflict was not acceptable, members tried to refrain from behaving in ways that suggest conflict.

It was observed by Jehn (1997) that in units where members were told explicitly not to fight or engage in heated discussions people did not discuss conflicting issues openly. In other groups, members were encouraged to have open discussions about work-related conflicts. The norms of acceptability in the International Moves Unit promoted an open, healthy, constructive

atmosphere around task conflict. This atmosphere permitted members to investigate various alternatives and to excel at their complex tasks. Jehn (1997) suggested that acceptability norms are not general norms applicable to all types of conflict within the group, as past theory suggests (Brett, 1984; Tjosvold, 1991), but are particular and specific to the type of conflict.

Resolution Potential

Resolution potential refers to the degree to which the conflict appears possible to resolve. Some conflicts are judged by group members as being more easily resolved than other. While past research (Blake & Mouton, 1984; Ancona & Caldwell, 1988) focuses on whether conflict is actually resolved and how, the aspect of resolution relevant in the research data set was the degree to which members believed conflict could be resolved. Through observations and interviews Jehn (1997) revealed that process conflicts could be solved easily by consulting a procedure manual or a group supervisor and members perceived them as having a high degree of resolution potential. Other conflicts were often perceived as more difficult to resolve, such as personality-based conflicts (categorized as relationship conflicts) or conflicts of great importance, such as strategic decision-making problems or top level government reporting discrepancies (Jehn, 1992; Bottger & Yetton, (1988). Factors that determined whether conflict was

perceived as resolvable were similar to those reviewed by Wall & Callister (1995) and include the history of antagonism, potential costs, status differences, socialization, uncertainty, and the ability or inability to leave the situation. Conflicts of low importance and emotionality were often perceived as more readily resolvable than high-emotion, high-importance conflicts, regardless of conflict type. The main determinants of whether a member perceived a conflict as resolvable included characteristics of the members – past experience, personalities – group structure, for example interdependence, leader involvement, and dimensions of conflict (Amason, 1996; Amason & Schweiger, 1994).

Categories of conflict

Conflict can be evaluated according to five categories – relationship, data, interest, structural and value – to help to determine the causes of conflict and design resolution strategies that will have a higher probability of success. The following is an explanation of each of the categories as stated.

Relationship Conflicts

Relationship conflicts occur because of the presence of strong negative emotions, misperceptions or stereotypes, poor communication or miscommunication, or repetitive negative behaviors. Relationship problems often fuel and lead to an

unnecessary escalating spiral of destructive conflict. Supporting the safe and balanced expression of perspectives and emotions for acknowledgment (not agreement) is one effective approach to managing relational conflict.

<http://www.smartmediator.com/medres/pg18.cfm>

Data Conflicts

Data conflicts occur when people lack information necessary to make wise decisions, are misinformed, disagree on which data is relevant, interpret information differently, or have competing assessment procedures. Some data conflicts may be unnecessary since they are caused by poor communication between the people in conflict. Other data conflicts may be genuine incompatibilities associated with data collection, interpretation or communication.

<http://www.smartmediator.com/medres/pg18.cfm>

Interest Conflicts

Interest conflicts are caused by competition over perceived incompatible needs. Conflicts of interest result when one or more of the parties believe that in order to satisfy his/her needs, the needs and interests of an opponent must be sacrificed. Interest based conflict will commonly be expressed in positional terms. A variety of interest and intentions underlie and motivate positions in

negotiation and must be addressed for maximum resolution. Interest based conflicts may occur over substantive issues (such as money, physical resources, time etc.); procedural issues (the way the dispute is to be resolved); and psychological issues (perceptions of trust, fairness, desire for participation, respect, etc.) (<http://www.smartmediator.com/medres/pg18.cfm>).

Structural Conflicts

Structural conflicts are caused by forces external to the people in dispute. Limited physical resources or authority, geographical constraints (distance proximity), time (too little or too much), organizational changes and so forth can make structural conflict seem like a crisis. It can be helpful to assist parties in conflict to appreciate the external forces and constraints bearing upon them (<http://www.smartmediator.com/medres/pg18.cfm>).

Value Conflicts

Value conflicts are caused by perceived or actual incompatible belief systems. Values are beliefs that people use to give meaning to their lives. Values explain what is “good” or “bad”, “right” or “wrong”, “just” or “unjust”. Differing values need not cause conflict. People can live together in harmony with different value systems. Value disputes arise only when people attempt to force one set of values on others or lay claim to

exclusive value systems that do not allow for divergent beliefs. It is of no use to try to change value and belief systems during relatively short and strategic mediation interventions. It can, however, be helpful to support each participant's expression of their values and beliefs for acknowledgment by other parties (<http://www.smartmediator.com/medres/pg18.cfm>).

Causes of Conflict

The causes of conflict between individuals and groups are numerous. Some of the more predominant instigators of conflict identified by Griffin, (2005); Gibson, Andrews & Herschel, (1998); Ivancevich & Donnelly, (1997); Wright & Noe, (1996) among other researchers include competition limited resources, role ambiguity, communication obstacles, status and power differences, and task interdependence. Owens, (1998); Barclay, (1991); and Walton & Dutton, (1969); also traced the major causes of organizational conflict to include the need to share scarce resources, differences in goals between units, the interdependence of activities in organization and differences in values or perceptions among organizations units.

Competition over Limited Resources

When limited resources are to be allocated, mutual dependencies increase and any differences in group goals become apparent. If money, space, labor and materials were unlimited, each group could pursue its own goals. But because resources are limited, groups seek to lower pressure on themselves by gaining control over critical resource supplies. What often occurs in limited-resources situations is a win-lose competition that can easily result in dysfunctional conflict if groups refuse to collaborate (Gibson, Ivancevich & Donnelly, 1997). According to Griffin (2005), conflict can also result from excess competitiveness among individuals. When two or more people are to share a limited resource, for example, they may resort to political behavior in an effort to gain advantage and this can lead to conflict. Competition for scarce resources can also lead to inter group conflict. Most organizations especially educational institutions have limited resources and this most of the time leads to conflict (Wright & Noe, 1996).

Differences in Goals

In some cases, conflict occurs because the organization fails to set goals and reward groups in ways that encourage cooperation. Goal differences also causes inter group conflict when

groups must compete for scarce resources. A group handling a particular project would have goals related to obtaining resources for the project at the expense of others in the organization and this may lead to conflict (Wright & Noe, 1996). Differences in group goals may create conflict when two departments in an organization set different targets or goals. For instance, if the goal of marketing is to increase market share and sales throughout the world, that department's personnel would not appreciate any attempt to reduce expansion of the company's products (Gibson, Ivancevich & Donnelly, 1997). Just like people, different departments often have different goals. Further, these goals may often be incompatible and if the groups are not able to reconcile their differences conflict will arise (Griffin, 2005).

Individuals in any unit at any organizational level may come into conflict over differences in value and goals. Finance and Audit unit often conflict in this way. Whenever groups or individuals within organizations possess different values, the resulting conflicts can be quite difficult to resolve (Andrews & Herschel, 1998).

Differences in Perceptions

Groups vary in their perceptions not only because of differences in their membership but also because of perceptual

biases at the group level. Like individuals, groups tend to perceive information in ways that reflect self-interest. Thus, a management decision that advances the group's objectives or status is viewed positively. Groups also hold stereotypes of one another and perceive information in terms of those stereotypes. For instance, if the human resource department issues new forms for groups to fill out when they want to discipline group member, groups are likely to perceive this as bureaucratic meddling that inhibits flexibility and this results in conflict (Wright & Noe, 1996). Differences on goals can be accompanied by differing perceptions of reality; disagreements over what constitutes reality can lead to conflict. For example, a problem in a hospital may be viewed in one way by the administrative staff and another by the medical staff (Gibson, Ivancevich & Donnelly, 1997). According to Griffin (2005), conflict between two or more individuals and groups is almost certain to occur in any organization, given the great variety in perceptions, goals, attitudes and so forth among its members.

Personality Differences

Personality differences and incompatibilities are another common cause of organizational conflict. Individuals may simply not like one another. Individual differences in background, education, socialization, age, and expectations can produce

different needs, perceptions and goals. If those differences stem from different attitudes and values, the resulting conflicts can be severe. In communication involving individuals who are personally incompatible, discussions can become highly emotional and take on moral overtones (Andrews & Herschel, 1998). A frequent source of interpersonal conflict in organizations is what many people call a “personality clash” – when two people distrust each other’s motives, dislike each other, or for some other reason simply cannot get along (Griffin, 2005).

Interdependence

Interdependence is where groups in an organization depend on one another to achieve their objectives. Areas of interdependence are potential causes for conflict. Where each group operates independently, but the organization’s overall success depends on the combination of the groups’ outcome relatively little conflict tend to surface. But when one groups’ output serve as another group’s input, poor performance by the first group can make the second group perform poorly, so conflict between the groups can be intense (Wright & Noe, 1996). Many inter group conflict arise more from organizational causes than from inter personal causes. Just as increased interdependence makes coordination more difficult, it also increases the potential

for conflict. For instance, in sequential in sequential interdependence, work is passed from one unit to another. Inter group conflict arise if the first group turns out too much, too little, or poor quality work (Griffin, 2005). Task interdependence is the extent to which two units depend on each other for assistance, information, compliance, or other coordinative acts in the performance of their respective tasks. Conflict becomes greater as departments increase their interdependence (Katz & Kahn, 1978).

Role Ambiguity

One of the most pervasive causes of conflict in organizations is role conflict. If an individual's perception and enactment of a role differs significantly from the expectations of others, conflict is likely to develop over this discrepancy. One way this conflict may manifest itself is in intra role conflict, in which an individual occupying a single role is subjected to stress. The other way is the inter role conflict which is so common that virtually no one escapes it. Nearly every employee is also a spouse, a friend, a parent and a member of a greater community. Conflict occurs when successful job performance requires that one forgoes one or more of his/her roles. Again, interpersonal role conflict occurs when two or more individuals seek the same position, or when roles overlap so that two or more people are called upon to do the

same things in different ways at the same time (Andrews & Herschel, 1998).

Jurisdictional ambiguity is the lack of clarity about which of two departments has the responsibility for particular decisions (Thomas, Walton & Dutton, 1972). Ambiguities of jurisdiction also lead to difficulties in assigning credits and blame for actions, which heightens conflict between units. Empirically, Walton, Dutton & Cafferty (1969) found the hypothesis that the lack of clarity about which of two departments has responsibility for a particular task will produce conflict was given the most consistent support. Lack of clarity again is conjectured to increase the task-related frustration that department members experience.

Status Conflict

Organizational roles are so significant and the ranking of those roles according to their importance can lead to status conflicts. Organizational members usually seek increases in status accompanied by larger salaries, bigger offices and more prestigious titles. Whatever symbolizes status, however, can lead to conflict. Conflict can result when young, relatively inexperienced employees are asked to supervise older, more experienced workers. Moreover, any individual in any organization may develop an expectation for normal career development and

achievement. If employees realize they will never attain the status they desire, they may become disillusioned, bitter, and hostile toward those who appear more successful (Andrews and Herschel, 1998). Usually, different status standards, rather than an absolute one, are found in an organization. The result is many status hierarchies. Conflicts concerning the relative status of different groups are common and influence perceptions. For example, status conflicts are often created by work patterns – that is which group initiates the work and which group responds (Gibson, Ivancevich & Donnelly, 1997).

Communication Barrier

Less serious than conflicts over values are conflicts that grow from deficiencies in an organization's information system. An important message may not be received, a supervisor's instructions may be misinterpreted, or decision makers may arrive at different conclusions because they used different databases. Conflicts based on missing or incomplete information tend to be straightforward, in that clarifying previous message or obtaining additional information generally resolves the dispute. Since value systems are not being challenged, these conflicts tend to be easily addressed by dealing directly with the information deficiency (Andrews & Herschel, 1998).

Conflict and Organizational Effectiveness

For most people, the term organizational conflict depicts a negative connotation. An effective organization is typically thought of as a coordinated group of individuals working towards common goals and that conflict would only hinder the coordination and team-work necessary to achieve the organization's goals. However, it is not all conflicts that result in organizational ineffectiveness. Some conflicts can be classified as functional (positive) conflicts while other conflicts can also be referred to as dysfunctional (negative) conflicts (Wright & Noe, 1996).

Functional Conflict

This is a confrontation between groups that enhances and benefits the organizations performance. For example, two departments in a faculty may be in conflict over the admission requirement into a programme of study. The two departments may agree on the goal but not on the means to achieve it. Whatever the outcome, students will probably end up being well trained for the job market once the conflict is settled. Without such conflict in organizations, there would be little commitment to change and most organizations would become stagnant. Thus, functional conflict can be thought of as a type of creative tension which is

needed for organizational growth (Gibson, Ivancevich & Donnelly, 1997).

When conflict in an organization is managed effectively, it often leads to constructive problem solving. The need to resolve conflict can prompt people to search for better way of doing things. The search for ways to resolve conflict may not only lead to innovation and change but it may make changes more acceptable (Mankoe, 2007). According to Robbin (1974), an organization which is totally devoid of conflict is probably static, apathetic and non-responsive to the need for change. Conflict is functional when it initiates the search for new and better ways of doing things, brings about constructive organizational change and undermines complacency within an organization. Change does not happen by chance, it needs a stimulus and that stimulus is conflict.

Dysfunctional Conflict

A dysfunctional conflict is any confrontation or interaction between groups that harms the organization or hinders the achievement of organizational goals. The very same level of stress and conflict that creates a healthy and positive movement toward goal achievement in one group may prove extremely disruptive and dysfunctional in another group (Gibson et al., 1997). Owens (1987) observed that frequent and powerful conflicts can have a

devastating impact upon the behaviour of people in organizations. Conflict often develops into hostility which also causes people to withdraw physically and psychologically. Conflict can lead to outright hostile or aggressive behaviour such as job actions, property damage and minor theft of property. According to Mankoe (2007), if conflict is not managed effectively, it can create a climate which can develop a downward spiral of mounting frustration, deteriorating organizational climate and increasing destructiveness.

Conflict may have either a positive or a negative impact on organizational performance, depending on the nature of the conflict and how it is managed. For every organization an optimal level of conflict exists that can be considered highly functional because it helps generate positive performance (Gibson et al., 1997). However, according to Robbin (1974), when the level of conflict is too low, the organization can not perform well. This is because innovation and change will be difficult and the organization may have difficulty in adapting to change in its environment. On the other hand, if the conflict level is too high, the resulting chaos, disruption and uncooperativeness can threaten the organizations survival.

Types of Conflict Management Styles

Conflict is often best understood by examining the consequences of various behaviors at moments in time. These behaviors are usually categorized according to conflict styles. Each style is a way to meet one's needs in a dispute but may impact on other people in different ways. The following is an examination of each of the conflict management mechanism.

Competing

Competing is a style in which one's own needs are advocated over the needs of others. It relies on an aggressive style of communication, low regard for future relationships and the exercise of coercive power (Webne-Behrman, 1998) Managers who use the competing style tend to seek control over a discussion, in both substance and ground rules. This is because they fear that loss of such control will result in solutions that fail to meet their needs. Competing tends to result in responses that increase the level of threat. It is most effective in conflict which involves personal differences that are unlikely to change (Adkins, 2006). It is valuable as a counter measure in situations where others are likely to take advantage of those who display a non-competitive nature. It is also valuable in circumstances which require a quick decision. Finally, one of its greatest values is in making unpopular decisions which need to be implemented. Competitive leaders

provide clear expectations of what, when and how things need to be done. There is clear demarcation between leader and follower. Authoritarian decision makers make choices independently with little or no input from the rest of the group. The down side of the model is the hostility it has as a tendency to breed in those on the losing side. This is especially true when it is the only style of conflict management being utilized (Darling & Walker, 2001).

Accommodating

This style which is also known as smoothing is the opposite of competing. Persons using this style yield their needs to those of others, trying to be diplomatic. They tend to allow the needs of the group to overwhelm their own, which may not ever be stated, as preserving the relationship is seen as most important (Webne-Behrman, 1998). When utilizing this technique one may find himself giving in to the other person for the sake of the relationship. There are two situations in which this technique is particularly useful. One is when managers are caught off guard by the conflict and the other party is well prepared for it. In this circumstance when managers find themselves situationally outmatched the technique allows them to save their face and move forward. The second instance in which this technique is useful is found in the client service model (Walker, 1986).

It is nearly always more important to maintain a positive relationship with a client than it is to be victorious in a confrontation. This is especially true if one is goal oriented toward business. On the other hand, if one finds himself over utilizing this strategy and always putting the needs of other people before his own, he will find himself with a built up of feelings of resentment. Another negative occurs when dealing with unscrupulous persons who perceive this technique as a weakness and will always consider their own interest first before the good of the many (Bolman & Terrence, 1997).

Avoiding

Avoiding is a common response to the negative perception of conflict. "...perhaps if we do not bring it up, it will blow over..." managers seem to say to themselves. But generally, all that happens is that feelings get pent up, views go unexpressed, and the conflict festers until it becomes too big to ignore. Like cancer that may well have been cured if treated early, the conflict grows and spreads until it kills the relationship (Webne-Behrman, 1998). Since needs and concerns go unexpressed, people are often confused, wondering what went wrong in a relationship. The avoiding style of conflict management is a non-confrontational approach to problems. It involves passive behaviors such as withdrawing or side stepping issues of contention in order to avoid

issues which might be harmful to relationships involved (Adkins, 2006).

This approach is best used when disagreements develop from minor unimportant issues. This technique is also useful when time is needed in order to gather additional information for informed decision making. It is often employed when the negative impact of the confrontation outweighs the benefit of a quick positive resolution (Darling & Walker, 2001). Unfortunately, problems that are not quickly addressed tend to grow over time. Relationships can be damaged by unresolved issues. Overuse of this style can lead into giving up too many of the managers personal goals and enable others to take advantage of him/her (Walker, 1986).

Compromising

This is an approach to conflict in which people gain and give in a series of tradeoffs. While satisfactory, compromise is generally not satisfying. Each party remains shaped by his/her individual perceptions of his/her needs and does not necessarily understand the other side very well. The parties often retain a lack of trust and avoid risk-taking involved in more collaborative behaviors (Webne-Behrman, 1998). This technique is often known as the “middle ground” approach. Compromise is a negotiation process in which both parties give up something they want.

Whatever one side gets, the other side loses. Neither side gets what they want but both sides make concessions in order to reach a conclusion that is equally acceptable to both (Adkins, 2006). It is most useful when both parties are of equal stature and there is no simple solution. The result is typically a series of offers and counter offers until an agreement is made. Unfortunately, no one is ever really satisfied with the results of this technique. But, at least both parties are equally dissatisfied (Darling & Walker, 2001).

Collaborating

Collaborating is the pooling of individual needs and goals toward a common goal. Often called “win-win problem-solving technique”, collaboration requires assertive communication and cooperation in order to achieve a better solution than either individual could have achieved alone. It offers the chance for consensus, the integration of needs, and the potential to exceed the “budget of possibilities” that previously limited the views of managers of the conflict. It brings new time, energy, and ideas to resolve the dispute meaningfully (Webne-Behrman, 1998). Collaboration can also be seen as a concept that people work together incorporating both the work of individuals and the product of larger collectives. Perhaps due to its unwieldy nature there is no commonly accepted theory of collaboration. Improving the

definition might go a long way in allowing managers to collaborate more effectively and efficiently. The greatest problem to collaboration based conflict management is that it is based on an oxymoron in and of itself (Adkins, 2006). Collaboration occurs when a group of equally vested parties interact in a process of shared rules, norms and structures to resolve an issue in which they are all vested. One of the most predominant models built around this conflict management style is “win-win conflict management” (Webne-Behrman, 1998). In this approach, problems are solved in ways that go beyond fair. This process is possible only when both parties are completely open and honest in expressing and prioritizing their desired outcomes. Theoretically, in this way both parties get what they want and negative relationships are minimized (Darling & Walker, 2001).

By understanding each style and its consequences, managers may normalize the results of their behavior in various situations. This is not to say, “thou shall collaborate” in a moralizing way, but to indicate the expected consequences of each approach. If managers use a competing style, they might force the others to accept their solution, but this acceptance may be accompanied by fear and resentment. If managers accommodate, the relationship may proceed smoothly, but they may build up frustrations that their needs are going unmet. If managers

compromise they may feel okay about the outcome, but still harbor resentments in the future. If managers collaborate, they may not gain a better solution than a compromise might have yielded, but they may be more likely to feel better about their chances for future understanding and goodwill. Not all, if managers avoid discussing the conflict at all, both parties may remain clueless about the real underlying issues and concerns, only to be dealing with them in the future

(www.ohrd.wisc.edu/onlinetraining/resolution/aboutwhatisit.htm).

Summary

The forgone has been a review of related literature on conflict and its management. The subject was broken down into various aspects and dealt with. Conflict in the historical era and conflict in the modern era were examined and the various types and resolution techniques available were looked at. In summary, conflict management process is not executed easily. Planning and evaluating conflict intensity make administration one of the most difficult professions. Each administrator is responsible for creating an environment that supports conflict and allows for appreciation of differences. Further, the administrator needs to understand that conflict management is not merely conflict resolution, but conflict stimulation as well.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter explains how the study was conducted. The research design, population and sampling, instruments, data collection procedure and data analysis techniques are explained in details.

Research Design

The study was a descriptive survey. According to Fraenkel and Wallen (2000), obtaining information from a large group of people by setting carefully worded questions and carefully administered questionnaire is what lies in the heart of a descriptive survey. Descriptive research involves the collection of data in order to answer research questions concerning current state of affairs of the subject under investigation. Descriptive research thus determines and reveals the way things are and is directed towards the determination of the nature of a situation as it exists at the time of the study. Gay (1992) was of the opinion that descriptive survey is a research technique which is very useful when investigating educational problems. Hence, the use of the descriptive survey is justified since the study sought to find and analyze a current

situation in an educational institution i.e. in the University of Cape Coast.

This design was chosen because it has the merit of gathering various responses from a wide range of people. It also enables one to have a clear picture of events and people's behavior on the basis of the data gathered for a particular period of time. Again, in depth follow-up questions can be asked and items that were not clear could be explained using descriptive survey design. Furthermore, descriptive survey helps to present the true state of affairs of a given situation after data have been collected from a number of people who respond to the same set of questions about a given situation. The data collected from respondents of the study was used to analyze the conflict management mechanisms in the administration of the faculties of the University of Cape Coast.

However, there was the problem of ensuring that the questions to be responded to using the descriptive survey design were clear and not misleading because the results obtained could vary significantly depending on the wording of the questions. It could also produce unreliable results since it inquired into private matters, people would not easily cooperate. These limitations notwithstanding, the researcher believed that this research design was the most appropriate design which could help him to make direct contact with the Senior Members and Senior Staff of the faculties

of the University of Cape Coast and enable him to draw useful and meaningful conclusions from the study.

Population

The population for the study was the Senior Members and Senior Support Staff of the 5 faculties of the University of Cape Coast. The population consisted of two categories. The first category included the Senior Members of the faculties. The Senior Members of the faculties consisted of Professors, Associate Professors, Senior Lecturers and Lecturers (Senior Member Teaching). The others were the Assistant Registrars (Senior Members Non-Teaching). The second category included the Senior Support Staff of the faculties. The Senior Support Staff consisted of the Chief Administrative Assistants, Principal Administrative Assistants and Senior Administrative Assistants. The others were the Senior Accounting Assistants and the Senior Auditing Assistants with the Finance and Audit Sections in the faculties.

Data collected from the Division of Human Resources of the University of Cape Coast and offices of the Deans indicate that as at the beginning of the 2007/2008 academic year the Faculty of Agriculture had 51 Senior Members and 29 Senior Staff. Out of the 51 Senior Members there were 48 of them in the teaching category and 3 Assistant Registrars (Non-Teaching). During the same

period the faculty had 25 Senior Administrative Staff and 4 Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff.

The Faculty of Arts had 73 Senior Members and 55 Senior Staff as at October 2007. There were 72 Senior Members in the teaching category and 1 Assistant Registrar (Non-Teaching). During the same period the faculty had 51 Senior Administrative Staff and 4 Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff. The Faculty of Education had 119 Senior Members and 80 Senior Staff as at October 2007. Out of the number of Senior Members there were 114 in the teaching category and 5 in the non-teaching category. The Senior Staff consisted of 74 Senior Administrative Staff and 6 Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff. The Faculty of Science had 93 Senior Members and 75 Senior Staff as at October 2007. Out of the number of Senior Members, there were 90 of them in the teaching category and the remaining 3 in the non-teaching category. During the same period the faculty had 70 Senior Administrative Staff and 5 Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff. The Faculty of Social Sciences had 76 Senior Members and 44 Senior Staff as at October 2007. Out of the number of Senior Members there were 74 of them in the teaching category and 2 in the non-teaching category. Also, there were 40 Senior Administrative Staff and 4 Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff in the faculty during the same period. Table 1 shows the distribution of the population by faculties.

Table 1
Population Distribution

Category	Faculty					Total
	Agriculture	Arts	Education	Science	Soc. Sci.	
SMT	48	72	114	90	74	398
SMNT	03	01	05	03	02	14
SA/AS	04	04	06	05	04	23
SAS	25	51	74	70	40	260
Total	80	128	199	168	120	695

Key:

SMT = Senior Members Teaching

SMNT = Senior Members Non-teaching

SA/AS = Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff

SAS = Senior Administrative Staff

Soc. Sci = Social Sciences

Sample Size and Sampling Procedure

The sample of the Senior Members (Teaching) included Professors, Associate Professors, Senior Lecturers and Lecturers serving in administrative positions in the various faculties of the University of Cape Coast at the time of conducting the study. A sample of 128 respondents representing 32% of Senior Members

(Teaching) was used for the study. This sample was arrived at by using the purposive sampling to sample 5 Deans of the 5 faculties and 3 respondents from each of the 41 departments or units or centers in the university. The 3 respondents sampled from each department or unit or center included the Head of Department or Unit or Center, the Registration Officer and the Examination Officer. In a department or unit or center where the same Senior Member served as the Registration and Examination Officer the third respondent was selected from amongst the other Senior Members available who were one time in-charge of a department or unit or center in the university. The researcher anticipated that these respondents chosen were capable of providing relevant information for the study to draw useful conclusions because they were in-charge of the day-to-day activities of the faculties in general and the departments specifically.

The sample of the Senior Members (Non-Teaching) included the Assistant Registrar in each faculty. A sample of 10 respondents representing 71% of the Senior Members (Non-Teaching) was used for the study. This sample was arrived at by using purposive sampling to sample 1 (one) respondent from each of the 5 faculties and 5 Assistant Registrars with the various institutes and schools within the university. This was done because the researcher anticipated that these respondents sampled assisted

the Deans of the faculties directly and thus would be able to provide relevant information for the study.

A sample of 41 respondents representing 16% of the Senior Administrative Staff was selected for the study. The sample of 41 respondents was arrived at by sampling a respondent (Senior Administrative Staff) from each of the 41 departments or units or centers in the University of Cape Coast. Where there were 2 or more Senior Administrative Staff in a department or unit or center, the most senior in terms of rank was purposively sampled for the study. The researcher anticipated that the most senior of the administrative staff might have served in that position for period of time long enough to be able to contribute meaningfully to the study. In addition, 10 respondents representing 43% were sampled from the Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff category using purposive sampling. The 10 respondents were drawn from staff of the Finance and Audit Sections who had served in each of the 5 faculties for at least 5 years. Table 2 shows the sample for each faculty.

Table 2**Sample selected for the Study**

Category	Faculty					Total
	Agriculture	Arts	Education	Science	Soc. Sci.	
SMT	16	28	28	37	19	128
SMNT	01	01	04	02	02	10
SA/AS	02	02	02	02	02	10
SAS	05	09	09	12	06	41
Total	24	40	43	53	29	189

In all, a sample of 189 respondents representing 27% of the population of 695 was sampled for the study. The choice of the sample was influenced by the assertion made by Nwana (1992) that, if the population is of a few hundreds, a sample 40% or more will do; if the population is of several hundreds a sample 20% will be appropriate; if the population is of a few thousands, 10% will do and if the population is of several thousands 5% will be appropriate. Hence the use of 27% sample is justified.

In addition, the 5 Deans and the 5 Assistant Registrars (Faculty Officers) of the faculties of the University of Cape Coast were interviewed to obtain confidential data that respondents were not willing to put into writing. Open-ended questions were asked

to enable the researcher to probe into areas not captured in the questionnaire. These respondents interviewed were directly involved in the day-to-day running of the faculties hence, the researcher believed they could provide relevant information which will enable him to draw useful conclusions from the study. The focus of the data collected for the study was on the mechanisms to conflict management in the administration of the faculties of the University of Cape Coast.

Instruments

Questionnaires and an interview guide were used to collect data from the respondents for the study. Sarantakos (1998) described questionnaires as being helpful because, it standardizes data collection and ensures high confidentiality of respondents thus eliciting truthful information from them. The questionnaire included a set of both open-ended and close-ended items and it had 5 sections which linked directly to the research questions raised for the study. The open-ended questions were used because they did not restrict the respondents to give a particular answer. The respondents were thus free to use their own words to provide the response the way they deemed fit. Open-ended questions give room for unanticipated but useful data and they are easy to construct as they do not require special skills and competencies. On the other hand, close-ended questions restrict the respondents

to the options given. Close-ended questions make the respondent's work easier, there is an assurance of focus and it saves time. The merits of both the open-ended and the close-ended questions justify their combination.

The questionnaire was completed by the respondents themselves because the study population was a highly literate one. The five sections of the questionnaire sought to solicit information on the existence and causes of conflict in the faculties, the common types of conflict that occurred in the faculties, the various ways of managing the conflict in the faculties and the effectiveness of the resolution mechanisms in the administration of the faculties in the University of Cape Coast.

The first section of the questionnaire sought to solicit information on the background of the respondents. The variables covered here included category of respondent, gender, academic/professional qualification and the number of years spent in serving the faculties of the University of Cape Coast. These were important since they helped the researcher to determine the level of understanding of the respondents concerning the subject under investigation.

The second section of the questionnaire sought information on the existence and causes of conflict in the administration of the faculties of the University of Cape Coast. The main purpose here

was to find out the various areas from which conflict arises in the faculties and to isolate the specific causes of conflict from the normal daily exchanges of give and take associated with life in organizations. The respondents were expected to respond to various questions in respect of what their opinions were especially the frequency of the occurrence of conflict as reflected in the items shown on the questionnaire.

The third section of the questionnaire was intended to gather data on the common types of conflict that occurred in the administration of the faculties. The purpose of this section was to determine the magnitude of occurrence of each of the types of conflict reviewed in the literature. Both open-ended and close-ended questions were used to find out the various types of conflict and their frequency of occurrence.

The fourth section focused on the methods or strategies for managing conflict in the administration of the faculties. There were a number of options available for dealing with conflict and the researcher gathered data concerning the various methods that are employed in handling conflict in the faculties.

The fifth section gathered data on the effectiveness of the various methods/strategies employed in handling conflict in the administration of the faculties. From the literature it was made clear that the occurrence of conflict in an organization was

associated costs and benefits depending on how the conflict was managed. Therefore, the researcher sought to gather data to find out whether conflict was being effectively managed in the administration of the faculties or not and whether the faculties were benefiting from the occurrence of conflict or not.

In addition, a semi structured interview guide was used to conduct interview with some of the respondents in administrative positions (the Deans and Faculty Officers) to obtain confidential data that respondents were not willing to put into writing. Open-ended questions were asked to enable the researcher to delve into areas not captured in the questionnaire. Thus, the focus of the data collected for the investigation was on conflict management mechanisms in the administration of the faculties of the University of Cape Coast.

Pre-Testing

The questionnaire was pre-tested at the Koforidua Polytechnic using 15 respondents. The purpose was to determine the internal consistency (reliability) of the instruments and to revise and improve the questions to make them more specific and effective in eliciting the needed information. The 15 respondents were selected using the purposive random sampling technique from both the teaching and non-teaching staff. The Koforidua Polytechnic was chosen because it is a tertiary institution and is

likely to experience similar conflict situation as is happening in the faculties of the University of Cape Coast. The suggestions were used to improve upon the questionnaire. Cronbach's Alpha α was used to determine the reliability of the questionnaire. Questions that were found to be ambiguous were rephrased. For example, existence of conflict between Dean and Senior Support Staff was changed to read "existence of conflict between Dean and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff". A question that read "existence of conflict between Senior Administrative Staff and Senior Support Staff" was deleted because it was found that Senior Administrative Staff were part of Senior Support Staff.

Data Sources

The study made use of both primary and secondary sources of data. Primary data were collected through the use of questionnaires administered to the staff of the University of Cape Coast and interviews conducted. The secondary sources of data were collected from published literature from the internet, journals, articles and unpublished theses on the study.

Data Collection Procedure

The researcher collected the data for the study. To facilitate the data collection process, an introduction letter from the Director of the Institute of Educational Planning and Administration (IEPA)

accompanied the questionnaire. The introductory letter helped the researcher to get access to very busy offices such as the Deans' office, the Faculty Officers' office and offices of Heads of Departments/Units/Centers to sought permission to administer and collect the questionnaire for the study and to book appointment for interviews.

Two separate files were opened for the data collected from both the Senior Members and the Senior Staff. The files were given names to make identification easier. Data collected from Senior Members were placed on one file and that of the Senior Staff was also placed on the other file. When about 80% of the questionnaire administered had been collected analysis of the data began. The data collection exercise lasted for six (6) weeks.

Data Analysis

Two separate data analysis procedures were used for the study since the questionnaire and interview guide consisted of both open-ended and close-ended questions. With regards to the close-ended questions, the researcher checked, edited, coded and processed the data using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software. Responses from the open-ended questions and data gathered from the interview conducted were read, edited, categorized, coded and processed using the SPSS software. From

the questionnaire it was observed that each of the research questions had both open-ended and close-ended questions hence, responses to the close-ended questions were checked, edited, coded and processed into tables of frequencies and percentages of occurrence using the SPSS software. In addition, responses to the open-ended questions and data gathered from the interview were read, edited, categorized, coded and processed into tables of frequencies and percentages of occurrence using the SPSS software. This enabled the researcher to present a clear picture of the responses from the respondents on the issue under investigation. In scoring the items fashioned along the Likert scale, the items 7-21, 23-30, 32-36 and 38-42 on the questionnaire were assigned the following weights, 3 – Often, 2 – Sometimes, 1 – Never. Also, items 44-48 on the questionnaire were assigned the following weights 3 – Very Effective, 2 – Effective, 1 – Not Effective.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The study sought to find out the conflict management mechanisms in place in the administration of the five faculties of the University of Cape Coast. Questionnaires were administered to four categories of respondents for the study. They are Senior Members (Teaching), Senior Members (Non-Teaching), Senior Administrative Staff and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff. The results of the study are presented and discussed in this chapter.

Findings of the Study

Research Question 1: What are the causes of conflict in the administration of the faculties of the University of Cape Coast? This research question was meant to gather responses to find out the frequency of occurrence of each of the causes of conflict identified in the literature. Relevant information relating to the existence of conflict in the faculties is summarized in Tables 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7. Table 3 presents responses on the existence of conflict between the Deans of the faculties on one hand and Faculty Officers (F.O), Heads of Departments (H.O.D), Lecturers (L), Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff (SA/AS) and Senior Administrative Staff (SAS) of the faculties on the other hand.

Table 3

**Occurrence of Conflict between Deans and Faculty Officers,
Heads of Departments, Lecturers, Senior Accounting/Auditing
Staff and Senior Administrative Staff**

Responses	Faculty				
	Agriculture f	Arts f	Education f	Science f	Soc. Sci. f
F. O.					
Often	04 (25.0)	07 (18.9)	07 (21.9)	14 (31.8)	08 (32.0)
S. times	05 (31.3)	13 (35.1)	13 (40.6)	15 (34.1)	07 (28.0)
Never	07 (43.7)	17 (46.0)	12 (37.5)	15 (34.1)	10 (40.0)
H. O. D.					
Often	01 (06.3)	04 (10.8)	09 (28.1)	05 (11.4)	04 (16.0)
S. times	09 (56.2)	18 (48.7)	14 (43.8)	19 (43.2)	06 (24.0)
Never	06 (37.5)	15 (40.5)	09 (28.1)	20 (45.4)	15 (60.0)
Lecturers					
Often	02 (12.5)	05 (13.5)	07 (21.9)	15 (34.1)	06 (24.0)
S. times	06 (37.5)	13 (35.1)	12 (37.5)	15 (34.1)	08 (32.0)
Never	08 (50.0)	19 (51.4)	13 (40.6)	14 (31.8)	11 (44.0)
S.A./A.S.					
Often	02 (12.4)	05 (13.5)	06 (18.7)	04 (09.1)	04 (16.0)
S. times	06 (37.6)	11 (29.7)	11 (34.4)	18 (40.9)	08 (32.0)
Never	08 (50.0)	21 (56.8)	15 (46.9)	22 (50.0)	13 (52.0)

S. A. S.					
Often	03 (18.8)	05 (13.5)	06 (18.7)	08 (18.2)	04 (16.0)
S. times	06 (37.5)	13 (35.1)	12 (37.5)	14 (31.8)	09 (36.0)
Never	07 (43.7)	19 (51.4)	14 (43.8)	22 (50.0)	12 (48.0)
Total	16 (100)	37 (100)	32 (100)	44 (100)	25 (100)

Figures in brackets represent percentage

H.O.D. = Head of Department

F.O. = Faculty Officer

S.A/A.S. = Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff

S. A. S. = Senior Administrative Staff

Soc. Sci. = Social Sciences

S. times = Sometimes

From the Faculty of Agriculture 9 (56%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between the Dean and the Faculty Officer. The remaining 7 (44%) of the respondents indicated that there was no conflict between the Dean and the Faculty Officer. Almost 10 (63%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between the Dean and Heads of Departments. On the other hand, 6 (37%) of the respondents were of the view that conflict did not exist between the Dean and Heads of Departments. Eight (50%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that conflict often or

sometimes did occur between the Dean and Lecturers. The remaining 8 (50%) of the respondents were of the view that conflict did not occur between the Dean and Lecturers of the faculty. Again, 8 (50%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes occurred between the Dean and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff and the remaining 8 (50%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not occur between the Dean and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff of the faculty. Last but not the least, 9 (56%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between the Dean and Senior Administrative Staff of the faculty. On the other hand, the remaining 7 (44%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not occur between the Dean and Senior Administrative Staff.

From the Faculty of Arts, 20 (54%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes occurred between the Dean and the Faculty Officer. The remaining 17 (46%) of the respondents were of the view that conflict did not occur between the Dean and the Faculty Officer. Twenty-two (59%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between the Dean and Heads of Departments but the remaining 15 (41%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not occur between the Dean and Heads of Departments. Eighteen (49%) of the respondents from the faculty

indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between the Dean and Lecturers and the remaining 19 (51%) of the respondents were of the view that conflict did not exist between the Dean and Lecturers. Sixteen (43%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between the Dean and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff and the remaining 21 (57%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not exist between the Dean and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff of the faculty. Eighteen (49%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes occurred between the Dean and Senior Administrative Staff. The remaining 19 (51%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not occur between the Dean and Senior Administrative Staff.

From the Faculty of Education, 20 (63%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between the Dean and the Faculty Officer. But the remaining 12 (37%) of the respondents were of the view that conflict did not occur between the Dean and Faculty Officer. Twenty-three (72%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between the Dean and Heads of Departments. However, the remaining 9 (28%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not occur between the Dean and Heads of Departments. Nineteen (59%) of the respondents were of the view that conflict often or sometimes existed between the Dean and Lecturers. But

the remaining 13 (41%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not exist between the Dean and Lecturers of the faculty. Seventeen (53%) of the respondents were of the view that conflict often or sometimes occurred between the Dean and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff and the remaining 15 (47%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not occur between the Dean and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff of the faculty. Eighteen (56%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes occurred between the Dean and Senior Administrative Staff. However, the remaining 14 (44%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not occur between the Dean and Senior Administrative Staff of the faculty.

From the Faculty of Science, 29 (66%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes occurred between the Dean and Faculty Officer during the period. On the other hand, 15 (34%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not exist between the Dean and the Faculty Officer. Twenty-four (55%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between the Dean and Heads of Departments and the remaining 20 (45%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not occur between the Dean and Heads of Departments. Thirty (68%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes occurred between the Dean and

Lecturers. On the other hand, the remaining 14 (32%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not occur between the Dean and Lecturers during the period. Twenty-two (50%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes occurred between the Dean and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff. The remaining 22 (50%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not occur between the Dean and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff. Again, 22 (50%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that conflict existed between the Dean and Senior Administrative Staff. However, the remaining 22 (50%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not occur between the Dean and Senior Administrative Staff of the faculty.

From the Faculty of Social Sciences 15 (60%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between the Dean and Faculty Officer. The remaining 10 (40%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not exist between the Dean and the Faculty Officer. Ten (40%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between the Dean and Heads of Departments but the remaining 15 (60%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not exist between the Dean and Heads of Departments. Fourteen (56%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that conflict often or sometimes occurred between the Dean and Lecturers. The

remaining 11 (44%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not exist between the Dean and Lecturers during the period. Twelve (48%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that conflict often or sometimes occurred between the Dean and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff. On the other hand, the remaining 13 (52%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not occur between the Dean and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff. Thirteen (52%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes occurred between the Dean and Senior Administrative Staff of the faculty. But the remaining 12 (48%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not exist between the Dean and Senior Administrative Staff. Table 4 summarizes the responses on the existence of conflict between the Faculty Officers and Heads of Departments, Lecturers, Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff, and Senior Administrative Staff.

Table 4**Occurrence of Conflict between Faculty Officer and Heads of****Departments, Lecturers, S.A/A.S and S. A. S**

Responses	Faculty				
	Agriculture	Arts	Education	Science	Soc. Sci.
	f	f	f	f	f
H. O.D.					
Often	05 (31.2)	07 (18.9)	10 (31.2)	15 (34.1)	10 (40.0)
S. times	05 (31.2)	13 (35.1)	13 (40.7)	14 (31.8)	04 (16.0)
Never	06 (37.6)	17 (46.0)	09 (28.1)	15 (34.1)	11 (44.0)
Lecturers					
Often	00 (00.0)	02 (05.4)	05 (15.6)	10 (22.7)	07 (28.0)
S. times	09 (56.3)	19 (51.4)	20 (62.5)	15 (34.1)	09 (36.0)
Never	07 (43.7)	16 (43.2)	07 (21.9)	19 (43.2)	09 (36.0)
S.A/A.S					
Often	01 (06.2)	06 (16.2)	08 (25.0)	09 (20.5)	06 (24.0)
S. times	05 (31.3)	17 (45.9)	13 (40.6)	14 (31.8)	08 (32.0)
Never	10 (62.5)	14 (37.9)	11 (34.4)	21 (47.7)	11 (44.0)
S. A. S.					
Often	04 (25.0)	05 (13.5)	04 (12.4)	11 (25.0)	08 (32.0)
S. times	03 (18.7)	14 (37.9)	14 (43.8)	13 (29.5)	05 (20.0)
Never	09 (56.3)	18 (48.6)	14 (43.8)	20 (45.5)	12 (48.0)
Total	16 (100)	37 (100)	32 (100)	44 (100)	25 (100)

From the Faculty of Agriculture, 10 (62%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes occurred between the Faculty Officer and Heads of Departments, on the other hand, the remaining 6 (38%) of the respondents indicated otherwise. Nine (56%) of the respondents indicated that conflict sometimes occurred between the Faculty Officer and Lecturers. But the remaining 7 (44%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not occur between the Faculty Officer and Lecturers. Six (38%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between the Faculty Officer and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff within the period. The remaining 10 (62%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not exist between the Faculty Officer and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff. Seven (44%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that conflict often or sometimes occurred between the Faculty Officer and Senior Administrative Staff. On the other hand, 9 (56%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not exist between the Faculty Officer and the Senior Administrative Staff during the period.

From the Faculty of Arts, 20 (54%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between the Faculty Officer and Heads of Departments. The remaining 17 (46%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not exist

between the Faculty Officer and Heads of Departments. Twenty-one (57%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that conflict often or sometimes occurred between the Faculty Officer and Lecturers and the remaining 16 (43%) of the respondents indicated otherwise. Twenty-three (62%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between the Faculty Officer and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff and the remaining 14 (38%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not occur between them. Nineteen (51%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that conflict often or sometimes occurred between the Faculty Officer and Senior Administrative Staff, on the other hand, 18 (49%) of the respondents indicated otherwise.

From the Faculty of Education, 23 (72%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes occurred between the Faculty Officer and Heads of Departments. On the other hand, the remaining 9 (28%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not occur between the Faculty Officer and Heads of Departments. Twenty-five (78%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between the Faculty Officer and Lecturers. The remaining 7 (22%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not exist between the Faculty Officer and Lecturers. Twenty-one (66%) of the

respondents from the faculty indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between the Faculty Officer and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff within the period the remaining 11 (34%) of the respondents indicated otherwise. Eighteen (56%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that conflict often or sometimes occurred between the Faculty Officer and Senior Administrative Staff, on the other hand, the remaining 14 (44%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not occur between the Faculty Officer and Senior Administrative Staff.

The Faculty of Science had 29 (66%) of the respondents indicating that conflict often or sometimes existed between the Faculty Officer and Heads of Departments but the remaining 15 (34%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not occur between the Faculty Officer and Heads of Departments. Twenty-five (57%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between the Faculty Officer and Lecturers. On the other hand, the remaining 19 (43%) of the respondents were of the view that conflict did not occur between the Faculty Officer and Lecturers. Twenty-three (52%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes occurred between the Faculty Officer and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff and the remaining 21 (48%) of the respondents indicated otherwise. Twenty-four (55%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes

existed between the Faculty Officer and Senior Administrative Staff. The remaining 20 (45%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not exist between the Faculty Officer and Senior Administrative Staff during the period.

From the Faculty of Social Sciences, 14 (56%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between the Faculty Officer and Heads of Departments. The remaining 11 (44%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not occur between the Faculty Officer and Heads of Departments. Sixteen (64%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between the Faculty Officer and Lecturers but the remaining 9 (36%) of the respondents indicated otherwise. Fourteen (56%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between the Faculty Officer and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff of the faculty. The remaining 11 (44%) of the respondents were of the view that conflict did not occur between the Faculty Officer and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff. Thirteen (52%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that conflict existed between the Faculty Officer and Senior Administrative Staff but the remaining 12 (48%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not occur. Table 5 summaries the responses on the existence of conflict

between Heads of Departments and Lecturers, Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff, and Senior Administrative Staff.

Table 5

Occurrence of Conflict between Heads of Departments and Lecturers, Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff and Senior Administrative Staff

Responses	Faculty				
	Agriculture f	Arts f	Education f	Science f	Soc. Sci. f
Lecturers					
Often	01 (06.2)	05 (13.5)	09 (28.1)	11 (25.0)	06 (24.0)
S. times	08 (50.0)	18 (48.7)	13 (40.6)	17 (38.6)	04 (16.0)
Never	07 (43.8)	14 (37.8)	10 (31.3)	16 (36.4)	15 (60.0)
S. A/A. S					
Often	02 (12.5)	04 (10.8)	04 (12.4)	04 (09.0)	07 (28.0)
S. times	08 (50.0)	18 (48.7)	16 (50.0)	18 (40.9)	06 (24.0)
Never	06 (37.5)	15 (40.5)	12 (37.6)	22 (50.1)	12 (48.0)
S. A. S.					
Often	02 (12.5)	09 (24.3)	05 (15.6)	14 (31.8)	03 (12.0)
S. times	09 (56.3)	22 (59.5)	17 (53.1)	16 (36.4)	09 (36.0)
Never	05 (31.2)	06 (16.2)	10 (31.3)	14 (31.8)	13 (52.0)
Total	16 (100)	37 (100)	32 (100)	44 (100)	25 (100)

From the Faculty of Agriculture 9 (56%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between Heads of Departments and Lecturers but the remaining 7 (44%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not exist between Heads of Departments and Lecturers. Ten (63%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between Heads of Departments and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff, the remaining 6 (37%) of the respondents indicated otherwise. Eleven (69%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that conflict often or sometimes occurred between Heads of Departments and Senior Administrative Staff. The remaining 5 (31%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not occur between Heads of Departments and Senior Administrative Staff during the period.

From the Faculty of Arts, twenty-three (62%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes occurred between Heads of Departments and Lecturers. The remaining 14 (38%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not occur between Heads of Departments and Lecturers. Twenty-two (59%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between Heads of Departments and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff. On the other hand, the remaining 15 (41%) of the respondents did not agree that conflict existed between Heads of Departments and Senior Accounting/Auditing

Staff. Thirty-one (84%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between Heads of Departments and Senior Administrative Staff. The remaining 6 (16%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not occur between Heads of Departments and Senior Administrative Staff.

From the Faculty of Education, 22 (69%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between Heads of Departments and Lecturers but the remaining 10 (31%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not exist between Heads of Departments and Lecturers. Twenty (62%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes occurred between Heads of Departments and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff. However, the remaining 12 (38%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not occur between Heads of Departments and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff. Twenty-two (69%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that conflict often or sometimes did occur between the Heads of Departments and Senior Administrative Staff but the remaining 10 (31%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not occur between Heads of Departments and Senior Administrative Staff.

From the Faculty of Science, 28 (64%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes did occur between Heads of Departments and Lecturers but the remaining 16 (36%) of the

respondents were of a different view that conflict did not occur between them. Twenty-two (50%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between Heads of Departments and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff. The remaining 22 (50%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not occur between Heads of Departments and Senior Accounting/Auditing. Thirty (68%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between Heads of Departments and Senior Administrative Staff. The remaining 14 (32%) of the respondents were of the view that conflict did not occur between Heads of Departments and Senior Administrative Staff.

From the Faculty of Social Sciences, 10 (40%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between Heads of Departments and Lecturers but the remaining 15 (60%) of the respondents indicated otherwise. Thirteen (52%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between Heads of Departments and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff. The remaining 12 (48%) of the respondents were of the view that conflict did not occur between Heads of Departments and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff. Twelve (48%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that conflict occurred between Heads of Departments and Senior

Administrative Staff. The remaining 13 (52%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not occur between Heads of Departments and Senior Administrative Staff. Table 6 presents the responses on the existence of conflict between lecturers on one hand and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff and Senior Administrative Staff on the other hand.

Table 6

Occurrence of Conflict between Lecturers and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff and Senior Administrative Staff

Responses	Faculty				
	Agriculture f	Arts f	Education f	Science f	Soc. Sci. f
S. A./A. S					
Often	03 (18.8)	02 (05.4)	07 (21.9)	08 (18.1)	06 (24.0)
S. times	05 (31.2)	17 (45.9)	12 (37.5)	17 (38.7)	08 (32.0)
Never	08 (50.0)	18 (48.7)	13 (40.6)	19 (43.2)	11 (44.0)
S. A. S.					
Often	03 (18.7)	04 (10.8)	06 (18.8)	10 (22.7)	04 (16.0)
S. times	06 (37.5)	24 (64.9)	16 (50.0)	23 (52.3)	06 (24.0)
Never	07 (43.8)	09 (24.3)	10 (31.2)	11 (25.0)	15 (60.0)
Total	16 (100)	37 (100)	32 (100)	44 (100)	25 (100)

From the Faculty of Agriculture, 8 (50%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes occurred between Lecturers and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff, the remaining 8 (50%) of the respondents indicated otherwise. Nine (56%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between Lecturers and Senior Administrative Staff but the remaining 7 (44%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not occur between Lecturers and Senior Administrative Staff.

From the Faculty of Arts, 19 (51%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between Lecturers and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff but the remaining 18 (49%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not occur between them. Twenty-eight (76%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between Lecturers and Senior Administrative Staff. The remaining 9 (24%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not occur between Lecturers and Senior Administrative Staff.

From the Faculty of Education, 19 (59%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes did exist between Lecturers and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff, on the other hand, the remaining 13 (41%) of the respondents responded in the negative that conflict did not exist. Twenty-two (69%) of the

respondents from the faculty indicated that conflict existed between Lecturers and Senior Administrative Staff. The remaining 10 (31%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not exist between Lecturers and Senior Administrative Staff.

From the Faculty of Science 25 (57%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes did occur between Lecturers and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff, the remaining 19 (43%) of the respondents indicated otherwise. Thirty-three (75%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that conflict often or sometimes occurred between Lecturers and Senior Administrative Staff but the remaining 11 (25%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not occur between Lecturers and Senior Administrative Staff of the faculty.

From the Faculty of Social Sciences, 14 (56%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between Lecturers and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff. The remaining 11 (44%) of the respondents were of the view that conflict did not exist between Lecturers and Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff. Ten (40%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that conflict often or sometimes did occur between Lecturers and Senior Administrative Staff. The remaining 15 (60%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not occur between Lecturers and Senior Administrative Staff of the faculty

during the period. Table 7 presents the responses on the existence of conflict between Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff and Senior Administrative Staff.

Table 7
Occurrence of Conflict between Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff and Senior Administrative Staff

Responses	Faculty				
	Agriculture	Arts	Education	Science	Soc. Sci.
	f	f	f	f	f
Often	01 (06.3)	07 (18.9)	05 (15.6)	13 (29.5)	05 (20.0)
S. times	08 (50.0)	14 (37.8)	14 (43.8)	08 (18.2)	07 (28.0)
Never	07 (43.7)	16 (43.3)	13 (40.6)	23 (52.3)	13 (52.0)
Total	16 (100)	37 (100)	32 (100)	44 (100)	25 (100)

From the Faculty of Agriculture 9 (56%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff and Senior Administrative Staff. The remaining 7 (44%) of the respondents were of a different view that conflict did not exist. From the Faculty of Arts 21 (57%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff and Senior Administrative Staff. The remaining 16 (43%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not occur between them. From the

Faculty of Education 19 (59%) of the respondents indicated that conflict often or sometimes occurred between Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff and Senior Administrative Staff but the remaining 13 (41%) of the respondents were of a different view that conflict did not occur. Twenty-one (48%) of the respondents from the Faculty of Science indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff and Senior Administrative Staff. However, the remaining 23 (52%) of the respondents were of a different view that conflict did not exist between them. Twelve (48%) of the respondents from the Faculty of Social Sciences indicated that conflict often or sometimes existed between Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff and Senior Administrative Staff. The remaining 13 (52%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that conflict did not occur between Senior Accounting/Auditing Staff and Senior Administrative Staff. Table 8 presents the responses on the causes of conflict in the five faculties of the University of Cape Coast.

Table 8
Causes of Conflict

Responses	Faculty				
	Agriculture	Arts	Education	Science	Soc. Sci.
	f	f	f	f	f
C.O.L.R					
Often	04 (25.0)	14 (37.8)	16 (50.0)	23 (52.2)	11 (44.0)
S. times	09 (56.3)	16 (43.3)	11 (34.4)	16 (36.4)	11 (44.0)
Never	03 (18.7)	07 (18.9)	05 (15.6)	05 (11.4)	03 (12.0)
D.G.					
Often	03 (18.7)	03 (08.1)	10 (31.3)	10 (22.7)	08 (32.0)
S. times	05 (31.3)	21 (56.8)	16 (50.0)	19 (43.2)	13 (52.0)
Never	08 (50.0)	13 (35.1)	06 (18.7)	15 (34.1)	04 (16.0)
D.P.					
Often	02 (12.4)	09 (24.3)	13 (40.7)	09 (20.5)	12 (48.0)
S. times	10 (62.5)	19 (51.4)	14 (43.7)	24 (54.5)	08 (32.0)
Never	04 (25.1)	09 (24.3)	05 (15.6)	11 (25.0)	05 (20.0)
P.D.					
Often	03 (18.7)	10 (27.0)	05 (15.7)	14 (31.8)	08 (32.0)
S. times	10 (62.6)	12 (32.4)	18 (56.2)	15 (34.1)	13 (52.0)
Never	03 (18.7)	15 (40.6)	09 (28.1)	15 (34.1)	04 (16.0)
T. I.					
Often	03 (18.8)	06 (16.2)	09 (28.1)	10 (22.8)	10 (40.0)

S. times	08 (50.0)	22 (59.5)	15 (46.9)	19 (43.1)	12 (48.0)
Never	05 (31.2)	09 (24.3)	08 (25.0)	15 (34.1)	03 (12.0)
R. A.					
Often	02 (12.5)	09 (24.3)	07 (21.9)	09 (20.5)	06 (24.0)
S. times	09 (56.2)	17 (45.9)	17 (53.1)	18 (40.9)	13 (52.0)
Never	05 (31.3)	11 (29.8)	08 (25.0)	17 (38.6)	06 (24.0)
S. C.					
Often	02 (12.5)	06 (16.2)	16 (50.0)	18 (40.9)	09 (36.0)
S. times	06 (37.5)	20 (54.1)	10 (31.3)	11 (25.0)	06 (24.0)
Never	08 (50.0)	11 (29.7)	06 (18.7)	15 (34.1)	10 (40.0)
C.B.					
Often	02 (12.6)	13 (35.1)	08 (25.0)	18 (40.9)	09 (36.0)
S. times	07 (43.7)	15 (40.6)	15 (46.9)	17 (38.6)	11 (44.0)
Never	07 (43.7)	09 (24.3)	09 (28.1)	09 (20.5)	05 (20.0)
Total	16 (100)	37 (100)	32 (100)	44 (100)	25 (100)

Key:

C.O.L.R. = Competition over limited resources

S. times = Sometimes

D.G. = Differences in Goals

D.P. = Differences in Perceptions

S. C. = Status Conflict

P.D. = Personality Differences

Soc. Sci. = Social Sciences

T. I. = Task Interdependence

R. A. = Role Ambiguity

C. B. = Communication Barrier

From the Faculty of Agriculture 13 (81%) of the respondents indicated that competition over limited resources often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty. On the other hand, the remaining 3 (19%) of the respondents disagreed that competition over limited resources caused conflict in the faculty during the period. Eight (50%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that differences in goals often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty but the remaining 8 (50%) of the respondents indicated that differences in goals did not cause conflict in the faculty. Twelve (75%) of the respondents indicated that differences in perceptions often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty. However, the remaining 4 (25%) of the respondents were of a different view. Thirteen (81%) of the respondents indicated that personality differences often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty whereas the remaining 3 (19%) of the respondents indicated that personality differences did not cause conflict in the faculty. Eleven (69%) of the respondents indicated that task interdependence often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty, on the other hand, the remaining 5 (31%) of the respondents indicated otherwise. Eleven

(69%) of the respondents indicated that role ambiguity caused conflict in the faculty. But the remaining 5 (31%) of the respondents indicated that role ambiguity did not cause conflict in the faculty during the period of study. Eight (50%) of the respondents indicated that status conflict often or sometimes occurred in the faculty however, the remaining 8 (50%) of the respondents indicated that status did not cause conflict in the faculty. Nine (56%) of the respondents indicated that communication barrier often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty and the remaining 7 (44%) of the respondents indicated that communication barrier did not cause conflict in the faculty.

From the Faculty of Arts 30 (81%) of the respondents indicated that competition over limited resources often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty. However, the remaining 7 (19%) of the respondents disagreed that competition over limited resources caused conflict in the faculty. Twenty-four (65%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that differences in goals often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty. On the other hand, the remaining 13 (35%) of the respondents indicated otherwise that differences in goals did not cause conflict in the faculty. Twenty-eight (76%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that differences in perceptions often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty during the period. But the remaining 9 (24%)

of the respondents indicated that differences in perceptions did not cause conflict in the faculty. Twenty-two (59%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that personality differences often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty but the remaining 15 (41%) of the respondents were of a different view that personality differences did not cause conflict in the faculty. Twenty-eight (76%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that task interdependence often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty but the remaining 9 (24%) of the respondents indicated that task interdependence did not cause conflict in the faculty during the period. Twenty-six (70%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that role ambiguity often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty whereas the remaining 11 (30%) of the respondents indicated that role ambiguity did not cause conflict in the faculty. Again, 26 (70%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that status often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty. On the other hand, the remaining 11 (30%) of the respondents were of the view that status did not cause conflict in the faculty. Twenty-eight (76%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that communication barrier often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty. But the remaining 9 (24%) of the respondents were of the view that communication barrier did not cause conflict in the faculty.

From the Faculty of Education 27 (84%) of the respondents indicated that competition over limited resources often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty and the remaining 5 (16%) of the respondents indicated that competition over limited resources did not cause conflict in the faculty. Twenty-six (81%) of the respondents indicated that differences in goals often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty but the remaining 6 (19%) of the respondents indicated that differences in goals did not cause conflict in the faculty. Twenty-seven (84%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that differences in perceptions often or sometimes caused conflict whereas the remaining 5 (16%) of the respondents indicated that differences in perceptions did not cause conflict. Twenty-three (72%) of the respondents indicated that personality differences often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty, on the other hand, the remaining 9 (28%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated otherwise. Twenty-four (75%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that task interdependence often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty. On the other hand, the remaining 8 (25%) of the respondents indicated that task interdependence did not cause conflict in the faculty. Again, 24 (75%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that role ambiguity often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty, but the remaining 8 (25%) of the respondents indicated

otherwise. Twenty-six (81%) of the respondents indicated that status often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty. However, the remaining 6 (19%) of the respondents indicated that status did not cause conflict in the faculty. Twenty-three (72%) of the respondents indicated that communication barrier often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty but the remaining 9 (28%) of the respondents from the faculty did not agree that communication barrier caused conflict.

From the Faculty of Science 39 (89%) of the respondents indicated that competition over limited resources often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty. However, the remaining 5 (11%) of the respondents indicated that competition over limited resources did not cause conflict in the faculty. Twenty-nine (66%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that differences in goals often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty. On the other hand, the remaining 15 (34%) of the respondents indicated that differences in goals did not cause conflict in the faculty. Thirty-three (75%) of the respondents indicated that differences in perceptions often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty but the remaining 11 (25%) of the respondents were of a different view that differences in perceptions did not cause conflict in the faculty. Twenty-nine (66%) of the respondents indicated that personality differences often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty. The

remaining 15 (34%) of the respondents were of the view that personality differences did not cause conflict in the faculty. Again, 29 (66%) of the respondents indicated that task interdependence often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty but the remaining 15 (34%) of the respondents indicated that task interdependence did not cause conflict. Twenty-seven (61%) of the respondents indicated that role ambiguity often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty but the remaining 17 (39%) of the respondents indicated otherwise. Twenty-nine (66%) of the respondents indicated that status caused often or sometimes conflict in the faculty whereas the remaining 15 (34%) of the respondents indicated that status did not cause conflict. Thirty-five (79%) of the respondents indicated that communication barrier caused conflict. However the remaining 9 (21%) of the respondents indicated otherwise.

From the Faculty of Social Sciences, 22 (88%) of the respondents indicated that competition over limited resources often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty. On the other hand, the remaining 3 (12%) of the respondents were of a different view that competition over limited resources did not cause conflict in the faculty. Twenty-one (84%) of the respondents indicated that differences in goals often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty but the remaining 4 (16%) of the respondents indicated that

differences in goals did not cause conflict in the faculty. Twenty (80%) of the respondents indicated that differences in perceptions often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty. The remaining 5 (20%) of the respondents indicated that differences in perceptions did not cause conflict in the faculty. Twenty-one (84%) of the respondents indicated that personality differences often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty but the remaining 4 (16%) of the respondents indicated otherwise. Twenty-two (88%) of the respondents from the faculty of indicated that task interdependence often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty. The remaining 3 (12%) of the respondents indicated that task interdependence did not cause conflict in the faculty. Nineteen (76%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that role ambiguity often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty. However, the remaining 6 (24%) of the respondents indicated that role ambiguity did not cause conflict. Fifteen (60%) of the respondents indicated that status often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty but the remaining 10 (40%) of the respondents indicated that status did not cause conflict in the faculty. Twenty (80%) of the respondents indicated that communication barrier often or sometimes caused conflict in the faculty. Nevertheless, the remaining 5 (20%) of the respondents indicated that communication barrier did not cause conflict in the faculty.

Research Question 2: What are the common types of conflict that occur in the administration of the faculties of the University of Cape Coast? This research question was posed to solicit views from respondents from the five faculties of the University of Cape Coast on the types of conflict that usually occurs in the running of the faculties of the university. Tables 9 summarize responses on the types of conflict from the five faculties of the University of Cape Coast.

Table 9

Types of Conflicts

Responses	Faculty				
	Agriculture f	Arts f	Education f	Science f	Soc. Sci. f
R. C.					
Often	04 (25.0)	10 (27.0)	15 (46.9)	21 (47.8)	10 (40.0)
S. times	08 (50.0)	23 (62.2)	15 (46.9)	13 (29.5)	13 (52.0)
Never	04 (25.0)	04 (10.8)	02 (06.2)	10 (22.7)	02 (08.0)
D. C.					
Often	02 (12.5)	08 (21.6)	11 (34.4)	10 (22.7)	09 (36.0)
S. times	09 (56.2)	22 (59.5)	19 (59.4)	23 (52.3)	11 (44.0)
Never	05 (31.3)	07 (18.9)	02 (06.2)	11 (25.0)	05 (20.0)
I. C.					
Often	01 (06.3)	08 (21.6)	10 (31.2)	15 (34.1)	11 (44.0)

S. times	10 (62.5)	19 (51.4)	19 (59.4)	20 (45.5)	12 (48.0)
Never	05 (31.2)	10 (27.0)	03 (09.4)	09 (20.4)	02 (08.0)
S. C.					
Often	05 (31.3)	11 (29.7)	12 (37.5)	12 (27.3)	05 (20.0)
S. times	07 (43.7)	18 (48.7)	16 (50.0)	27 (61.4)	14 (56.0)
Never	04 (25.0)	08 (21.6)	04 (12.5)	05 (11.3)	06 (24.0)
V. C.					
Often	00 (00.0)	04 (10.8)	08 (25.0)	14 (31.8)	10 (40.0)
S. times	06 (37.5)	20 (54.1)	16 (50.0)	13 (29.6)	10 (40.0)
Never	10 (62.5)	13 (35.1)	08 (25.0)	17 (38.6)	05 (20.0)
Total	16 (100)	37 (100)	32 (100)	44 (100)	25 (100)

Key:

R. C. = Relationship Conflict

D. A. = Data Conflict

I. C. = Interest Conflict

S. C. = Structural Conflict

V. C. = Value Conflict

S. times = Sometimes

Soc. Sci. = Social Sciences

From the Faculty of Agriculture 12 (75%) of the respondents indicated that relationship conflict was a type of conflict that often or sometimes occurred in the faculty but the

remaining 4 (25%) of the respondents indicated otherwise. Eleven (69%) of the respondents indicated that data conflict often or sometimes occurred in the faculty. On the other hand, the remaining 5 (31%) of the respondents were of the view that data conflict did not occur in the faculty. Again, 11 (69%) of the respondents indicated that interest conflict often or sometimes occurred in the faculty but the remaining 5 (31%) of the respondents did not agree that interest conflict occurred in the faculty. Twelve (75%) of the respondents indicated that structural conflict was a type of conflict that often or sometimes occurred in the faculty, however, the remaining 4 (25%) of the respondents indicated otherwise. Six (37%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that value conflict sometimes occurred in the faculty, but the remaining 10 (63%) of the respondents indicated that value conflict did not occur.

From the Faculty of Arts 33 (89%) of the respondents indicated that relationship conflict often or sometimes occurred. On the other hand, the remaining 4 (11%) of the respondents were of a different view that relationship conflict did not occur. Thirty (81%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that data conflict often or sometimes occurred in the faculty and the remaining 7 (19%) of the respondents indicated that data conflict did not occur. Twenty-seven (73%) of the respondents indicated

that interest conflict often or sometimes occurred in the faculty whereas the remaining 10 (27%) of the respondents indicated otherwise. Twenty-nine (78%) of the respondents indicated that structural conflict often or sometimes occurred in the faculty. On the other hand, the remaining 8 (22%) of the respondents indicated that structural conflict did not occur. Twenty-four (65%) of the respondents indicated that value conflict often or sometimes occurred in the faculty. The remaining 13 (35%) of the respondents indicated that value conflict did not occur.

Thirty (94%) of the respondents from the Faculty of Education indicated that relationship conflict often or sometimes occurred in the faculty. The remaining 2 (6%) of the respondents indicated that relationship conflict did not occur. Again, 30 (94%) of the respondents indicated that data conflict often or sometimes occurred in the faculty. On the other hand, the remaining 2 (6%) of the respondents had a different view that data conflict did not occur. Twenty-nine (91%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that interest conflict often or sometimes occurred in the faculty but the remaining 3 (9%) thought otherwise. Twenty-eight (87%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that structural conflict often or sometimes occurred in the faculty. On the other hand, the remaining 4 (13%) of the respondents indicated that structural conflict did not occur. Twenty-four (75%) of the

respondents indicated that value conflict often or sometimes occurred during the period but the remaining 8 (25%) of the respondents had a different view about the occurrence of value conflict.

From the Faculty of Science 34 (77%) of the respondents indicated that relationship conflict often or sometimes occurred in the faculty. On the other hand, the remaining 10 (23%) of the respondents did not agree that relationship conflict occurred. Thirty-three (75%) of the respondents indicated that data conflict often or sometimes occurred during the period. The remaining 11 (25%) of the respondents indicated that data conflict did not occur in the faculty. Twenty-five (80%) of the respondents indicated that interest conflict often or sometimes occurred in the faculty whereas the remaining 9 (20%) of the respondents indicated that interest conflict did not occur in the faculty. Thirty-nine (89%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that structural conflict often or sometimes did occur in the faculty but the remaining 5 (11%) of the respondents indicated that structural conflict did not occur in the faculty. Twenty-seven (61%) of the respondents indicated that value conflict often or sometimes occurred in the faculty, but the remaining 17 (39%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated otherwise.

From the Faculty of Social Sciences 23 (92%) of the respondents indicated that relationship conflict often or sometimes occurred in the faculty. However, the remaining 2 (8%) of the respondents indicated that relationship conflict was not a type of conflict that occurred in the faculty. Twenty (80%) of the respondents indicated that data conflict was a type of conflict that often or sometimes occurred in the faculty but the remaining 5 (20%) of the respondents indicated otherwise. Twenty-three (92%) of the respondents indicated that interest conflict often or sometimes occurred in the faculty and the remaining 2 (8%) of the respondents indicated that interest conflict did not occur in the faculty. Nineteen (76%) of the respondents from indicated that structural conflict often or sometimes occurred in the faculty whereas the remaining 6 (24%) of the respondents indicated that structural conflict did not occur during the period. Twenty (80%) of the respondents indicated that value conflict often or sometimes occurred in the faculty. Nevertheless, the remaining 5 (20%) of the respondents indicated that value conflict did not occur in the faculty.

Research Question 3: In what ways are conflicts managed in the administration of the faculties of the University of Cape Coast? The purpose of this research question was to solicit data in connection with the methods of managing conflict in the

administration of the faculties of the University of Cape Coast. Respondents were to indicate how often each of the conflict management styles identified was employed in dealing with conflict in the faculties. Table 10 presents the responses on the conflict management mechanisms from the faculties of the University of Cape Coast.

Table 10
Conflict Management Mechanisms

Responses	Faculty				
	Agriculture f	Arts f	Education f	Science f	Soc. Sci. f
Coll					
Often	10 (62.6)	15 (40.5)	14 (43.8)	22 (50.0)	13 (52.0)
S. times	04 (25.0)	14 (37.8)	16 (50.0)	14 (31.8)	09 (36.0)
Never	02 (12.4)	08 (21.7)	02 (06.2)	08 (18.2)	03 (12.0)
Com					
Often	02 (12.4)	14 (37.8)	15 (46.9)	15 (34.1)	15 (60.0)
S. times	10 (62.6)	20 (54.1)	16 (50.0)	24 (54.5)	10 (40.0)
Never	04 (25.0)	03 (08.1)	01 (03.1)	05 (11.4)	00 (00.0)
Avoi					
Often	04 (25.0)	13 (35.1)	09 (28.1)	15 (34.1)	08 (32.0)
S. times	05 (31.3)	15 (40.6)	13 (40.7)	18 (40.9)	13 (52.0)
Never	07 (43.7)	09 (24.3)	10 (31.2)	11 (25.0)	04 (16.0)

Acc					
Often	04 (25.0)	10 (27.0)	16 (50.0)	19 (43.2)	11 (44.0)
S. times	07 (43.8)	19 (51.4)	12 (37.5)	14 (31.8)	12 (48.0)
Never	05 (31.2)	08 (21.6)	04 (12.5)	11 (25.0)	02 (08.0)
Competing					
Often	04 (25.0)	08 (21.7)	08 (25.0)	13 (29.5)	08 (32.0)
S. times	05 (31.2)	20 (54.0)	18 (56.3)	19 (43.2)	13 (52.0)
Never	07 (43.8)	09 (24.3)	06 (18.7)	12 (27.3)	04 (16.0)
Total	16 (100)	37 (100)	32 (100)	44 (100)	25 (100)

Key:

Coll = Collaboration

Com = Compromise

Avoi = Avoidance

Acc = Accommodation

Soc. Sci. = Social Sciences

S. times = Sometimes

From the Faculty of Agriculture 14 (88%) of the respondents indicated that collaboration was often or sometimes used to resolve conflict in the faculty but the remaining 2 (12%) of the respondents indicated that collaboration was not used in the faculty. Twelve (75%) of the respondents indicated that compromise was often or sometimes used to manage conflict in the

faculty, however, the remaining 4 (25%) of the respondents indicated otherwise. Nine (56%) of the respondents indicated that avoidance was often or sometimes used to resolve conflict in the faculty but the remaining 7 (44%) of the respondents indicated that the avoidance style was not used. Eleven (69%) of the respondents indicated that the accommodation style was often or sometimes used to resolve conflict in the faculty. However, the remaining 5 (31%) of the respondents indicated that the accommodation style was not used. Nine (56%) of the respondents indicated that the competing style was often or sometimes used to manage conflict in the faculty but the remaining 7 (44%) of the respondents indicated otherwise.

From the Faculty of Arts 29 (78%) of the respondents indicated that collaboration was often or sometimes used to manage conflict in the faculty. On the other hand, the remaining 8 (12%) of the respondents did not agree that the collaboration style was used. Thirty-four (92%) of the respondents indicated that compromise was often or sometimes used to manage conflict in the faculty. On the other hand, the remaining 3 (8%) of the respondents indicated that the compromise style was not used. Twenty-eight (76%) of the respondents indicated that the avoidance style was often or sometimes used to ensure peaceful coexistence in the faculty. The remaining 9 (24%) of the respondents

disagreed that avoidance was used in the faculty. Twenty-nine (78%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that the accommodation style was often or sometimes used to manage conflict. Nevertheless, the remaining 8 (22%) of the respondents indicated that the accommodation style was not employed. Twenty-eight (76%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that the competing style was used often or sometimes to resolve conflict in the faculty, on the other hand, the remaining 9 (24%) of the respondents indicated otherwise.

Thirty (94%) of the respondents from the Faculty of Education indicated that collaboration was used often or sometimes to manage conflict situations in the faculty but the remaining 2 (6%) of the respondents indicated otherwise. Thirty-one (97%) of the respondents indicated that compromise was often or sometimes used to manage conflict in the faculty. On the other hand, the remaining 1 (3%) of the respondents did not agree that compromise was employed in the faculty. Twenty-two (69%) of the respondents indicated that avoidance was used often or sometimes to resolve conflict in the faculty. However, the remaining 10 (31%) of the respondents indicated that avoidance was not used. Twenty-eight (87%) of the respondents indicated that the accommodation style was often or sometimes used to manage conflict in the faculty. But the remaining 4 (13%) of the

respondents indicated that the accommodation style was not employed. Twenty-six (81%) of the respondents from the faculty indicated that the competing style was often or sometimes employed to resolve conflict in the faculty, nevertheless, the remaining 6 (19%) of the respondents indicated otherwise.

From the Faculty of Science 36 (82%) of the respondents indicated that collaboration was often or sometimes employed to ensure peaceful co existence in the faculty. On the other hand, the remaining 8 (18%) of the respondents indicated that the collaboration style was not employed. Thirty-nine (89%) of the respondents indicated that compromise was often or sometimes employed to resolve conflict situations in the faculty. However, the remaining 5 (11%) of the respondents were of the view that the compromise style was not used. Thirty-three (75%) of the respondents indicated that the avoidance style was often or sometimes used to manage conflict in the faculty. But the remaining 11 (25%) of the respondents indicated that the avoidance style was not used. Thirty-three (75%) of the respondents indicated that the accommodation style was often or sometimes used to manage conflict in the faculty, however, the remaining 11 (25%) were of a different opinion. Thirty-two (73%) of the respondents indicated that the competing style was employed often or sometimes to manage conflict in the faculty,

however, the remaining 12 (27%) of the respondents indicated otherwise.

From the Faculty of Social Sciences 22 (88%) of the respondents indicated that collaboration was often or sometimes used to manage conflict in the faculty. On the other hand, the remaining 3 (12%) of the respondents indicated that collaboration was not used. Twenty-five (100%) of the respondents indicated that the compromise style was used often or sometimes to manage conflict situations in the faculty. Twenty-one (84%) of the respondents were of the view that the avoidance style was often or sometimes used to resolve conflict in the faculty whereas the remaining 4 (16%) of the respondents indicated that the avoidance style was not used. Twenty-three (92%) of the respondents indicated that the accommodation style was often or sometimes employed to ensure peace building in the faculty but the remaining 2 (8%) of the respondents disagreed that the accommodation style was employed to resolve conflict in the faculty. Whereas 21 (84%) of the respondents indicated that the competing style was employed often or sometimes to manage conflict in the faculty, the remaining 4 (16%) of the respondents indicated otherwise.

Research Question 4: How effective have the conflict resolution mechanisms been in the administration of the faculties? This research question sought to gather information about the

effectiveness of the conflict management strategies employed in the five faculties of the University of Cape Coast to resolve conflict situations. Table 11 represents responses on the effectiveness of the conflict management mechanisms/styles in the faculties of the University of Cape Coast.

Table 11

Effectiveness of Conflict Management Mechanisms

Responses	Faculty				
	Agriculture f	Arts f	Education f	Science f	Soc. Sci. f
Coll					
V. Eff.	03 (18.8)	03 (08.1)	03 (09.4)	06 (13.6)	06 (24.0)
Effective	12 (75.0)	32 (86.5)	25 (78.2)	33 (75.0)	18 (72.0)
Not Eff.	01 (06.2)	02 (05.4)	04 (12.4)	05 (11.4)	01 (04.0)
Com					
V. Eff.	00 (00.0)	03 (08.1)	02 (06.2)	03 (06.8)	03 (12.0)
Effective	13 (81.3)	29 (78.4)	24 (75.1)	34 (77.3)	21 (84.0)
Not Eff.	03 (18.7)	05 (13.5)	06 (18.7)	07 (15.9)	01 (04.0)
Avoi					
V. Eff.	00 (00.0)	02 (05.4)	00 (00.0)	00 (00.0)	01 (04.0)
Effective	11 (68.8)	23 (62.2)	21 (65.6)	32 (72.7)	16 (64.0)
Not Eff.	05 (31.2)	12 (32.4)	11 (34.4)	12 (27.3)	08 (32.0)
Acc					

V. Eff.	00 (00.0)	03 (08.1)	02 (06.2)	01 (02.3)	02 (08.0)
Effective	12 (75.0)	26 (70.3)	25 (78.2)	37 (84.1)	22 (88.0)
Not Eff.	04 (25.0)	08 (21.6)	05 (15.6)	06 (13.6)	01 (04.0)
Competing					
V. Eff.	00 (00.0)	02 (05.4)	01 (03.1)	05 (11.4)	02 (08.0)
Effective	09 (56.3)	19 (51.3)	23 (71.9)	24 (54.5)	13 (52.0)
Not Eff.	07 (43.7)	16 (43.3)	08 (25.0)	15 (34.1)	10 (40.0)
Total	16 (100)	37 (100)	32 (100)	44 (100)	25 (100)

Key:

V. Eff. = Very Effective

Not Eff. = Not Effective

From the Faculty of Agriculture 15 (94%) of the respondents indicated that the collaboration style was either very effective or effective in dealing with conflict however, the remaining 1 (6%) of the respondents were of a different view that the collaboration style was effective. Thirteen (81%) of the respondents indicated that the compromise style was an effective mechanism to manage conflict in the faculty but the remaining 3 (19%) of the respondents indicated otherwise. Eleven (69%) of the respondents indicated that the avoidance style employed in the faculty to manage conflict was effective. On the other hand, the remaining 5 (31%) of the respondents indicated that the avoidance

style was not effective. Twelve (75%) of the respondents indicated that the accommodation style for managing conflict in the faculty was effective. However, the remaining 4 (25%) of the respondents disagreed that the accommodation style was effective. Whereas 9 (56%) of the respondents indicated that the competing style of managing conflict in the faculty was effective, the remaining 7 (44%) of the respondents indicated otherwise.

From the Faculty of Arts whereas 35 (95%) of the respondents indicated that the collaboration style was either very effective or effective, the remaining 2 (5%) of the respondents indicated that the collaboration style was not effective. Thirty-two (87%) of the respondents indicated that the compromise style for managing conflict was either very effective or effective. However, the remaining 5 (13%) of the respondents indicated that the compromise style was not effective. 25 (68%) of the respondents indicated that the avoidance style of managing conflict in the faculty was either very effective or effective but the remaining 12 (32%) of the respondents indicated otherwise. Twenty-nine (78%) of the respondents indicated that the accommodation style for managing conflict in the faculty was either very effective or effective. However, the remaining 8 (22%) of the respondents indicated that the accommodation style was not effective. Twenty-one (57%) of the respondents indicated that the competing style

employed in the faculty for managing conflict was either very effective or effective. But, the remaining 16 (43%) of the respondents indicated that the competing style was not effective.

From the Faculty of Education 28 (88%) of the respondents indicated that the collaboration style for managing conflict in the faculty was either very effective or effective but the remaining 4 (12%) of the respondents indicated that the style was not effective in managing conflict in the faculty. Twenty-six (81%) of the respondents indicated that the compromise style for managing conflict was either very effective or effective. However, the remaining 6 (19%) of the respondents indicated that the compromise style was not effective. Twenty-one (66%) of the respondents indicated that the avoidance style for managing conflict was effective whereas the remaining 11 (34%) of the respondents indicated that the avoidance style was not effective. Twenty-seven (84%) of the respondents indicated that the accommodation style was either very effective or effective for managing conflict in the faculty but the remaining 5 (16%) of the respondents indicated otherwise. Twenty-four (75%) of the respondents indicated that the competing style was either very effective or effective. However, the remaining 8 (25%) of the respondents indicated that the competing style was not effective.

From the Faculty of Science 39 (89%) of the respondents indicated that the collaboration style for managing conflict situations in the faculty was either very effective or effective. On the other hand, the remaining 5 (11%) of the respondents indicated that the collaboration style was not effective. Thirty-seven (84%) of the respondents indicated that the compromise style for managing conflict was either very effective or effective but the remaining 7 (16%) of the respondents indicated that the compromise style was not effective. Thirty-two (73%) of the respondents indicated that the avoidance style for managing conflict was effective. However, the remaining 12 (27%) of the respondents indicated that the avoidance style was not effective. Thirty-eight (86%) of the respondents indicated that the accommodation style was either very effective or effective for managing conflict in the faculty but the remaining 6 (14%) of the respondents indicated otherwise. Twenty-nine (66%) of the respondents indicated that the competing style for managing conflict was either very effective or effective. However, the remaining 15 (34%) of the respondents indicated that the competing style was not effective.

From the Faculty of Social Sciences 24 (96%) of the respondents indicated that the collaboration style was either very effective or effective for conflict resolution. However, the

remaining 1 (4%) of the respondents were of the view that the collaboration style was not effective. Again, 24 (96%) of the respondents indicated that the compromise style for conflict resolution was either very effective or effective, but the remaining 1 (4%) of the respondents indicated otherwise. Seventeen (68%) of the respondents indicated that the avoidance style for peaceful coexistence in the faculty was either very effective or effective. On the other hand, the remaining 8 (32%) of the respondents indicated that the avoidance style was not effective. Twenty-four (96%) of the respondents indicated that the accommodation style for managing conflict was either very effective or effective but the remaining 1 (4%) of the respondents indicated that the accommodation style was not effective. Whereas 15 (60%) of the respondents indicated that the competing style was either very effective or effective, the remaining 10 (40%) of the respondents indicated that the competing style was not effective.

Research Question 5: What are the differences in the use of conflict management techniques of the faculties? The aim of this research question was to gather responses in connection with the methods of managing conflict in the administration of the faculties of the University of Cape Coast.

The data gathered showed that all the 5 faculties of the University of Cape Coast employed the collaboration,

compromise, avoidance, accommodation, and competing mechanisms to manage conflict during the period. However, the rate of usage of each of the mechanisms varied between the faculties. For instance, 88% of the respondents from the Faculty of Agriculture indicated that the faculty employed the collaboration mechanism however, 94% of the respondents from the Faculty of Education indicated same.

Summary of Interview

From 5 faculties of the University of Cape Coast, 6 (86%) of the respondents agreed that there had been instances where conflict situations had arisen between the Deans, Heads of Departments, and lecturers during the period of the study. On the other hand, the remaining 1 (14%) of the respondents indicated that conflict did not occur in his faculty. Again, 6 (86%) of the respondents indicated that misperceptions and repetitive negative behaviour (relationship conflict) and limited physical resources (structural conflict) were the prevailing types of conflict in the faculties, on the other hand, the remaining 1 (14%) of the respondents maintained that there was no conflict. On the causes of conflict in the faculties, 4 (57%) of the respondents indicated that personality differences, competition over limited resources, and differences in perceptions caused conflict in the faculties. Two (29%) of the respondents indicated that task interdependence

caused conflict situations in the faculties during the period of the study. However, the remaining 1 (14%) of the respondents maintained that there was no conflict in his faculty.

From 5 faculties in the University of Cape Coast, 6 (86%) of the respondents indicated that the collaborating and compromising mechanisms were the prevailing conflict management mechanisms. However, the remaining 1 (14%) of the respondents indicated that since there was no conflict in his faculty, there was no need for conflict resolution mechanism. Out of the respondents who indicated that there were mechanisms for managing conflict situations in the faculties 5 (71%) indicated that they learnt about the conflict management mechanisms at conferences and seminars they attended outside the University of Cape Coast. All of the 6 (86%) of the respondents indicated that the collaborating and the compromising mechanisms for managing conflict had been effective in managing conflict situations in the faculties during the period of the study.

From the analysis of the data gathered it can be said that all 5 five faculties of the University of Cape Coast did employ more than one conflict management style to manage conflict situations in the faculties. On the other hand, there were differences in the frequency of usage of the conflict management approaches

employed by the faculties to manage conflict situations during the period.

Discussion of Findings

The findings from the study are discussed under the following headings based on the research questions that guided the study: causes of conflict; types of conflict; conflict management mechanisms; and the effectiveness of the conflict management mechanisms.

Causes of conflict in 5 faculties of the University of Cape Coast

The study revealed that conflict existed in the faculties of the University of Cape Coast during the period of the study. It was also found that personality differences, competition over limited resources, differences in perception and task interdependence were the prevailing causes of conflict situations in the five faculties of the university. Again, it was found that the rate of occurrence differed between the faculties.

These findings support earlier study by Andrews & Herschel (1998) which concluded that people may simply not like one another because of differences in background, education, socialization, age and expectations. The findings also support earlier study by Gibson, Ivancevich & Donnelly (1997) which concluded that when two or more organizational groups depend on one another to complete their task, the potential for conflict is high.

A possible reason for these findings could be that people found working in organizations comes from different cultural backgrounds which influences their likes and dislikes for people with other backgrounds. Since people from the faculties of the University of Cape Coast come from different cultural backgrounds, if ones background is causing conflict in Europe that same factor could be causing conflict in the faculties of the University of Cape Coast. Another likely reason for these findings could be that since most (if not all) organizations the world over have different departments/units which work together to achieve the common goal of the organization, the departments/units will be depending on one another to complete their tasks. This situation which can lead to conflict is present in the faculties of the University of Cape Coast.

However, these findings contradict earlier studies by Barclay (1991) and Goodge (1978) which concluded that barriers to communication may reduce the quantity and quality of information shared between departments/units of an organization and this could lead to increased diversity in views formed and held by different departments/units hence conflict is likely to arise. A possible reason for this finding could be that the channels of communication in the faculties of the University of Cape Coast are clearly defined and well followed hence the possibility of conflict

situations arising as a result of lack of communication in the faculties is reduced.

Types of conflicts in 5 faculties of the University of Cape Coast

The study revealed that the prevailing types of conflicts that usually occurred in the faculties of the University of Cape Coast were relationship conflict and structural conflict. The indication was that, there is the presence of strong negative emotions, misperceptions, and repetitive negative behaviors which often fuel and lead to an unnecessary escalating spiral of destructive conflict. Also, conflicts in the faculties are caused by forces external to the people in dispute. Limited physical resources or authority, geographical constraints, too little or too much time, and organizational changes among others can make structural conflict seem like a crisis.

Conflict management mechanisms employed in 5 faculties of the University of Cape Coast to manage conflicts

It was found that the prevailing conflict resolution mechanisms employed by the faculties of the University of Cape Coast were the collaborating style and the compromise style. This finding support earlier study by Rahim & Bonoma (cited in Anderws & Hershel, 1998) which concluded that both managers and subordinates prefer the collaboration conflict management

style. A possible reason for this finding could be that the administrators of the faculties of the University of Cape Coast always want to deal with the conflict situation by encouraging those involved in the conflict to express themselves assertively and reinforce the value of listening to others and approaching the problem constructively. This finding also supports earlier study by Wright & Noe (1996) which concluded that parties to a conflict prefer to reach for a mutually acceptable solution in which each person gets only part of what he or she wants. A possible reason for these findings could be that the managers of the faculties of the University of Cape Coast resolve conflict situations looking for a mutually acceptable solution in which each of the parties in the conflict wins something. It could be that once each party in the conflict wins something they want the conflict situation would not escalate. Hence, the administrators were very careful to keep the conflict situation within acceptable level.

However, the finding contradicts earlier study by Gibson, Ivancevich & Donnelly (1997) which concluded that managers may prefer to avoid conflict as a temporary alternative for managing conflict. A possible reason for this could be that administrators of 5 faculties of the University of Cape Coast manage to avoid conflict so as to look for a more appropriate mechanism to resolve the problem. Although avoidance may not

bring any long-term benefit, it can surely work as a short run solution.

Effectiveness of the conflict management mechanisms employed in 5 faculties of the University of Cape Coast

The study revealed that the most effective conflict management styles in the faculties of the University of Cape Coast were the collaborating style and the compromising styles. It was also found that the frequencies and percentages of effectiveness varied among the faculties. These findings support earlier studies by Filley (cited in Andrews & Herschel, 1998) and Wheelless & Reichel (1990) which concluded that both managers and subordinates viewed the collaborative style of conflict management as the most effective style for managing conflict situations. A possible reason for this finding could be that administrators of the faculties of the University of Cape Coast try to manage conflict situations by taking advantage of the numerous advantages the collaborating style has. Hence, the parties to a conflict situation in the faculties may be called together to face the situation openly and directly and to seek, by working together, an integrative solution so that at the end all parties to the conflict would have been satisfied.

However, the finding contradicts earlier studies by Putnam & Wilson (1982) and Putnam & Poole (1987) which concluded

that managers rely on competing as their most characteristic mode of handling conflicts and subordinates in contrast see avoiding as a more preferred approach to deal with conflicts. A possible reason for this finding could be that the administrators of the faculties may see competing as a time consuming approach unless they use their position to force a solution on their subordinates. In the end the administrators may not be able to deal with the conflict situation effectively and prevent conflict based on personal differences (which can be harmful to the faculties) from escalating into chaos. Another possible reason for this finding could be that the subordinates of the faculties of the University of Cape Coast may want to withdraw issues of contention in order to avoid issues which might be harmful to relationships involved.

Differences in the use of conflict management mechanisms employed in 5 faculties of the University of Cape Coast

It was found that all the faculties of the University of Cape Coast employed more than one conflict management style in handling conflict situations in the faculties. This finding supports earlier study by Rahim & Bonoma (cited in Andrews & Herschel, 1998) which concluded that there was agreement between theorists that no one style is the ideal way to manage all conflict situations. A possible reason for this finding may be that the effectiveness of a particular style may depend on the type of conflict and the attitude

of the parties to the conflict in the faculties. Clearly, conflict that stems from personality differences will surely require a different resolution style as compared to a conflict situation that stems from role ambiguity in the faculties. Another likely reason could be that the resolution styles have their peculiar advantages which may suit each of the parties in the conflict situation. For instance, due to status differences administrators and subordinates in the faculties may refer different conflict resolution styles which may suit their individual needs.

The research design characteristics limit the generalizations that can be made from the findings. First, caution must be taken in drawing conclusions from inter-faculty causes of conflict and conflict management styles because although similar factors caused conflict in the faculties the frequencies of occurrence differs among the faculties. Again, the frequency of usage of the conflict resolution mechanisms differed between the faculties. Second, the results represent an educational institution in Cape Coast hence, may be generalized to other Ghanaian tertiary educational institutions only

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the Study

The topic for the study was an investigation into conflict management mechanisms in the administration of the faculties of the University of Cape Coast. The population was made up of Senior Members and Senior Support Staff of the five faculties of the University of Cape Coast. In all, the study had a population of 695 respondents. The purposive sampling procedure was used to select the sample for the study. In all, a sample size of 189 respondents representing 27% of the population was selected for the study. The study was guided by five research questions. They are (1). What are the causes of conflict in the administration of the faculties of the University of Cape Coast? (2). What are the common types of conflict that occur in the administration of the faculties of the University of Cape Coast? (3). In what ways are conflicts managed in the administration of the faculties of the University of Cape Coast? (4). How effective have the conflict resolution mechanisms been in the administration of the faculties of the University of Cape Coast? (5). What are the differences in

the use of conflict management techniques of the faculties of the University of Cape Coast? The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software was used to analyze the data gathered into tables, frequencies and percentages of occurrence, usage and effectiveness.

The study revealed the following.

1. Conflict existed in the faculties of the University of Cape Coast, however, the rate of occurrence was minimal
2. The prevailing causes of conflict in the five faculties of the University of Cape Coast were personality differences, competition over limited resources, differences in perceptions and task interdependence.
3. The prevailing types of conflict that occurred in the five faculties of the University of Cape Coast were relationship conflict and structural conflict.
4. The prevailing conflict management mechanisms employed to resolve conflict situations in the five faculties of the University of Cape Coast were the collaborating style and the compromising style.
5. The collaborating and the compromising styles of managing conflict in 5 faculties of the University of Cape Coast were the most effective of the conflict management styles employed in the faculties.

6. All the five faculties of the University of Cape Coast did employ more than one conflict management technique to manage conflict during the period.

Conclusion

The study revealed that conflict existed in the faculties of the University of Cape Coast and administrators of the faculties were aware of the implications of unresolved conflicts. This puts them in a better position to manage conflict. For example, the administrators were aware of the presence of personality differences, competition over limited resources, differences in perceptions and task interdependence as causes of conflict situations in the faculties. Robbins (1974) was of the view that it is true that conflict is uncomfortable and can be a source of problems but additionally true is the fact that “conflict is absolutely necessary in organizations if they are to maintain their viability and to increase the probability of surviving” (p. 6).

The administrators have varied styles to manage conflict situations in the faculties of the University of Cape Coast. Notable among the conflict management styles were the compromise style, competing style, accommodating style, avoiding style and collaborating style. This information shows that the administrators of the faculties of the University of Cape Coast were aware of the conflict management mechanisms and they (administrators) are

using the conflict management mechanisms to manage conflicts in the faculties thereby taking advantage of the occurrence of conflict for growth and survival. According to Gibson, Ivancevich & Donnelly (1997), functional conflict enhances and benefits the performance of an organization. The faculties of the University of Cape Coast have survived troubled times from when every semester saw a break in academic activities to the present day when the academic calendar runs smoothly uninterrupted. This depicts that the University is managing conflict situations and thus, has benefited from the occurrence of conflicts.

Recommendations

The study revealed that apart from the collaborating and compromising styles of managing conflict in the faculties of the University of Cape Coast the rest of the conflict management styles were not effective. Hence the study recommends the following.

1. There is the need for seminars or workshops on effective conflict management approaches in the faculties to be organized periodically by the University of Cape Coast for its staff to enhance the ability of staff of the university to deal effectively with conflict situations.
2. Although conflict levels in the faculties of the University of Cape Coast have not reached destructive levels, the

university needs to educate its staff members on the importance of keeping conflict levels within acceptable levels so as to benefit from the occurrence of conflict in the faculties.

3. In some of the faculties the existence of conflict was high indicating that if steps are not taken the conflict situation can get out of hand. Therefore, it will be prudent for the Deans of each of the faculties to set up a committee which will be responsible for assisting staff members of the faculties to manage conflict situations.

Area for further Study

The University of Cape Coast is an educational institution that trains quality personnel for the various sectors of the Ghanaian economy especially the educational sector. Therefore, the knowledge of conflict and conflict management mechanisms between administrators and students on one hand and between teaching staff and students on the other hand will go a long way to help administrators of educational institutions to be effective managers of conflict situations to ensure growth and survival of the institutions.

REFERENCES

- Abel, R. (1982). *The politics of informal justice*. New York: Academic Press.
- 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.
- Amason, A. C. & Schweiger, D. M. (1994). Resolving the paradox of conflict, strategic decision making, and organizational performance. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 5, 239-253.
- Ancona, D. G. & Caldwell, D. F. (1988). Beyond task and maintenance: defining external functions in groups. *Group and Organization Studies*, 13, 468-494.
- Andrews, P. H. & Herschel, R. T. (1998). *Organizational communication*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Assael, H. (1969). Constructive role of inter-organizational conflict. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 14, 573-582.
- Bagozzi, R. P. (1993). An examination of the psychometric properties of measures of negative affect in the PANAS-X scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 836-851.
- Baiden-Koomson, G. (2007). *Conflict management mechanisms in the Administration of higher educational institutions in Ghana: a case study of the university of education, winneba*. Unpublished M.Phil thesis., University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast.
- Barclay, D. W. (1991). Interdepartmental conflict in organizational buying: the impact of the organizational context. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 28, 145-159.

- Bennis, W. G., Benne, K. D. & Chin, R. (1969). *The planning of change*. (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston inc.
- Bergen, G. L. & Haney, W. V. (1966). *Organizational relations and management action*. New York: McGraw Hill Book.
- Blake, R. & Mouton, J. (1984). *The managerial grid*. Houston: Gulf Publishing.
- Blake, R. & Mouton, J. (1964). *The managerial grid*. Houston: Gulf Press.
- Boje, D.M. & Rosile, G.A. (2001). Where's the Power in Empowerment? Answers from Follett and Clegg. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Vol.37 (1)*, 90-117.
- Bolman, L. & Terrence, D. (1997). *Reframing organizations*. (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bottger, P. C. & Yetton, P. W. (1988). An integration of process scheme explanations of group solving performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 42, 234-249.
- Braverman, H. (1974). *Labor and monopoly capitalism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Brett, J. M. (1984). Managing organizational conflict. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 15, 644-678.
- Brown, L. D. (1992). Normative conflict management theories: Past, present and future. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 303-309.
- Brown, L. D. (1983). *Managing conflict at organizational interfaces*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.
- Burrell, G. & Morgan, G. (1979). *Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis*. Portsmouth: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Cole, G. A. (2004). *Management theory and practice*. (6th ed.). London: Book Power Cornwall.

- Corwin, R. G. (1969). Patterns of organizational conflict. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 14, 507-522.
- Cox, T. (1991). The multicultural organization. *Academy of Management Executives*, 5(2), 34-47.
- Crowfoot, J. & Wondelleck, J. (1990). *Environmental disputes: community involvement in conflict resolution*. Washington: Island Press.
- Darling, R. D. & Walker, W. E. (2001). Effective conflict management: use of the behavioral style model. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 22, 230-242.
- Davis-Blake, A. & Pfeffer, J. (1989). Just a mirage: the search for dispositional effects in organizational research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 385-400.
- Deutsch, M. (1973). *The resolution of conflict*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Deutsch, M. (1969). Conflicts: productive and destructive. *Journal of Social Issues*, 25, 7-41.
- Drucker, P. (1988). New organizational forms. *Harvard Business Review*, January-February.
- Emery, F. & Trist, E. (1965). The causal texture of organizational environments. *Human Relations*, 18, 21-32.
- Ephron, L. R. (1961). Group conflict in organizations: a critical appraisal of recent theories. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, Spring, 53.
- Felstiner, W., Abel, R. & Sarat, A. (1981). The emergence and transformation of disputes: naming, blaming and claiming. *Law and Society Review*, 15, 631.
- Fiske, S. T. & Taylor, S. E. (1984). *Social cognition*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.
- Follett, M. P. (1940). *Dynamic administration: the collected papers of Mary Parker Follett*. New York: Harper and Row.

- Fraenkel, J.R. & Wallen, N.E. (2000). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. (4th ed). New York: McGraw- Hill Higher Education
- Freeman, R. (1984). *Strategic management: a stakeholders approach*. Marshfield: Pitman.
- Gay, R. L. (1992). *Educational research: competencies for analysis and application*. (4th ed). New York: MacMillam Publishing Company.
- Gibson, J. L., Ivancevich, J. M. & Donnelly, J. H. (1997). *Organizations*. Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill Co.
- Goode, P. (1978). Inter group conflict: a rethink. *Human relations*, 31, 475-487.
- Gray, B. G. (1989). *Collaborating: finding common ground for multiparty problems*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Griffin, R. W. (2005). *Management*. (8th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Gross, B. M. (1964). *The managing organizations*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
- Guetzkow, H. & Gyr, J. (1954). An analysis of conflict in decision making groups. *Human Relations*, 7, 367-381.
- Habermas, J. (1971). *Knowledge and human interests*. Boston: Beacon.
- Hage, J. & Aiken, M. (1974). Organizational conflict and consensus. Working paper. University of Wisconsin, Department of Socioligy.
- Hellriegal, D. Slocum, J. W., Jr. & Woodman, R. W. (1992). *Organizational behaviour*. (6th ed.). St. Paul: West Publishing Company.
- James, L. R. & Jones, A. P. (1976). Organizational structure: a review of structural dimensions and their conceptual relationships with individual attitude and behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16, 74-113.

- Janis, I. L. (1971). Groupthink. *Psychology Today*, November, 43-46, 74.
- Jehn, K. A. (1997). A quantitative analysis of conflict types and dimensions in organizational groups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1-27.
- Jehn, K. A. (1992). A multi method examination of the benefits and detriments of intra group conflict. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40, 256-282.
- Jehn, K. A. (1992). *The impact of intra group conflict on effectiveness: A multi method examination of the benefits and detriments of conflict*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University.
- Karambayya, R. & Brett, J. (1989). Managers handling disputes: third party roles and perceptions of fairness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32, 687-705.
- Katz, D. & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations*. (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & sons, Inc.
- Katz, D. & Kahn, R. (1966). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Kelly, J. (1969). *Organizational behavior*. Homewood: Richard D. Irwin.
- Kinard, J. (1988). *Management*. Lexington: D. C. Heath and Company.
- Kolb, D. M. & Bartunek, J. (1992). *Hidden conflict in organizations: uncovering behind-the-scenes disputes*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Kolb, D. M., & Putnam, L. L. (1992). The multiple faces of conflict in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 311-324.
- Kotter, J. (1986). *Why power and conflict are at the core of executive work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Lawrence, P. R. & Lorsch, J. W. (1967). *Organization and environment*. Homewood: Irwin McGraw-Hill
- Lax, D. & Sebenius, J. (1986). *The manager as the negotiator*. New York: Free Press.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1982). Thoughts on the relations between emotion and cognition. *American Psychologist*, 37, 1019-1024.
- Locke, E., Saari, L. M., Shaw, K. N. & Latham, G. P. (1981). Goal setting and task performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, 90, 125-152.
- Mankoe, J. O. (2007). *Educational administration and management in Ghana*. (2nd ed.). Kumasi: Payless Publication Limited.
- Maslow, A. (1965). *Eupsychian management*. Homewood: Richard D. Irwin.
- Mather, L. & Yngvesson, B. (1980-1981). Language, audience and the transformation of disputes. *Law and Society Review*, 15, 755.
- Mazrui, A. (1975). *World culture and the search for human consensus*. Accra: Ghana Publishing Corporation.
- Morris, M. H., Paul, G. W. & Rahtz, D. (1987). Organizational rewards and coalition in the industrial buying center. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 4, 131-146.
- Nwadinigwe, I. P. (2002). *Fundamentals of research methods and statistics*. (2nd ed.). Lagos: Sibon Books Ltd.
- Nwana, O. C. (1992). *Introduction to education research*. Ibadan: Heimeman Educational Books (Nigeria) PLC.
- Owens, R. (1998). *Organizational behavior in education*. Needham Heights: Ally and Bacon.
- Park, O. S., Sims, H. P. & Motowidlo, S. J. (1986). *The thinking organization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Pfeffer, J. & Salancik, G. (1978). *The external control of organizations*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Pickering, P. (2000). *How to manage conflict*. (3rd ed). New Jersey: The Career Press Inc.
- Pondy, L. R. (1969). Varieties of organizational conflicts. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, December, 503.
- Pondy, L. R. (1967). Organizational conflict: concepts and models. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17, 296-320.
- Raiffa, H. (1982). *The art and science of negotiation*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Rico, L. (1964). Organizational conflict: a framework for reappraisal. *Industrial Management Review*, Fall, 67.
- Robbins, S. P. (1974). *Managing organizational conflict: a nontraditional approach*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Russel, J. A. & Fehr, B. (1994). Fuzzy concepts in a fuzzy hierarchy: varieties of anger. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 186-205.
- Russell, J. A. (1978). Evidence of convergent validity on the dimensions of affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 345-356.
- Schein, E. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sheppard, B. H. (1992). Conflict research as schizophrenia: the many faces of organizational conflict. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 325-334.
- Shepard, H. & Mouton, J. (1964). Managing intergroup conflict in industry. *Foundation for Research on Human Behavior*, Ann Arbor, MI.
- Smith, K. K. (1989). The movement of conflict in organizations: the joint dynamics of splitting and triangulation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 34, 1-21.

- Stearns, F. R. (1972). *Anger: psychology, physiology, and pathology*. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas.
- Susskind, L. & Cruikshank, J. (1987). *Breaking the impasse*. New York: Basic Books Ltd.
- Thomas, K. W. (1976). *Conflict and conflict management*. Chicago: Rand McNally, Inc.
- Thomas, K. W., Walton, R. E. & Dutton, J. M. (1972). *Determinants of inter departmental conflict*. Chicago: Rand McNally, Inc.
- Thompson, J. (1967). *Organizations in action*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Tjosvold, D. (1991). Rights and responsibilities of dissent: cooperative conflict. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 4, 13-23.
- Trist, E. (1983). Referent organizations and the development of inter organizational domains. *Human Relations*, 36, 247-268.
- Ury, W., Brett, J. & Goldberg, S. (1988). *Getting disputes resolved: designing systems to cut the costs of conflict*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Walker, W. E. (1986). *Changing organizational culture*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
- Wall, J. A. & Callister, R. R. (1995). Conflict and its management. *Journal of Management*, 3, 515-558.
- Walton, R. E. & Dutton, J. M. (1969). The management of interdepartmental conflict: a model and review. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 14, 73-84.
- Walton, R. E., Dutton, J. M. & Cafferty, T. P. (1969). Organizational context and inter departmental conflict. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 14, 522-542.
- Walton, R. E. & Mckersie, R. B. (1965). *A behavioral theory of labor negotiations*. New York: McGraw- Hill.

Webne-Behrman, H. (1998). The practice of facilitation: Managing group process and solving problems. Retrieved March 21, 2007 from www.ohrd.wisc.edu/onlinetraining/resolution/aboutwhatisit.htm

Wright, P. M. & Noe, R. A. (1996). *Management of organizations*. Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill Co.

Wrong, D. (1979). *Power: its forms, bases and uses*. New York: Harper.

Zajonc, R. B. (1984). On the primacy affect. *American Psychologist*, 39, 117-123.

<http://www.smartmediator.com/medres/pg18.cfm> Retrieved March 21, 2007)

<http://directionservice.org/cadre/section2.cfm> Retrieved March 20, 2007)

http://meta.wikimedia.org/wiki/sources_of_conflict Retrieved March 21, 2007)

<http://www.lifehack.org/articles/lifehack/five-types-of-conflict-management.html> March 21, 2007)

APPENDIX A

AN INVESTIGATION INTO CONFLICT MANAGEMENT MECHANISMS IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE FACULTIES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

This questionnaire intended to solicit information on the conflict management mechanisms in the administration of the faculties of the University of Cape Coast to determine how administrators of the faculties are managing conflict. Since you are in administration, your responses will be of value to the study. The information you provide will be treated as confidential and your identity will not be disclosed to any other person.

PART 1: Personal Background Information

Please respond by ticking the appropriate box. For example []

1. Category of respondent

Senior Member (Teaching) []

Senior Member (Non-Teaching) []

Senior Administrative Staff []

Senior Account/Audit Staff []

2. Gender

Male [] Female []

3. Faculty

Agriculture [] Arts [] Education []

Science [] Social Sciences []

4. How many years have you spent serving the faculties of the University of Cape Coast?

.....

5. What is your current position/status in the faculties of the University of Cape Coast?

.....

PART 2

This part of the questionnaire is to solicit information on the sources and causes of conflict in the administration of the faculties of the University of Cape Coast. Please indicate the frequency of occurrence that each of the following occurs in your area of service by ticking the appropriate box for each item.

Occurrence of conflict between	Often	Sometimes	Never
7. Dean and Faculty Officer			
8. Dean and Heads of Departments			
9. Dean and Lecturers			
10. Dean and Senior Account /Audit Staff			
11. Dean and Senior Administrative Staff			
12. Faculty Officer and Heads of Departments			
13. Faculty Officer and Lecturers			
14. Faculty Officer and Senior Account/Audit Staff			
15. Faculty Officer and Senior Administrative Staff			
16. Heads of Departments and Lecturers			
17. Heads of Departments and Senior Account/Audit Staff			
18. Heads of Departments and Senior Administrative Staff			
19. Lecturers and Senior Account/Audit Staff			
20. Lecturers and Senior Administrative Staff			
21. Senior Account/Audit Staff and Senior Administrative Staff			

22. Apart from the items 7 – 21, please indicate any other source of conflict and the frequency of occurrence in your area of work.

.....

Causes of conflict	Often	Sometimes	Never
23. Competition over limited resources			
24. Differences in goals			
25. Differences in perceptions			
26. Personality difference			
27. Task interdependence			
28. Role ambiguity			
29. Status conflict			
30. Communication barrier			

31. Apart from the items 23 – 30, please indicate any other cause of conflict and the frequency of occurrence in your area of work.

.....

PART 3

This section will gather information on the common types of conflict that occur in the administration of the faculties of the University of Cape Coast. Please indicate the extent to which each of the following occurs in your area of operation by ticking the appropriate box for each item.

Types of conflict	Often	Sometimes	Never
32. Relationship conflict (when there is strong negative emotions and poor communication)			
33. Data conflict (when there is lack of information and information is interpreted differently)			
34. Interest conflict (when there is competition over perceived incompatible needs)			
35. Structural conflict (when there is limited physical resources and organizational changes)			
36. Value conflict (when there is perceived or actual incompatible belief systems)			

37. Apart from the items 32 – 36, please indicate any other type of conflict and the frequency of its occurrence in your outfit.

.....

.....

PART 4

This section aims at gathering responses from respondents in connection with the methods of managing conflict in the administration of the faculties of the University of Cape Coast. Please indicate the extent to which each of the following is employed in your area of operation by ticking the appropriate box for each item.

Conflict Management Style	Often	Someti mes	Never
38. Collaborating (pooling of individual needs and goals toward a common goal “win-win” problem solving)			
39. Compromising (negotiation in which both parties in conflict give up something they want)			
40. Avoiding (views go unexpressed and the conflict festers until it becomes too big to ignore)			
41. Accommodating (one yields his/her needs to those of others, trying to be diplomatic)			
42. Competing (one’s own needs are advocated over the needs of others)			

43. Apart from the items 38 – 42, please indicate any other conflict management technique and the frequency of its usage in your area of work

PART 5

This section seeks to gather information about the effectiveness of the conflict management strategies in place in the faculties of the University of Cape Coast. Please indicate the extent to which each of the following is effective in handling conflict in your outfit by ticking the appropriate box for each item.

Conflict Management Style	Very Effective	Effective	Not Effective
44. Collaborating (pooling of individual needs and goals toward a common goal “win-win problem solving)			
45. Compromising (negotiation in which both parties in conflict give up something they want)			
46. Avoiding (views go unexpressed and the conflict festers until it becomes too big to ignore)			
47. Accommodating (one yields his/her needs to those of others, trying to be diplomatic)			
48. Competing (one’s own needs are advocated over the needs of others)			

49. Apart from the items 44 – 48, please indicate any other conflict management technique and its effectiveness in dealing with conflict situations in your outfit.

.....
.....

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

APPENDIX B

AN INVESTIGATION INTO CONFLICT MANAGEMENT
MECHANISMS IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE
FACULTIES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GUIDE

- Q1. Please can you give any instance to show that conflict exist in your faculty?
- Q2. What are the types of conflict that occurs in your faculty?
- Q3. What are the causes of conflict in your faculty?
- Q4. What mechanisms are in place for managing conflict situations in your faculty if conflict exists?
- Q5. How effective have the conflict resolution mechanisms in your faculty been?

Thank you

