An Investigation into the Management of Departmental Conflicts in Universities in Edo State

Jacinta Isioma Okovido

Abstract— This study was carried out to investigate into the management of conflicts in Universities in Edo State. Three research questions were raised, two of which were answered while one was hypothesized. The research design used was the descriptive survey research. The data were collected using simple random sampling technique of 453 academic staff comprising Heads of Departments (HODs) and general staff in the departments across Universities in Edo State. Two research instruments used for the study were questionnaires titled: 'H.O.D's Factor Structured Opinion on Management of Conflicts in Universities (HFSOMCU)' and 'Staff Factor Structured Opinion on Management of Conflicts in Universities (SFSOMCU)'. The validity of the instruments were subjected to scrutiny and the Cronbach alpha reliability results were 0.87 and 0.81 for SFSOMCU and HFSOMCU research instruments respectively, indicating that the instruments were reliable. The data was analysed using descriptive statistics such as frequency and simple percentages while analysis of variance (ANOVA) and t-test statistics were used for the hypotheses. Results revealed that the dominating strategy was the mostly used conflict management strategy by Heads of Departments. It was discovered that the management strategies by Heads of Departments in resolving conflicts had not been effective. However, significant differences (p < 0.05) were not found to exist in the conflict management strategies of Heads of Departments the various departments. Based on the findings, it was recommended that University authorities should improve on their communication network between the administrators and staff on one hand and among staff on the other hand. This will ensure that all are aware of management policies and actions. This will eliminate alienation and communication gap. Also, University staff should ensure that their selfish interests do not conflict with the University goals as stipulated by the National University Commission (NUC).

Index Terms— conflicts management, university department, university staff, Head of Department.

I. INTRODUCTION

The focal point in educational management today is that schools should be effectively managed. Being a citadel of learning and the bedrock of development of any nation, Universities requires effective management of all and sundry. Achieving this is a demand of a conflict-free atmosphere from administrators in Universities in Nigeria. University administrators such as Vice Chancellor, Deans, and Heads of Departments as well as general staff in the University have varying and interwoven roles they play in ensuring success in university education. Pursuance of these roles by administrators and staff often results in clash, disagreement,

Jacinta Isioma Okovido, University of Benin, Edo State, Nigeria.

tension and frustration. This is conflict at its origin. Conflict is a struggle over values and claims to scarce resources and power in which the aims of the opponents are to neutralize or eliminate the rivals. Obisi (2013) posited that conflict is an expressed struggle between at least two parties who perceive incompatible goals, actions and outcomes from other parties in achieving their goals.

Though, a university is an academic enterprise, a lot of academic effectiveness rests on administrative support machinery. Management of conflict is therefore an important aspect of administrative management in Universities. Hence, administrators like Vice Chancellor, Deans and Heads of Departments are saddled with the responsibility of managing conflicts in their various domains. Within departments in Universities, Heads of Departments are expected to effectively manage conflicts. Galabawa (2000) canonises the Heads of Departments as manager of conflict within their departments in that they exercise control and provide guidance to staff and students in the department. The management competencies of Heads of Departments determine to an extent, the severity of conflicts in each department, irrespective of the origin of the conflict. Departments whose heads have authoritarianism and dogmatism tendencies are particularly conflict-prone (Adeyemi, 2010). Equally prone to conflicts, are those with low self-esteem and a disposition to distrust and suspicion. Todd (2009) found that the variables of age, sex and experience of administrators all have effect on how conflict is managed at the departmental level.

While conflict occurrence have been observed to be inevitable in human organizations, the strategies for managing it have remained topical issue and matters of concern to individuals, groups and scholars. Consequently, the challenge facing most Heads of Departments is how best to manage conflicts from becoming debilitating, while still retaining the full positive potential of competition, creativity, growth and improved job satisfaction among staff. In effectively managing conflict in Universities, a consideration of a wide range of alternative solutions is necessary. Although, there may be existing mechanism and procedures already in place to deal with conflicts at the departmental level whenever they occur, some Heads of Departments who are reactive administrators rise to the situation when conflict occurs. Thus, conflict management does not connote a rigid approach that suits all situations, rather, it involves a series of concerted efforts to prevent and/or arrest a seemingly serious crisis. Therefore, given the importance of managing conflicts effectively in universities, this study is on the management of departmental conflicts in Universities in Edo State of Nigeria.

II. PURPOSE OF STUDY

Specifically, the study objective is to:
- Examine the conflict management strategies adopted by Heads of Departments across Universities in Edo State
- Determine the effectiveness of the management strategies adopted by Heads of Departments in resolving conflicts in their departments
- Determine if there is a difference in the conflict management strategies of Heads of Departments across the departments

III. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The study provides answers to the following research questions:
- What are the conflict management strategies adopted by Heads of Departments across Universities in Edo State?
- How effective are the management strategies by Heads of Departments in resolving conflicts across Universities in Edo State?
- Is there a difference in the conflict management strategies of Heads of Departments across the departments?

IV. CONFLICTS AND ITS MANAGEMENT IN UNIVERSITIES

The term conflict was derived from the Latin word 'conflictus' which means "strike together". Conflict according to Hocker and Wilmot (2005) means clash, contention, confrontation, a battle or struggle or quarrel. Barki and Hahartwick (2004) defined conflict as a struggle over values and claims of scarce status, power and resources, in which the aims of the opponents are to neutralise, injure or eliminate their rivals. Conflict is a natural condition existing in any organization (Bingham, 2004).

However, the success of any organization depends on the ability of conflict recognition and the very way of conflict management (Leung, 2009). Moreover, it is generally acknowledged that conflict represents the most severe test of manager's interpersonal skills (Vokić & Sontor, 2011).

Conflict management strategy implies integration of all factors which can contribute to conflict resolution or its prevention (Tidwell, 2008). Different authors have postulated various approaches to conflict management. Joan (2010), Rahim (2003) and Havenga (2002) identified five conflict management strategies which are explained below:

i. Integrating Strategy: This strategy works by integrating ideas set out by multiple people (Havenga, 2002). The objective of this strategy is to find a creative solution acceptable to everyone. Integrating strategy, though useful, calls for a significant time commitment not appropriate to all conflicts. For example, a business owner can use this strategy to establish policies, but using this strategy in decision-making regarding office supplies wastes time better spent on other activities. In general, administrators use this approach when the goal is to meet as many current needs as possible by using mutual resources. This approach sometimes raises new mutual needs. Integrating strategy can also be used when the goal is to cultivate ownership and commitment.

ii. Compromising Strategy: Rahim (2003) calls it mutual give and take. This approach is used when the goal is to get past the issue and move on together. This strategy typically calls for both sides of a conflict to give up elements of their position in order to establish an acceptable, if not agreeable, solution. This strategy prevails most often in conflicts where the parties hold approximately equivalent power (Havenga, 2002). Business owners frequently employ compromise during contract negotiations with other businesses when each party stands to lose something valuable, such as a customer or necessary service.

iii. Dominating Strategy: This strategy operates as a zero-sum game, in which one side wins and other loses (Joan, 2010). Highly assertive personalities often fall back on dominating strategy as a conflict management strategy (Rahim, 2003). The dominating strategy works best in a limited number of conflicts, such as emergency situations. In general, staff benefit from holding the dominating strategy in reserve for crisis situations and decisions that generate ill-will, such as pay cuts or layoffs (Rahim, 2003). Managers and staff can work to get their way, rather than clarifying and addressing the issue. Dominating personalities love obliging/accommodating personalities. Effective managers use this approach when they have a very strong conviction about their position (Joan, 2010).

iv. Obliging Strategy: This is a strategy that entails giving the opposing side what it wants. For example, an organization that requires 'formal dress code' may institute a "casual Friday" policy as a low-stakes means of keeping the peace with the rank and file (Joan, 2010). Managers can give in to others, sometimes to the extent that they compromise themselves. Effective managers use this approach very sparingly and infrequently, for example, in situations when they know that they will have another more useful approach in the very near future. Usually this approach tends to worsen the conflict over time, and causes conflicts within managers of conflict (Rahim, 2003).

v. Avoiding Strategy: This is a strategy that seeks to put off conflict indefinitely (Havenga, 2002). By delaying or ignoring the conflict, the avoider hopes the problem resolves itself without a confrontation. In some circumstances, avoiding can serve as a profitable conflict management strategy, such as after the dismissal of a popular but unproductive employee. Managers who actively avoid conflict frequently have low esteem or hold a position of low power (Joan, 2010). This strategy is generally used when the issue is trivial or other issues are more pressing. It is also used when confrontation has a high potential for damage or more information is needed. The drawbacks are that important decisions may be made by default (Havenga, 2002).

V. EMPIRICAL REVIEW

Adeyemi and Ademilua (2012) investigated conflicts management strategies and administrative effectiveness in Nigerian universities. The study found that conflict in Nigerian universities occurred frequently. Communication

gap between the authorities and the workers was found to be the major cause of conflict in the universities in the study. The effectiveness of the existing conflict management strategies used in Nigerian universities was at a moderate level. The study recommended that the authorities of Nigerian universities should adopt a blend of management strategies in managing conflicts in their institutions in order to enhance administrative effectiveness.

Vokić and Sontor (2011) study examined the dominant conflict handling style in Croatian organizational setting as well as explore individual characteristics affecting the choice of conflict resolution style of Croatian employees. Study findings revealed that compromising conflict handling style was found to be the most frequently used style among Croatian employees, as well as the dominant style in all 22 subgroups of respondents. Three out of seven individual characteristics surveyed were found to relate to the conflict handling style used by Croatian employees. Specifically, gender, marital status and parenthood were found to relate significantly with the respondents' usage of accommodating strategy, gender and parenthood were found to relate significantly with the respondents' usage of compromising strategy, and parenthood was found to relate significantly with the respondents' usage of avoiding management strategy. Age, education, field of work and hierarchical level were not found to relate with Croatian employees' usage of conflict management strategy.

Chaudhry, Sajjad and Khan (2011) investigated the difference in the selection of employees' conflict management strategies at their workplace across different age groups and departments. The Chi-square test conducted in the study revealed that there is a significant difference in conflict management strategies adopted by the sampled employees. No overall difference of conflict management strategies was found between upper versus lower age group and support versus technical staff. However, younger employees choose compromising approach significantly higher than older employees.

Shweta and Shilpa (2010) explored the relationship between gender and conflict resolution styles among aspiring Indian managers. The empirical results revealed that the aspiring Indian managers generally adopt accommodating style of conflict resolution, followed by avoiding style, irrespective of their gender. Moreover, there is a significant difference in the competing style of conflict resolution mode between the two genders. Males are more competing than females, a phenomenon that may be attributed to the socio-cultural milieu and Indian ethos.

VI. METHODOLOGY

The survey research design was adopted for this study. This design was used since the study is centred on opinions and perceptions of administrators and staff in University

departments on the management of conflicts. The population of study comprised Heads of Departments (HOD) and staff in NUC accredited Universities in Edo State. The study population was 11,696 comprising of 239 HODs (management staff) and 11,457 general staff (subordinate staff) in a total of seven (7) NUC-accredited universities in Edo State. Three of the Universities representing 43% of Universities in Edo State were sampled in this study. The selected Universities are University of Benin, Benin City (UNIBEN), Ambrose Ali University, Ekpoma (AAU), and Igbinedion University, Okada. Consequently, a total of 453 staff were randomly sampled from the selected Universities comprising of 39 HOD's and 414 departmental staff. The study's sample size constituted 30% of HOD's and 5% of staff from the study population.

Two research instruments were used in this study to generate data, one for HODs and the other for staff in the departments. Each of the two instruments were designed in two (2) sections; section A and B. Section A was used to collect demographic data on the respondents while section B sought information from the respondents on the conflict management strategies adopted by HOD's and the effectiveness of management strategies adopted by HOD's. The responses were rated on a four (4) point rating scale ranging from Strongly Agree (SA) = 4, Agree (A) = 3, Disagree (D) = 2 to Strongly Disagree (SD) = 1. The instruments were subjected to face and content validity, and validated by two experts in the field of study. The reliability of the two research instruments was 0.87 and 0.81, thus indicating that the instruments are reliable.

Data collected from the respondents were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as frequency, percentage and means. The decision point was based on the mean such that any calculated mean equal to or greater than 2.5 was regarded as agreed, whereas any calculated mean less than 2.5 was regarded as disagreed. Inferentially, analysis of variance (ANOVA) and independent t-test statistics were employed in the study with P-values of less than 0.05 considered to be significant. The data analysis was done with the aid of IBM SPSS version 24.0, a statistical analysis software package.

VII. DATA ANALYSIS

Out of the four hundred and fifty-three (453) administered questionnaires, 390 (86%) responses were used for the analysis comprising of 30 HOD's (management staff) and 360 departmental staff (subordinate staff). In this section of the study, the data analysis was based on answering the research questions raised.

Research Question 1: What are the conflict management strategies adopted by Heads of Departments across Universities in Edo State?

Responses to the 29 items in table 1 were used to answer research question one (1)

Table 1: Table showing the conflict management strategies adopted by Heads of Departments

S/N	ITEMS	SA	A	D	SD	Mean	Decision
1	My H.O.D tries to investigate an issue with me to find a solution acceptable to us	62 (15.9%)	182 (46.7%)	127 (32.6%)	19 (4.9%)	2.74	Accept
2	My H.O.D collaborates with me to come up with decisions acceptable to us	69 (17.7%)	256 (65.6%)	65 (16.7%)	-	3.01	Accept

3	My H.O.D tries to work with me to find solutions to a problem which satisfy our expectations	79 (20.3%)	218 (55.9%)	82 (21%)	11 (2.8%)	2.94	Accept
4	My H.O.D tries to work with me for a proper understanding of a problem	102 (26.2%)	212 (54.4%)	57 (14.6%)	19 (4.9%)	3.02	Accept
5	My H.O.D exchanges accurate information with me to solve a problem together	78 (20%)	202 (51.8%)	107 (27.4%)	3 (0.8%)	2.91	Accept
6	My H.O.D tries to integrate his/her ideas with those of mine to come up with a decision jointly	64 (16.4%)	164 (42.1%)	162 (41.5%)	-	2.75	Accept
7	My H.O.D usually accommodates the wishes of mine	97 (24.9%)	94 (24.1%)	91 (23.3%)	108 (27.7%)	2.46	Reject
8	My H.O.D gives in to the wishes of mine	64 (16.4%)	126 (32.3%)	130 (33.3%)	70 (17.9%)	2.47	Reject
9	My H.O.D generally tries to satisfy the needs of mine	47 (12.1%)	113 (29%)	130 (33.3%)	100 (25.6%)	2.27	Reject
10	My H.O.D tries to satisfy the expectations of mine	67 (17.2%)	103 (26.4%)	152 (39%)	68 (17.4%)	2.43	Reject
11	My H.O.D usually allows concessions to me	26 (6.7%)	117 (30%)	149 (38.2%)	98 (25.1%)	2.18	Reject
12	My H.O.D often goes along with the suggestions of mine	39 (10%)	82 (21%)	199 (51%)	70 (17.9%)	2.23	Reject
13	My H.O.D usually proposes a middle ground for breaking deadlocks	39 (10%)	153 (39.2%)	198 (50.8%)	-	2.59	Accept
14	My H.O.D tries to find a middle course to resolve an impasse	82 (21%)	180 (46.2%)	105 (26.9%)	23 (5.9%)	2.82	Accept
15	My H.O.D negotiates with me so that a compromise can be reached	70 (17.9%)	178 (45.6%)	122 (31.3%)	20 (5.1%)	2.76	Accept
16	My H.O.D uses "give and take" so that a compromise can be made	59 (15.1%)	173 (44.4%)	139 (35.6%)	19 (4.9%)	2.70	Accept
17	My H.O.D considers relationship very important	57 (14.6%)	154 (39.5%)	179 (45.9%)	-	2.69	Accept
18	My H.O.D uses his/her authority to make a decision in his/her favour	152 (39%)	187 (47.9%)	38 (9.7%)	13 (3.3%)	3.23	Accept
19	My H.O.D uses his/her influence to get his/her ideas accepted	122 (31.3%)	236 (60.5%)	21 (5.4%)	11 (2.8%)	3.20	Accept
20	My H.O.D is generally firm in pursuing his/her side of the issue	243 (62.3%)	127 (32.6%)	20 (5.1%)	-	3.57	Accept
21	My H.O.D sometimes uses his/her power to win a competitive situation of a problem	168 (43.1%)	219 (56.2%)	1 (0.3%)	2 (0.5%)	3.42	Accept
22	My H.O.D often thinks that subordinates lack expertise to make technical decisions	188 (48.2%)	170 (43.6%)	25 (6.4%)	7 (1.8%)	3.38	Accept
23	My H.O.D usually implement unpopular course of action in the department	179 (45.9%)	162 (41.5%)	41 (10.5%)	8 (2.1%)	3.31	Accept
24	My H.O.D tries to keep his/her disagreement to himself/herself in order to avoid hard feelings	155 (39.7%)	194 (49.7%)	20 (5.1%)	21 (5.4%)	3.24	Accept
25	My H.O.D avoids an encounter with me	126 (32.3%)	223 (57.2%)	39 (10%)	2 (0.5%)	3.21	Accept
26	My H.O.D tries to stay away from disagreement	132 (33.8%)	246 (63.1%)	12 (3.1%)	-	3.31	Accept
27	My H.O.D tries to avoid unpleasant exchanges with me	84 (21.5%)	198 (50.8%)	97 (24.9%)	11 (2.8%)	2.91	Accept
28	My H.O.D attempts to avoid being "put on the spot" and try to keep our conflict to himself/herself	101 (25.9%)	244 (62.6%)	43 (11%)	2 (0.5%)	3.14	Accept
29	My H.O.D usually avoids open discussion of his/her differences with me	116 (29.7%)	249 (63.8%)	6 (1.5%)	19 (4.9%)	3.18	Accept

Source: Researchers' computation using SPSS

Table 2: Summary of the conflict management strategies adopted by H.O.D's and their rankings

s/n	Conflict Management Strategy	Measured as:	Mean	Rank
1	Integrating Strategy	Items 1 to 6	2.90	3rd
2	Obliging Strategy	Items 7 to 12	2.34	5th
3	Compromise Strategy	Items 13 to 17	2.71	4th
4	Dominating Strategy	Items 18 to 23	3.35	1st
5	Avoiding Strategy	Items 24 to 29	3.17	2nd

Results presented in table 2 shows the conflict management strategies as highlighted by the respondents and their respective rankings. Among the five conflict management strategies, four were agreed upon by the respondents as often employed by Heads of Departments. These include integrating strategy, compromise strategy, dominating strategy, and avoiding strategy. Heads of departments were found to rarely use obliging strategy in managing conflict in their departments. In terms of ranking, dominating strategy with a mean score of 3.35 was found to be the mostly used by Heads of Departments followed by avoiding strategy with a mean score of 3.17 and then integrating strategy with a mean score of 2.90. The least used management strategy by Heads of Departments are compromise strategy (mean = 2.71) and obliging strategy (mean = 2.34).

Research Question 2: How effective are the management strategies by Heads of Departments in resolving conflicts across Universities in Edo State?

Responses to the 5 items in table 3 were used to answer research question two (2)

Table 3: The effectiveness of strategies used by Heads of Departments in resolving conflicts

S/N	ITEMS	SA	A	D	SD	Mean	Decision
1	Head of department failed in the way conflict had been managed in the department	3 (0.8%)	93 (23.8%)	119 (30.5%)	175 (44.9%)	1.81	Reject
2	Head of department had allowed conflicts to degenerate to crises in the way they had been managed	27 (6.9%)	170 (43.6%)	193 (49.5%)	-	2.57	Accept
3	Head of department had been on bad terms with one or two staff in the department after each conflict	108 (27.7%)	152 (39%)	70 (17.9%)	60 (15.4%)	2.79	Accept
4	One conflict had always led to another in the department	144 (36.9%)	186 (47.7%)	38 (9.7%)	22 (5.6%)	3.16	Accept
5	Better alternative strategies in managing conflicts could have been used	164 (42.1%)	169 (43.3%)	40 (10.3%)	17 (4.4%)	3.23	Accept
	MEAN INDEX					2.71	

Source: Researchers' computation using SPSS

The items in table 3 were constructed such that a mean score of 2.5 and above indicated ineffectiveness in the management strategy of Heads of Departments. As can be seen in table 3, the respondents accepted items 2, 3, 4, and 5 while item 1 was rejected. This revealed that the respondents are of the opinion that conflicts have not been managed effectively in their departments. However, majority of the respondents absolved their HOD as having failed in managing conflicts by rejecting item 1. The mean index of all 5 items in table 3 was computed as 2.71, thus indicative that the management strategies by Heads of Departments in resolving conflicts had not been effective.

Research Question 3: Is there a difference in the conflict management strategies of Heads of Departments across the departments?

Research question 3 was hypothesized as follows:

H_0: There is no significant difference in the conflict management strategies of Heads of Departments

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) statistics was used to test the above stated hypothesis at a significance level of 0.05. Table 4 below contain the ANOVA test result:

Table 4: Table showing the ANOVA test on conflict management strategies across experience in years

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.467	1	.467	1.288	.257
Within Groups	140.825	388	.363		
Total	141.292	389			

Source: Researchers' computation using SPSS

Result: F (389) = 1.288, p = 0.257. Since p > 0.05, we do not reject the null hypothesis; the researcher thus concludes that there is no significant difference in the conflict management strategies of Heads of Departments.

VIII.   DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Study findings for research question one (1) as shown in tables 1 and 2 revealed that Heads of Departments employ a range of strategies in managing conflicts in their departments. Dominating strategy with a mean score of 3.35 was found to be mostly used by Heads of Departments followed by avoiding strategy with a mean score of 3.17 and then integrating strategy with a mean score of 2.90. The least used management strategy by Heads of Departments are compromise strategy (mean = 2.71) and obliging strategy (mean = 2.34). The empirical results of Shweta and Shilpa (2010) study revealed that Indian managers generally adopt accommodating style of conflict resolution, followed by avoiding style, irrespective of their gender. Contrary to this study finding, Vokić and Sontor (2011) found that compromising conflict handling style was the most frequently used style among Croatian employees, as well as the dominating style in all 22 subgroups of respondents in their study.

Results obtained from this study as regards research question two (2) revealed that conflicts have not been managed effectively in Universities. This is due to the fact that the mean index of all 5 items measuring effectiveness of the management strategies employed by HOD is 2.71, thus indicating that the management strategies by Heads of Departments in resolving conflicts had not been effective. In the study by Adeyemi and Ademilua (2012), they discovered that the effectiveness of the existing conflict management strategies used in Nigerian universities was at a poor level.

It was revealed in this study that there is no significant difference in the conflict management strategies of Heads of Departments across departments in Universities. As regards differences in the conflict management strategies, Chaudhry, Sajjad and Khan (2011) found that no overall difference of conflict management strategies between departments. According to Vokić and Sontor (2011) study, younger employees choose compromising approach significantly higher than older employees. In Shweta and Shilpa (2010) study, no overall difference of conflict management strategies was found between support staff versus technical staff.

IX.   CONCLUSION

It can be clearly seen from the opinions of the respondents to this study that conflict is inevitable in Universities. The results of the study also confirmed that majority of the respondents have experienced one form of conflict or the other from one point in time to another in the course of performing their tasks. From the study findings, a wide range of conflict management strategies were identified which may be used to deal with conflicts at various levels. Therefore, administrators like H.O.D's are expected to ascertain the presence of conflict in their domains, its basic sources, the level at which it manifest itself, its degree of intensity and the

ways of furthering the objectives of conflict management. However, results showed that various conflict management strategies are being used by HOD's in managing conflicts in departments but the strategy adopted in each instance depends on the nature of the conflict and the administrator involved. Dominant strategy was found to be the mostly used conflict management strategy and was discovered not to be effective enough. The findings in this study calls for University administrators to be more open to handling of conflicts. Considering the findings of this study, it was concluded that conflict management strategies are critical variables in administrative effectiveness in Nigerian universities.

X.   RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations were made:

1. Since a conflict free atmosphere is the best predictor of administrative effectiveness as evident from this study, university administrators in Nigeria should adopt a blend of management strategies in managing conflicts in their institutions for higher administrative effectiveness.
2. University authorities should improve on their communication network between the administrators and staff on one hand and among staff on the other hand. This will ensure that all are aware of management policies and actions. This will eliminate alienation and communication gap.
3. Individual aims and University goals should not be congruent. University staff should ensure that their selfish interests do not conflict with the University goals as stipulated by the National University Commission (NUC). This will foster harmony in achieving the set University goals.
4. The academic and professional administrators in Universities should continue to demonstrate spirit of tolerance so as to ensure the smooth running of the University. Simple conflict situation should not be allowed to generate into crisis.
5. Universities' constitution, laws and regulations should be made available to both academic and professional administrators and all staff so as to avoid communication gap and conflict within the system.

REFERENCES

[1] Adeyemi, J.K. (2010). Conflict management strategies and administrative effectiveness in Nigerian Universities. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies (JETERAPS)*, 3 (3): 368-375.
[2] Adeyemi, T.O & Ademilua, S.O. (2012). *Corporate management; issues and* strategies. Enugu: Precision Printers.
[3] Barki, T. & Hahartwick, J. (2004). Conceptualizing the construct of interpersonal conflict. *International Journal of Conflict Management,* 15 (3): 216-244.
[4] Bingham, L. B. (2004). Employment dispute resolution: The case for mediation. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 22: 145–174.
[5] Borisoff, D. & Victor, D.A. (1998). *Conflict Management: A Communication Skills Approach*. Needham Heights: Oslo, Norway.
[6] Brett, J.M. (2007). *Negotiating globally: How to Negotiate Deals, Resolve Disputes and Make Decisions*. San Francisco: Jossey Bassy.

[7]   Chaudhry, A.A., Sajjad, M. & Khan, I. (2011). Employees' conflict management strategies and demography: A case of Pakistan. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5 (9): 3549-3555.

[8]   Galabawa, J.C. (2000). Perspective in Educational Management and Administration. Dar es Salaam: *Institute of Kiswahil Research,* 5 (2): 41-53.

[9]   Havenga, W. (2002). *Conflict management within a local government environment. M.A dissertation, Potchefstroom University*. A comparative analysis of conflict dynamics within private and public sector organizations. PhD thesis, Potchefstroom University.

[10] Hocker, J.I. & Wilmot, W.W. (2005). Interpersonal Conflict Dubuque, IOWA: Wmc. Brown Publisher.

[11] Joan, M.A. (2010). *Antecedents & Consequences of Intergroup Conflict Among Nurses in Acute Care Setting*. A PhD Thesis, University of Toroto.

[12] Leung, Y.F. (2009). *Conflict Management and Educational Intelligence.* Unpublished Thesis for Degree of Business Administration, Southern Cross University, Lismor.

[13] Obisi, C. (2013). *Understanding and Managing Conflicts in the Workplace.* Lagos: Interpublishers.

[14] Rahim, M.A. (2003). Measurement of organizational conflict. *Journal of General Psychology,* 109:188-99.

[15] Shweta & Shilpa Jain (2010). Gender Perspective on Conflict Resolution Styles of Aspiring Indian Managers. *General Psychology,* 11:10-19

[16] Tidwell, A.C. (2008). *Conflict Resolved? A Critical Assessment of Conflict Resolution.* New York. A Cassell Imprint.

[17] Todd, J. M. (2009). *Mediation and the dynamics for collective bargaining.* Washington: Bureau of National Affairs.

[18] Vokić, N.P & Sontor, S. (2011). Conflict Management Styles in Croatian Enterprises: The Relationship between Individual Characteristics and Conflict Handling Styles. *Working paper series*, 09-05