UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

PERCEIVED ROLE OF CIRCUIT SUPERVISORS IN MANAGING CONFLICTS IN BASIC SCHOOLS IN THE KUMASI METROPOLIS.

HANS CHRISTIAN ANDERSON

2010

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST

PERCEIVED ROLE OF CIRCUIT SUPERVISORS IN MANAGING CONFLICTS IN BASIC SCHOOLS IN THE KUMASI METROPOLIS.

BY

HANS CHRISTIAN ANDERSON

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION OF THE FACULTY OF EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST, IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF MASTER OF EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT DEGREE.

AUGUST, 2010

DECLARATION

Candidate's Declaration

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

Candidate's Signature..... Date: 11/08/10

Name: Hans Christian Anderson

Supervisor's Declaration

I hereby declare that the presentation of the thesis was supervised in accordance with the guidelines on supervision of thesis laid down by the University of Cape Coast.

Supervisor's Signature: ..... Date: 11/08/10

Name: P.K. Baah

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the Perceived Role of Circuit Supervisors in Managing Conflicts in Basic Schools in the Kumasi Metropolis. It also examines the intensity of conflict in the circuits and the extent to which conflict management behaviours demonstrated by the Circuit Supervisors contribute to or reduce the amount of conflicts that arise in Basic Schools in the Metropolis. Information was obtained from both head teachers and teachers numbering 664 made up of 63 headteachers and 601 teachers from 45 schools sampled from 189 Basic Schools in the Metropolis, using a five- point Likert Scale Questionnaire. Data analysis produced a significant negative correlation between conflict prevention techniques demonstrated by Circuit Supervisors and conflict intensity in the schools. That is, the more a Circuit Supervisor exhibited conflict prevention techniques, the less the intensity of conflict that existed in the schools in the circuits. There was also a significant negative correlation between conflict resolution techniques employed by Circuit Supervisors and conflict intensity. Thus, Circuit Supervisors who employed rational approaches to conflict resolution experienced reduced levels of conflict intensity, whilst those who used force in resolving conflict had high levels of conflict intensity in the schools. Among the recommendations made were the following: Circuit Supervisors should avoid such tendencies as being too authoritarian that could lead to conflicting situations. They should involve the subordinates in decision-making and should be concerned with subordinates' welfare. To the greatest extent possible, the final resolution of conflict should advance the interest of all parties.

AKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am highly grateful to all those who offered me valuable advice and assistance in diverse ways for making this work possible. I would, nonetheless, like to express my profound gratitude to Mr. P.K. Arhin, Deputy Registrar, Division of Human Resource, University of Cape Coast; who was also my lecturer in Student-Personnel Services (SPS) and the Principal Supervisor of this thesis for his constructive criticisms, directions and useful suggestions.

I am greatly indebted to Mr. C. T. Mensah, a senior colleague at the Kumasi Metropolitan Education Directorate for painstakingly reading through the entire work and offering useful suggestions as well as assisting with the work on the computer.

I would also like to thank all Headteachers, Teachers and colleague Circuit Supervisors and more especially, Mr. Thomas Arthur, a senior and experienced Deputy Director of Education formally in charge of Supervision for many years, and also the Officer-In-Charge (O.I.C.) of Asokwa Sub-Metropolitan Education Directorate in the Kumasi Metropolis for their immense assistance and encouragement in diverse ways. To Miss Gladys Nontwiri (staff, Subin Sub-Metro Education Office) and Mr. David Odoom (National Service Personnel), both of whom are instructors at the Sub-Metro Education Office Computer Centre, I am sincerely grateful for their great help in the typing of the work. I wish, also to acknowledge the work of Mr. Anthony Annan (a.k.a. Mr. Hammer),

Head of Mathematics Department and Mr. Addo (alias K) of the same Department at Kumasi Anglican Senior High School for their guidance on the analysis of the data.

Finally, I appreciate the assistance and encouragement given me by my closest pal and colleague, Mr. Collins Gyimah Asante of Kumasi Metropolitan Education Directorate and that of my family.

DEDICATION

To my parents, my entire family and all loved ones for their sacrifices, support and understanding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background to the study

Conflicts and disputes are inseparable in life. Societies, communities, organisations or interpersonal relationships often experience one conflict situation or another as part of daily interactions. No organisation, whether simple or complex, can survive without conflict and disciplinary problems. However, it should not continue to be without resolving or managing them.

Conflicts are inevitable when and wherever people come together in groups to pursue various goals. Conflict manifests itself in-group setting such as school with diversity of interest groups including professionals, semi-professionals, skilled and technical as well as student population, parents and government officials demanding that educational policies be implemented. In most cases, it is the type of educational structures, which can make institution's environment prone to constant confrontation.

"Conflict occurs when there is a clash between opposing views. Conflicts can be constructive and disruptive. Competitive conflict results when employees seek limited resources. Anger during conflicts causes disruption, such that employees may abandon pursuit of organisational goals and engage in irrational acts of aggression." Nnadi (1997, page 82).

Among students, conflicts may arise from the socio-economic background of parents. Some may have everything they want at their disposal at home, but do not have facilities or opportunities at school, so they may find it difficult to cope or adjust. That becomes a source of conflict. In mixed schools, student male-

female relationships and male teacher-female student relationships may also cause conflicts.

In school supervision, the Head teacher's and Circuit Supervisor's relationship with both teachers and students as well as with the community or other stakeholders can cause conflicts. Teacher's negative attitude to work, use of intemperate language and lack of self-control as well as poor teaching methods or ineffectiveness and incompetence can also lead to conflicts. It is essential for Headteachers and Circuit Supervisors to develop the ability to resolve and manage conflicts if organisational (educational) goals are to be adequately met.

They also have to rely on a combination of factors, one of which is the authority inherent in their official capacity as supervisors and for that matter school administrators and managers. Then there is expert influence, which results from work-related knowledge and skill.

It is therefore clear that to be effective in conflict management in basic schools both the Circuit Supervisors and the Headteachers must be conversant with the dynamics of Human Management.

Statement of the Problem

The manner in which conflicts are resolved or managed determines whether the consequence will be functional or dysfunctional.

The problem is: "How do Circuit Supervisors of Basic Schools in the Kumasi Metropolis manage unavoidable conflicts which form part and parcel of their work as supervisors? How do they create conducive and enabling environment for

effective teaching and learning rather than creating chaotic conditions that will lead to a dysfunctional school system?"

In other words, do all Circuit Supervisors of Basic Schools in the Kumasi Metropolis have the ability to manage conflicts effectively in their schools to decrease tensions associated with them and positively influence effectiveness and efficiency?

Purpose of the Study

The objective of the study is to identify and analyse conflict situations and the frequency of such conflicts in Basic Schools in the Kumasi Metropolis.

The study will also find out the conflict management behaviours exhibited by Circuit Supervisors.

Moreover, the study aims at discovering how such conflict management behaviours exhibited by the Circuit Supervisors increase or decrease conflict intensity in these schools.

Research Questions

The following questions are serving as guides for the study:

1. To what extent do conflicts occur in Basic Schools in the Kumasi Metropolis?
2. What types of conflicts are common in the Basic Schools in the Metropolis?
3. What conflict prevention techniques do Circuit Supervisors of Basic Schools in the Kumasi Metropolis demonstrate?

4. How do Circuit Supervisors of Basic Schools resolve conflicts that arise in their schools?

5. How do the conflict management behaviours of Circuit Supervisors of Basic Schools contribute to conflict intensity in the Kumasi Metropolis?

6. Are Circuit Supervisors well-trained to manage conflicts in schools?

7. To what extent are Circuit Supervisors playing their role in conflict management?

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were formulated and tested:

1. There is no significant relationship between conflict management techniques demonstrated by Circuit Supervisors and the existence of conflicts in Basic Schools in the Kumasi Metropolis as perceived by the respondents.
2. There is no significant correlation between conflict resolution techniques employed by Circuit Supervisors and the existence of conflicts in Basic Schools in the Kumasi Metropolis.

Significance of the Study

This study has some educational significance. It is targeted towards identifying and analysing the types and causes of conflicts in basic schools in the Kumasi Metropolis. It is believed that this could help Basic School Circuit Supervisors in the Metropolis to be aware of conflict situations in the schools and enable them take steps to minimize their occurrence. The study could also help

Circuit Supervisors gain effective conflict management skills for positive returns from conflict situations. It may also help prepare prospective supervisors to be aware of the various conflict situations they are likely to encounter in their chosen career.

Delimitation

This study was restricted to Basic Schools in the Kumasi Metropolis in the Ashanti Region of Ghana. This was because the researcher lives and works in this area. The researcher works with the Kumasi Metropolitan Directorate of Education as a Circuit Supervisor in charge of Asawasi Circuit, one of the sixteen (16) circuits in the Metropolis. It was convenient travelling through the Metropolis to undertake the study. Furthermore, only interpersonal conflicts, that is, conflicts between two or more individuals were studied.

The Conflict situations studied under interpersonal conflict were conflicts between the Circuit Supervisor and the Teachers and the Headteachers as well, conflict between Basic School Headteachers and Teachers, and conflict among teachers.

Both constructive and destructive conflicts lead to change, innovation, wise decision-making and progress in performance as well as improved interpersonal relationship. However, destructive conflict wastes resources, breeds confusion, results in dissatisfaction and militates against goal attainment. As a result, the researcher studied the management of destructive conflicts to find out whether Circuit Supervisors and could achieve positive results from it. Thus, the study did not include management of constructive conflicts.

Management of conflicts between school authorities and students and role conflict was also left out. Their inclusion in the study would have made it too broad an undertaking.

It was the Headteachers' and teachers' perception of the Circuit Supervisors' conflict management abilities that was being studied. The findings of the study would be limited to the area of research and aspect studied. However, educational districts or metropolis with similar characteristics might find the outcome of the study beneficial.

Limitations

The study was aimed at identifying conflict situations and the management of such conflicts in basic schools by Circuit Supervisors. The main limitations were time constraints, inadequate material and financial resources. The study was limited to forty-five (45) public basic schools sampled from the fifteen (15) out of the sixteen (16) circuits in the Kumasi Metropolis. That is, three (3) schools in each circuit. One circuit, the Asawasi Circuit was excluded from the study because that was where the researcher worked as a Circuit Supervisor and also schools used for the pilot study were in that circuit. The limited area of study, i.e. limited to Kumasi Metropolis alone, coupled with the sampling procedure could decrease the tendency to generalise the findings. It is therefore necessary for other researchers to embark on similar studies in other districts in the region and other regions of the country. This will help confirm or otherwise the findings of the study and to generalise them (i.e. the findings) to other parts of the country.

Definition of Terms

In the context of this study, the following terms are defined: -

Conflict**:** Refers to the expressed struggle of interconnected parties who perceive incompatible goals and interference from one or more parties in attaining those goals.

Subordinate: refers to the teaching staff.

Superordinate refer to the Circuit Supervisor.

Staff: refers to the teachers of the schools studied. Even though the headmaster / mistress could be classified as a member of the teaching staff, the concept as used in the study excluded the headmasters and headmistress who are normally regarded as administrators.

Administrator: in the study refers to the headmaster or headmistress.

Manager: as used in the study refers to the headmaster as a policy maker and one who controls and monitors affairs in the school.

Role: refers to a set of expectations and behaviours associated with a given position in the school being studied.

Interpersonal conflict: refers to conflict between two or more individuals.

Subordinate conflict: refers to conflict between the headmaster / headmistress and a teacher or a group of teachers over whom the headmaster has authority or responsibility.

Lateral conflict: refers to conflict between teachers or group of teachers who have equal authority.

Superordinate conflict: refers to conflict between the headmaster and a person or group that has authority over the headmaster.

Role conflict: occurs when an individual is subjected to incompatible role expectations.

Constructive conflict: refers to the type of conflict that leads to change, innovation, decision-making and problem solving.

Destructive Conflict: is that type of conflict that hampers goal attainment, wastes resources, produces confusion, demoralizes personnel and yields dissatisfaction.

Conflict Management: indicate efforts designed to prevent, ameliorate or resolve disagreements between and among individuals and groups.

Win-lose: in conflict management refers to the situation where one party wins and one loses in a conflict.

Lose-lose: refers to the situation where both parties lose in the deal.

Win-win: refers to the situation where both parties are satisfied with the outcome of the conflict.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Conflict management has attracted the attention of many scholars. There is a number of literature dealing with the subject. In this chapter, some of the relevant and related literature is reviewed to form the theoretical framework of the study.

The Review of Literature is organized under the following sub-headings:

- Definition of conflict
- Destructive Conflict
- Constructive Conflict
- Types of conflict
- Causes and Levels of Conflict
- Conflict Management
- Communication Style of Conflict Management.
- Prevention of Conflicts
- Resolution of Conflicts
- Definition of Supervision
- Who is a Supervisor?
- Management of Education at the Circuit Level
- The Circuit Supervisor
- The Circuit Supervisor as Curriculum Advisor and Teacher Supporter
- The Circuit Supervisor as Evaluator of Teaching and Learning
- Functions of a Circuit Supervisor.

- Purpose of School Visits

Definition of Conflict

'Conflict occurs between two persons or groups when values they cherish or believe in are undermined or threatened. This occurs in every situation where something or somebody is perceived to be interfering with the achievement of a desired value or goal' –Ghana Education Service (GES) – Information, Education and Communication (IEC) Messages and Training Manual (page 48).

Deutsch, (1973) states that conflict exist whenever an action by one person or group prevents, obstructs, interferes with, injures, or in some way, makes less likely or less effective the desired action of another person or group (page 10). Kriesburg, (1973) defines conflict as a relationship between two or more parties who believe they have incompatible goals, (page 17).

Steers, (1991), in his book, 'Introduction to Organisational Behavior'; (page 514) defines conflict as the process in which individuals or groups feel that other individuals or groups have frustrated, or are about to frustrate, their plans, goals, beliefs or activities. In other words, conflict involves situations in which the expectations or actual goal-directed behaviours of one person or group are blocked; or about to be blocked-by another person or group.

Conflict is the expressed struggle of inter-connected parties who perceive incompatible goals and interference from one or more parties in attaining those goals. Folger et al, 1993; Hocker & Wilmot, 1998 state that, conflict is a disagreement over social issues, beliefs and teachings (ideologies) or specific behaviours that occur when the aspirations of two (or more) parties have divergent interests concerning the same issues. Kotter, (1997) states that conflict

is an intrinsic part of a setting where individuals struggle to further an agenda, to advance above and beyond others, and to maintain control. (page 680). McShane and Von Glinow (2000), maintain that conflict is a process in which one party perceives that its interests are being opposed or negatively affected by another party, (page 402). Robbins (1983) notes that certain commonalities among most conflict definitions are the concepts of opposition, scarcity and blockage. He adds that there is also the assumption that there are two or more parties whose interests or goals appear to be incompatible (page 336).

Firstly, conflict is an expressed struggle between two or more parties: - for a conflict to exist, one has to indicate his or her unhappiness to another person (party) in some fashion. Secondly, conflict involves inter connected parties. The behaviour of one party must have consequences for the other party. Thirdly, perceived interference from parties who pursue incompatible goals is necessary for conflict to occur. For two people to have a conflict, one or both must interfere with the other's goal attainment.

Perception plays an important role in conflict. Goals may not be incompatible, and goal attainment, may not be interfered with by anyone. Nevertheless, if one acts as if one's goals are incompatible with one's partner's goals and as if one's partner is trying to interfere with one's goal achievement, conflict will occur until perceptions are clarified and accepted. To most people, conflict always seems to be destructive. Conflict can make us angry, fearful, frustrated, and upset. These are feelings we don't usually like to experience, especially if the feelings are intense and frequent. Our communication however, determines to what degree conflict will be destructive or constructive.

Destructive Conflict

According to Wilmot & Hocker 1998, escalation, retaliation, domination, competition, cross- complaining and rigidity characterise destructive conflict. When conflict is destructive, it spirals out of control. Participants lose sight of the initial goals. Hurting the other party becomes a primary focus. Complaints by one party are countered by complaints from the other party in a competitive one-upsmanship contest. This cross complaining is the most dysfunctional thing that people in conflict do because it escalates conflict. The ability to prevent the escalation of a conflict distinguishes the competent from the incompetent communicator.

Constructive Conflict

Conflict is sometimes constructive, not destructive. Constructive conflict is characterised by 'a we-orientation, cooperation, and flexibility', Wilmot & Hocker, 1998. The focus is on achieving a solution that is mutually satisfactory to all parties in the conflict. Participants work together flexibly to deal effectively with their conflicts by controlling and deescalating them.

Dialectics within relationships especially close relationships, enviably produce conflict. Dialogue is the chief means used to address this conflict effectively. Destructive conflict shuts off dialogue, whereas constructive conflict embraces it. Tannen (1998), explains: "In dialogue, there is opposition, yes, but no head-on collision. Smashing heads does not open minds... Even cooperation, after all, is not the absence of conflict but a means of managing conflict". (page 26).

Constructive conflict does not mean we have to feel all warm and fuzzy as we work out our differences with others. Constructive conflict can be contentious, frustrating and difficult. It is constructive; however, because the communication is competent, that is, it is knowledgeable, skilful, sensitive, committed, and ethical. We cement our relationship when we reconcile our conflicts cooperatively and supportively. When we try to impose our will on others in a competitive test of power and control, we propel ourselves toward the relationships graveyard where the pathetic remains of a once happy relationship are buried for eternity.

Types of Conflicts

In order to understand the roots of conflict, one needs to know what type of conflict is present. Different scholars classify conflict into different types. Steers (1991), identifies at least four types of conflict. These are goal conflict, cognitive conflict, affective and behavioural conflicts.

- **Goal conflict**: Goal conflict can occur when one person or group desires a different outcome than others do. This is simply a clash over whose goals are going to be pursued. In the school setting for example, if teachers and headteachers pursue a different agenda other than the Ghana Education Service's (GES) set goals for basic schools; and Circuit Supervisors insist on adherence to GES regulations or vice versa, goal conflict is said to be at play.
- **Cognitive Conflict**: Cognitive conflict can result when one person or group holds ideas or opinions that are inconsistent with those of others**.** Cognitive conflict is common in decision-making. It comes in several

varieties and may be either task-related or emotional. Task-related (cognitive) conflict involves debates over ideas-disagreements about underlying assumptions, analysis and criteria that go into making a choice. In decision making in schools between headteachers and teachers, and even among teachers; cognitive or task- related conflict may result when parties exhibit inconsistency in a decision-making process.

- **Affective conflict**: This type of conflict emerges when one person's or group's feelings or emotions (attitudes) are incompatible with those of others. Affective conflict is seen in situations where two individuals simply do not get along with one another. In a school situation, for instance, if a headteacher does not get on well with a particular teacher or group of teachers, or two teachers do not get along with each other, or if a Circuit Supervisor does not get along with a headteacher or a teacher, affective conflict can result. Affective (Emotional) conflict involves personal frictions-acrimonious debates, disparaging comment and hostile criticism aimed at the individual rather than the substance of the issues at hand**.**
- **Behavioural Conflict**: Behavioural conflict exists when one person or group does something (i.e.; behaves in a certain way) that is unacceptable to others. Dressing for work in a way that 'offends' others and using profane language or offensive and disrespectful behaviour are examples of behavioural conflict. In the school and the community where headteachers and teachers are expected to be exemplary in their behaviour, certain behaviour characteristics portrayed by an individual teacher, headteacher

or group of them may result in behaviour conflict. Circuit Supervisors in their day- to-day interactions with the schools – (i.e. headteachers and teachers) as school inspectors, may as a result of certain behaviour characteristics exhibited either by them or teachers or headteachers encounter behavioural conflict.

Bailey (1971), identifies three types of conflict situations, he says these are subordinate conflict, superordinate conflict and lateral conflict. He notes that subordinate conflict is between the administrator and a person or group over which he/she has authority or responsibility. He continues that super- ordinate conflict is between the administrator and a person or group, which has authority over him/her (the administrator). Bailey adds that lateral conflict is between persons or groups who have equal authority.

Deutsch (1973), contends that a conflict, whatever its reality, is usually about one or another of several types of issues. He describes five basic types of issues. He says these are control over resources, preferences and nuisances, values, beliefs and the nature of the relationship between the parties. These are described below.

Control over resources: Deutsch (1973), points out that such resources as space, money, property, power, prestige, food and so forth may be viewed as non-sharable. He notes that if two or more parties seek exclusive use of a resource or a given part of it, conflict is apt to occur between them.

Preferences and nuisances: Deutsch states that many conflicts arise because the activities or tastes of one person or group impinge upon another's preferences, sensitivities or sensibilities.

Values: Deutsch continues that one person may prefer a system of government that emphasizes social justice, another that emphasizes individual liberty.

He says that it is not the differences in values per se that lead to conflict rather the claim that one should dominate or be applied generally, even by those who hold different values.

Beliefs: Deutsch observes that many conflicts are over what "is", over fact, information, knowledge or belief about reality. He says that not all discrepancies in beliefs lead to conflict, unless one of the parties or both decide that his or her belief should dominate and be accepted by the other.

The nature of the relationship between the parties: Deutsch maintains that two people may be in conflict because of opposing views and desires in their relationship. He says both may want to be dominant, or both may desire to be dominated; one may want more "togetherness" than the other; and so on. Deutsch notes further that another useful distinction among conflicts is that between destructive and constructive conflicts. He maintains that at the extremes these terms are easy to define. He observes that a conflict has productive consequences if its participants are all satisfied with their outcomes and feel they have gained as a result of the conflict. He says these are functional, constructive forms of conflict. Additionally, he notes that there are conflicts that hinder group performance; these are dysfunctional or destructive forms. He continues that a conflict has destructive consequences if its participants are dissatisfied with the outcome and feel they have lost as a result of the conflict.

Causes and Levels of Conflict

Many scholars point out that any attempt by anyone to manage a specific conflict situation requires the one to be knowledgeable of its origin. In line with this, the views of some scholars pertaining to the causes of conflict are presented here.

According to the Commonwealth Secretariat (1993), at the outset, a conflict situation is often perceived as a single event, but this is seldom the case. It says that conflicts do not simply erupt; rather they develop through stages and in each of these stages, certain factors contribute to the possibility of conflict. It continues that potential conflicts are precipitated by how individuals "see" each other and that these perceptions determine whether conflict will occur. It notes that people's feelings and attitudes towards each other, and the particular cause of conflict will further affect their eventual behaviour. It concludes that based on the two stages above, confrontation will occur, being either conflictive or problem solving.

In their study, Newhose and Neely (1993), observe that how questions about goals, interests and other questions about the school are answered determines in part, the nature of the conflicts which will arise. They note that in any conflict there may be antecedent conditions that are at the root of the initial dispute. They argue that these conditions may not cause the full-blown conflict but they may be strong enough to start the process on its way. They mention a few of them as ambiguous roles, conflicting interests, communication barriers, dependence on one party and unresolved prior conflict. They contend that on the

other hand, the lack of certain conditions can also cause conflict. They say possibilities are lack of trust, of integrity, of benefit, of information and of clarity.

In the view of Fisher (1981), every conflict that arises has its own special character. He says a conflict cannot be separated from individuals, the particular organisation and the unique circumstances in which the problem occurs.

He maintains that there are however, certain general characteristics of organisations that produce conflict. He notes that knowing these can sharpen our ability to identify conflict and spot situations that have potential for conflict. He mentions win-lose situations and concerns about status and authority as typical among the sources of conflict.

Win-lose situations: Fisher contends that sometimes two people or groups have goals that cannot be obtained simultaneously. He says that win-lose conflicts are frequent where resources are limited.

Concerns about status and authority: Fisher states that issues of status and authority take several forms. He says some of the more common ones are individual desire of autonomy and inconsistency between authority and prestige differences. He observes that personal desires for autonomy lead to conflict in many ways. He argues that conflict can come up around people's desire to have increased control over their work and share in decision-making. He continues that if frustrated, the desire for autonomy can lead to active resistance. Fisher concludes that conflict is much more likely when demands are made on a group by another whose status is seen as inferior. .

Negben (1978), Robbins (1983) and Lindelow & Scott (1989) share similar views on the cause of conflict.

Negben postulates four categories of causes of conflict. She says these are communication problems, structural factors within the organisation, human factors and conflict-promotion interactions. Robbins says, for simplicity's sake conditions which can be looked at as causes or sources of conflict have been condensed into three categories: communication, structure and personal variables. On their part, Lindelow & Scott identify four primary sources of conflict within the school: communication problems, organisational structure, and human factors such as personality and limited resources.

Communication Problems: Lindelow & Scott (1989), maintain that poor communication is a major cause of conflicts. They note for example that, teachers who do not receive regular feedback about performance may have poor morale and negative attitudes, resulting in unwillingness to respond to administrative directive.

Negben (1978), says poor communication is the most frequently cited source of conflict in schools. She points out that communication difficulties can arise from semantic differences or insufficient information. She notes that semantic problems occur when words mean different things to people; varying connotations can distort and impede communication. She contends that insufficient exchange of information also contributes to communication problems, in that each party in the conflict may lack the clear and unambiguous information regarding the other's point of view that is necessary for the clarification of the situation.

Robbins (1983), observes that a review of the research suggests that semantic difficulties, insufficient exchange of information and noise in the

communication channel are barriers to communication and potential antecedent conditions to conflict.

Structural Causes: Lindelow & Scott (1989), point out that schools where the administrator encourages empowerment will have more frequent conflicts, although minor. They say major disruptive conflicts lessen as empowerment increases.

On structural causes of conflict, Negben (1978), says that they arise out of those variables in complex organisations that are controllable by the executive within the organisation. She contends that size of organisation for example, has been found a correlate with amounts of conflict, the larger the school, the greater the number of conflicts and the higher the intensity. She notes that lack of participation in decision-making process results in an increase in conflict.

Robbins (1983), also maintains that the larger the group and the more specialized its activities are, the greater the likelihood of conflict. He adds that reward systems too, are found to create conflict when one member's gain is at another's expense.

Human Factors: Lindelow & Scott (1989) say that the administrators cannot eliminate human factors; rather they must be properly managed. They maintain that differing values of goals are one of the most important human sources of conflict.

Robbins (1983), states that certain personality types, for example, individuals who are authoritarian, dogmatic and who demonstrate low esteem lead to potential conflict. He notes that the most important, and probably the most overlooked variable in the study of social conflicts, is differing value systems.

Robbins observes that value differences, for example, are the best explanation of such diverse issues as prejudice, disagreement over one's contribution to the group and the reward one deserves.

Nye (1973) submits that personality, role satisfaction, role status and differing goals can contribute to conflict. Like Robbins, Nye points out those persons who are authoritarian and have low self-esteem are more prone to distort reality than others. He notes that such people tend to misinterpret the behaviour of others and set the stage for conflict situation. He says that when people are dissatisfied with, or cannot realize their status aspirations they can foster increased conflict within schools. He concludes that conflicting goals of special interest groups are further causes of conflict.

Hampton et al. (1978), hold the view that people who fear ambiguity in status, beliefs or authority seem more likely to seek supremacy by vanquishing their real or imaginary enemies. They contend that conflict sometimes occurs when an individual wishes to satisfy security, affiliative or esteem needs in a group situation, but the group demands excessive conformity or stressful behaviour. They say such conflict may arise from an individual's efforts to promote his or her own interests, such as making more money by breaking the group's norms on permissible production. They observe that such transgression of the emergent rules will often result in collective retaliation on the unfortunate offender.

On Conflict-promoting interactions, Negben (1978), states that conflict-promoting interactions are those that involve competition, domination and provocation. She says that in competitive interaction, i.e.; each side is trying to

gain something that the other wants. She continues that when interaction involves dominance, one party is attempting to control the behaviour of the other party. Negben contends that in provocation, another inflicts intentional or unintentional harm on one person or group. She adds that conflict-promoting interactions occur at all levels of interpersonal and inter group relations, and can create and maintain conflicts among individuals and groups within school organization.

Knezevich (1984), notes that conflicts have their roots in competing interests, differing perceptions and unfulfilled desires (page 71). A conflict of one individual versus another occurs as individuals compete for promotion, limited resources, power, status, prestige, etc. Unresolved personality conflicts for example, wastes human as well as material resources and can cause frustration; time and talents are also wasted. Many conflicts in organizations arise because people or groups want the same resources such as funding, promotion, desirable work, or working conditions or management attention or approval. Often employees perceive that too little of the desired resources are available to meet everyone's objectives-a condition called resource scarcity.

According to McShane & Von Glinow (2000), we often hear about "personality" conflict in which people have divergent personal values and disposition. Although personality differences certainly influence conflict, this phrase often masks the underlying causes of conflict behaviour and perceptions. According to Lindelow & Scott (1989), the fourth source of conflict is competition over limited resources. They point out for example, that, conflict results when teachers fail to get certain incentives they think they deserve or when the science department fails to get the desired equipment.

Organizational research has identified six conditions under which conflict tends to germinate and flourish. These are goal incompatibility, differentiation, task interdependence, communication problems, ambiguity and scarce resources.

1. **Goal incompatibility**: According to Dutton & Walton (1966), this is a common source of conflict, which occurs when people or work units have goals that interfere with each other. Financial rewards for goal accomplishments further entrench the perceived conflict because employees are more motivated to pursue their goals.
2. **Differentiation**: Differentiation occurs when people hold divergent beliefs and attitudes due to their unique background experiences or training. Moreover, behaviours of people from different backgrounds are more easily misinterpreted. Quite often, we rely on traditional stereotypes to explain the behaviours of people whom we seldom meet, and thereby increasing the perception of conflict, Hambrick et al, (1998).

i. **Task Interdependence**: This exists when team members who must share common inputs to their individual tasks, need to interact in the process of executing their work, or receive outcomes (such as rewards) that are partly determined by the performance of others. Conflict tends to increase with the level of task interdependence. In other words, the higher the level of task interdependence, the greater the risk of conflict, because there is a greater chance that each side will disrupt or interfere with the other side's goals. Early & Northcraft (1989).

ii. **Communication problems**: Brett et al. (1984), explained that conflict often occurs due to the lack of opportunity, ability, or motivation to communicate effectively, when two parties lack the opportunity to communicate, they tend to use stereotypes to explain past behaviours and anticipate future action. Unfortunately, stereotypes are sufficiently subjective that emotions can negatively distort the meaning of an opponent's action, thereby escalating perceptions of conflict.

Moreover, without direct interaction the two sides have less psychological empathy for each other. Some people lack the necessary skills to communicate in a diplomatic, non-confrontational manner. When one party communicates its disagreement in an arrogant way, opponents are more likely to heighten their perception of conflict. Arrogant behaviour also sends a message that one side intends to be competitive rather than cooperative. This may lead the other party to reciprocate with a similar conflict management style.

Ineffective communication often leads to an escalation of the conflict cycle.

Ineffective communication can also lead to a third problem: less motivation to communicate in future. Unfortunately, less communication can further escalate the conflict because there is less opportunity to emphasize with the opponent's situation and opponents are more likely to rely on distorted stereotypes of the other party. Indeed conflict tends to further distort these stereotypes through the process of social identity.

- **Ambiguity**: Ambiguity breeds conflict because the uncertainty increases the risk that one party intends to interfere with the other party's goals.

- **Scarce resources**: Scarce resources generate conflict because scarcity motivates people to compete with others who also need those resources to achieve their objectives. Notz, Stance & Atwell "The Manager as Arbitrator'': Conflicts Over Scarce Resources, in Bazeeman & Liwicki Ed, 'Negotiating in Organizations', **(**page 143-164).

Conflict Management

Conflict is a process in which one party perceives that its interests are being opposed or negatively affected by another; McShane & Von Glinow (2000).

Generally, the term conflict management refers to programmes that teach individual concepts and skills for preventing, managing and peacefully resolving conflicts. Traditionally, peer mediation programmes have been the most popular form of conflict management. However, teachers and school administrators are increasingly recognizing the importance of implementing programmes that use conflict management skills to handle misbehaviour and to enhance peaceful coexistence. For example, conflict management programmes can teach life skills, "win-win" negotiation strategies, mediation skills, and violence prevention strategies. They are implemented in basic and high schools to help students, teachers, administrators and parents resolve conflict effectively. Although conflict management programmes may not all look alike, or use identical problem-solving models, they do share several basic philosophical underpinnings: -(The Ohio Commission on Dispute Resolution and Conflict Management, the Ohio Department of Education and the Ohio Board of Education in Conflict Management Overview). According to Tubbs (2001), conflict is natural. Conflict,

to differing degrees, occurs daily in every one's life. Conflict in and of itself, is not necessarily good or bad. The way that conflict is handled makes the outcome positive or negative. If handled effectively, conflict can create a good learning experience. If handled ineffectively, conflict can quickly escalate to physical and emotional violence**.**

Individuals can learn new skills. Although conflict is a natural part of human existence, many super-ordinates and subordinates lack the skills necessary to effectively resolve conflicts. Conflict management skills have proven that young people and adults as well as super-ordinates and subordinates can quickly learn to use effective problem solving concepts and skills, if they are given an opportunity to practice the new skills. The acquisition of conflict management skills empowers individuals to take responsibility for their own conflicts and the resolution of those conflicts.

Research in the past decades had reviewed various approaches to conflict management. School administrators should be aware not only of the wide variety of techniques but also their likely consequences in order to select the appropriate strategy for a given situation.

Wofford (1982), notes that conflict management involves the stimulation and control of constructive conflict as well as the prevention and resolution of destructive conflict (page 249). He observes that since constructive conflict is a positive force for innovation and change, the manager should stimulate it. He however adds that if the intensity of a constructive conflict becomes too great, it becomes a negative force. To Wofford, destructive conflict should be prevented if possible, but once it occurs, the manager should be responsible for its resolution.

Wofford (1982), continues that the management of destructive conflict involves two activities: prevention and resolution (page 251). He says prevention of destructive conflict is the most desirable approach. He contends that prevention avoids both the conflict and the long-term effects that destructive conflict can have, even if it is resolved. He concludes that when destructive conflict emerges, it has to be resolved by the manager within the school context. Gorton & Snowden (1993), share the view of Wofford. They observe that conflict management is concerned with efforts designed to prevent, ameliorate or resolve disagreements between and among individuals and groups (page 87).

Despite the frequency and negative potential of conflict, however, the principal theme of this unit of the chapter is that conflict can be a constructive force in relationships at home, at work, (at school) and at play if managed competently. Conflict can appear ugly and destructive to us when it is frequent and we lack the skills necessary to manage it constructively. Conflict, however, can be a signal that change needs to occur for relationship to remain vital. According to Lulofs (1994), it also can help partners (i.e. co-workers - superordinates and subordinates) recognize boundaries in their relationships.

Conflict can also produce creative problem solving in the workplace by raising tension, which may encourage an energetic search for innovative answers. Reducing the severity of conflict episodes by learning conflict management techniques is a key to constructive conflict. (Canary et al; 1995).

Consequently, this section shows ways to manage conflict constructively so relationships can remain vibrant. It describes the primary communication styles

available for managing conflict, drawing distinctions between them, and to discuss ways to manage conflict competently.

Communication Style of Conflict Management

A communication style of conflict management is a typical way a person addresses conflict. Blake & Mouton (1964) and Kilmann & Thomas (1977) identify and describe five communication styles: Collaborating, Accommodating, Compromising, Avoiding and Competing.

- **Collaborating** (Cooperation): Working together to maximize the attainment of goals for all parties in a conflict is called collaborating. This is a cooperative style of conflict management. It is 'we' not 'me'-oriented. The collaborative style has three key components: Confrontation, Integration and Smoothing.
- **Confrontation**: The overt recognition of conflict and the direct effort to find creative ways to satisfy all parties in the conflict is called confrontation. It is an assertive strategy; that is, the apposite of avoidance.

  Confrontation brings the conflict out into the open for careful examination and discussion. Confrontation as collaborative strategy should utilize all the elements of supportive communication (i.e. describe, treat others of equals, problem solve, emphasize, be honest, and qualify your statements). Some conflicts are too trivial to warrant confrontation.

  Sometimes the timing is wrong. Individuals wake up irritable and need time to gather their thoughts. Confronting them before they have had their

morning coffee or something pleasant or when they are late for a meeting at work will probably escalate a conflict.

Confrontation is best attempted at a time when people are able to work on problems. Additionally, confrontation should be used judiciously, for important issues. Incessant can become annoying and counter productive.

Integration is a collaborative strategy that meets the goals of all parties in the conflict. Two integrative tactics are expanding the pie and bridging.

Expanding the Pie

Expanding the pie refers to finding creative ways to increase resources, typically money. Scarce resource often causes conflict (power struggles).These conflicts can easily degenerate into competitive clashes where adversaries struggle to divide a woefully inadequate budget.

Bridging

Bridging considers the goals of all parties in the conflict and offers a new option that satisfies the interests of everyone involved.

Research on collaborating as a conflict management style is consistently positive Hocker & Wilmot (1995). Collaborating produces better decisions than other styles, and participants typically are more satisfied with the decision, the process, and the interpersonal relations developed during conflict management.

- **Accommodating** (Yielding): When we surrender to the needs and desires of others during a conflict, we are using the accommodating style. This is

a non-assertive style of conflict management. It may appear that accommodating is we-oriented because the accommodator yields to others "for the sake of the relationship or group". This may be true in some cases, but yielding to others to maintain harmony can easily build resentment that one's own needs have been sacrificed. This can lead to a martyr complex and ultimately to bitterness and complaint.

Accommodating is most often the style of the less powerful. Less powerful individuals are most often expected to accommodate more often and to a greater degree than more powerful individuals do; Lulofs (1994). Employees are expected to yield to the requests or demands of their supervisors. Super-ordinates are less likely to accommodate subordinates wishes. One mistake made by more powerful individuals, however, is failing to appreciate the value of accommodating even when yielding isn't required. When a person is clearly wrong about an issue or a point of contention, it makes sense to yield on it. This yielding demonstrates reasonableness and enhances relationship with the other person. This flexibility is an aspect of constructive conflict management. The roles may be reversed in the future, and it may be appropriate for the other party to yield. Accommodating by others is more likely when there is a history of mutual flexibility.

Accommodating can be a constructive and necessary style of conflict management. A less powerful person may need to yield to a more powerful person to keep a job, maintain a relationship, or avoid nasty consequences. Yielding can sometimes maintain harmony in a relationship

Nevertheless, being too accommodating can make one someone else's doormat.

- **Compromising**: When we give out something to get something, we are compromising. The compromising style of conflict management occurs most often between parties who are of relatively equal power. More powerful individuals do not usually consider compromising as necessary. They can dominate and they often choose to do so.

  Compromising emphasizes workable, but not optimal, decisions and solutions. Some have referred to compromising as a lose-lose style of conflict management because trade-offs and exchanges are required to reach agreement. Only some of the goals and needs are met in a compromise. Gain is counter balanced by lose. As one anonymous sage person puts it, compromise is "a deal in which two people get what neither of them wanted". Pruitt and Rubin (1986) express this negative point of view when they argue that compromising arises "from two sources-either lazy problem solving involving a half-hearted attempt to satisfy the two parties' interests or simply yielding by both parties" (page 29). Despite those negative views, compromising may be the only feasible goal in a conflict of interest where parties have relatively equal power. Half a loaf is better than starvation, so goes the thinking. Compromising can be a useful strategy when an integrative decision is not feasible, when issues are not critical, when essential values are not undermined, and when such a settlement is only temporary until a better solution can be found and negotiated.

- **Avoiding** (Withdrawing): When we side step or turn our back on conflict, we are avoiding. The avoiding style is exhibited in many ways (Lulofs, 1994). We avoid conflict when we ignore it or deny it exists even though it does. When we shift topics so we don't have to address a conflict, we avoid it. We may crack jokes to deflect a focus on disagreeable issues. We may quibble about the meaning of a word used by another who is probing uncomfortably about a subject of some dispute, or we may simply not respond to a question. A particularly powerful form of avoiding is stonewalling; Gottman (1994). Stonewalling is exhibited by story silence, monosyllabic mutterings (e.g. "Yah", "Hmmm") refusal to discuss problems, or physical removal when one partner is complaining, disagreeing, or attacking the other partner. Stone wallers often justify their withdrawal from conflict by claiming that they are merely trying to be under control and not make the contentiousness worse by responding. Stone walling can be extremely frustrating to those faced with the withdrawal. Stone walling can also communicate disapproval, conceit, self-righteousness, and cold indifference, a defensive communication pattern. Avoiding is a frequently used conflict style. One study Sillars et al (1982), reports that students used avoiding in more than half of their conflicts. Another study by Larson & LaFasto (1989), found that managers often avoid giving negative feedback to employees because they find it to be the most unpleasant and difficult task they have to perform. They are reluctant to stir up conflict. Managers, who avoid critiquing employees poor work performance typically, become increasingly annoyed by the

continued bad performance. When the annoyance rises to extremely high levels, they give feedback that is usually biting, sarcastic, harsh, threatening and personal; Baron (1988). This merely intensifies anger by both parties.

Avoiding is a strategy often used by abused partners to keep away from provoking violence from the abusers; Gelles & Straus (1990). This avoidance creates a chilling effect wherein a partner low in power avoids discussing issues

with his or her abusive partner that might trigger aggression; Roloff & Cloven (1990). Avoiding is not always an inappropriate and ineffective style of conflict management. We can avoid trivial issues without damage to our relationships.

- **Competing** (Power-Forcing): When we approach conflict as a win-lose contest, we are competing. The competing or power-forcing style is exhibited in a variety of ways: by threats, criticism, contempt, hostile remarks and jokes, sarcasm, ridicule, intimidation, fault finding and blaming and denial of responsibility Hocker & Wilmot (1995). All of these behaviours upset the ratio of positive to negative communication. Gottman (1994), maintains that at least a 5 to 1 ratio of positive to negative communication is necessary to sustain a relationshipage

  The competing style of conflict management emphasizes the negative. The competing style is aggressive, not assertive. It is me-oriented style that is focused on winning a dispute at other's expense.

The essence of competing style is pressuring others to change their behaviour to ones advantage. The more we try to force others to do our bidding, however, the more we ignite psychological reactions. In other words, the competing style has the greatest potential for destructive conflict because it can easily escalate a conflict even beyond stupidity and pointlessness. The chief flaw of competing style is that the focus is on victory for oneself, not on a mutually satisfactory decision for all parties involved. The competing style attempts to create or to expand power imbalances in relationships.

Prevention of Conflicts

Wofford (1982) has suggested some techniques for the prevention of destructive conflicts. He mentions the direct approaches of integrating goals and expanding resources. He adds that there is also an indirect approach of using interpersonal styles.

- **Integration of goals**: Wofford notes that the incidence frequency of conflict over goals can be minimized by establishing superordinate goals (i.e. goals for the overall organization). He says there should be a clear understanding and agreement as to how each unit's goal contributes to these broader ones. He contends that once the individuals become primarily concerned with the superordinate goal and secondly concerned with their unit's goals, the likelihood of destructive conflict drastically diminishes.

- **Expansion of resources:** Wofford (1982), continues that the obvious answer to the prevention of conflict caused by scarce resources is to expand the resources available if the conflict is over salary increases, money for supplies or use of physical resources. He concedes however that it is often impracticable because we rarely are able to obtain all the resources that are desired.
- **Use of interpersonal style:** Wofford (1982), discusses several approaches to conflict prevention through effective communication. He says some of the most significant approaches include communication style that emphasizes trust, openness, self-disclosure, feedback, listening and avoidance of defensiveness and threats.

Gorton & Snowden (1993), express similar sentiments when they note that an administrator can prevent much conflict by meeting regularly with personnel for the purpose of clarifying expectations and offering suggestions on how job performance might be improved (page 93).

In the opinion of Asiedu-Akrofi (1978), a good administration of a school is not a product of chance. He sees it as a result of the co-operative action of all the members of staff. According to him, some of the most important factors that ensure good organisation are free communication of ideas, equitable distribution of influence and availability of means for detecting and solving problems. He says a good school circulates information about most of its activities, thereby minimizing the chances of distorting facts. He points out that the circulation of information breeds a sense of security and freedom because it is easy to sense inner troubles. He notes that by the

same token, prompt analysis of difficulties can be made and proper remedies applied. He observes further that whenever teachers, students, workers and other school personnel have a feeling that whatever they do or say can influence the top people, for instance the headmaster, conflict with authority is minimal. He explains that it is not suggested that conflict will not be present, rather there develops a sense of cooperation and all work in support of the school.

Asiedu-Akrofi (1978), points out that no school can be run without trouble because human beings are not infallible. He contends that problems are inevitable but how they are met indicates how well a school is organized. He adds that fairness in handling school problems and finding out how to solve them brings the best out of everybody. He notes that this gives everyone the impression that the organisation as well as the school is healthy.

Resolution of Conflicts

The administrator might do his best to prevent conflicts from arising in the school, but when these attempts fail, the conflicts must be resolved. It therefore appears desirable to review possible techniques that the administrator may consider for resolving conflicts.

Negben (1978), Wofford (1982) and Robbins (1983) express similar views on conflict resolution. Negben (1978) mentions such approaches as avoidance techniques, use of force, rational approaches and use of third party in resolving conflicts. Wofford (1982), notes that conflicts can be resolved through such

techniques as collaboration, bargaining and third party intervention. On his part, Robbins (1983), contends that such approaches as collaboration, accommodation, competition and avoidance may be employed in conflict resolution.

Avoidance techniques: Negben (1978), says that avoidance techniques for conflict resolution include non-response or withdrawal, smoothing and bringing about a deadlock situation. She notes that behind the technique of withdrawal or non-response is the belief that "silence is golden". She mentions that the parties may avoid contact with each other altogether, or if meetings are inevitable, engage in pleasantries or evasions in order to avoid confronting the problem. She observes that isolation precludes opposition since there can be no conflict between two groups who have nothing to do with each other.

Nebgen (1978), adds that procrastination is a variation of the "silence is golden" attitude; conflict manager adopts a "let's wait and see" stance. She says in smoothing, the conflict manager attempts to play down the differences and emphasizes the common interests of the groups. She points out that here; discussion is limited to only those matters upon which the parties can agree. She says that all conversation is about positive things; nothing negative is said.

Negben (1978), further adds that avoidance can be a useful technique for cooling off the parties or preventing disputes about unimportant things clearly though, it is not a valid method for achieving long-term solutions to serious basic issues that divide contending parties.

Commenting on the use of avoidance techniques, Robbins (1983) contends that a party may recognise that a conflict exists, but react by withdrawing or suppressing the conflict. He notes that indifference or the desire to evade overt

demonstration of disagreement cannot result in withdrawal. He continues that the parties acknowledge physical separation and each stakes out a territory that is distinct from the others. He mentions further that if withdrawal is not possible or desirous, the parties may suppress, that is, withhold their differences. He adds that when group members are required to react because of the independence of their tasks suppression is a more probable outcome than withdrawal.

Negben (1978) says conflict resolution techniques, which involve the use of force, include coercion, domination and imposition. She notes that, implied in the use of force is the assumption that one party is in superordinate position to the other. She observes that in coercion one party tries to make the other yield from fear or actual injury by the use of implied or explicit force. She continues that domination is the action by one party to settle the conflict without consultation with the other. She adds that imposition takes place in a win-lose situation in which the participants are antagonists, arguing from absolutely fixed positions, and the stronger party settles the matter by forcing a solution.

Robbins (1983) says when one party seeks to achieve its goals or further its interest regardless of the impress and dominates. He points out that these win-lose struggles frequently utilises the formal authority of a mutual superior as the dominant, force, and the conflicting parties each will use their own power bases in order to resolve a victory in their favour.

Fisher (1981) observes that forcing is necessary in emergencies, at times, when unpopular courses of action need to be implemented; when the parties are in adversary relationship to each other –so totally opposed that no other approach is possible. He however adds that one drawback might be that the person who is

most powerful is not always the most competent to make the decision. Fisher notes further that another problem with forcing is that it can evoke bitterness in the losing party (page 288).

Definition of Supervision

Supervision is a developmental approach where a practitioner assists a client to carry out an assignment more easily and more effectively in order to achieve improved results.

Who is a Supervisor?

A supervisor is one who is given authority and responsibility by management to perform functions such as -

- Planning
- Organising
- Directing and controlling-the work activities of others. The supervisor is also expected to take decisions in the performance of all the managerial functions.

The supervisor is a:

- Member of Management team,
- Direct link between Management and the operatives,
- Management representative who solves problems regarding job, task and activities and
- Person who gets results through team work

At school level, supervision concentrates on improving the quality of instruction. The supervisor has the responsibility to assist the teacher. The

interactive process of helping a teacher to improve standards of teaching in a learning situation is referred to as instructional supervision.

Alfonso, Furth & Neville (1981) define instructional supervision as the behaviour officially designated by organization that directly affects teacher behaviour in such a way as to facilitate pupils' learning and achieve the goals of the organization.

Harris (1985) wrote that supervision of instruction is what school personnel do with adults and things to maintain or change the school operation in ways that directly influence the teaching process employed to promote pupils' learning.

Instructional supervision facilitates effective teaching and learning. Teachers spend most of their formal engagement time giving instruction to their pupils/students. Inspectors and other supervisors especially, Headteachers and Circuit Supervisors need to ensure that lessons are delivered as effectively as possible. It is the concern for effective lesson delivery that gives rise to instructional supervision.

There is never perfection in the delivery of a lesson where a teacher deals with a group of learners who obviously are unique and different in many respects- i.e. supervisors meet a need in our current educational structure and will undoubtedly continue to do so for a long time to come. Theoretically, however, we could dispense with the services of supervisors if all headteachers and teachers were dynamic, knowledgeable, and skillful and of the right kind of attitude. As not all headteachers and teachers have reached a stage of perfection, the need for supervision remains.

By providing supervision, the educational system is declaring, in effect, that headteachers and teachers are not completely free to run their own schools and classrooms as they see fit. Limitations are imposed by school regulations, state legislature regulations, type of students and type of communities. A supervisor is often more aware of or more sensitive to these limitations than headteachers and teachers and can help them work within the restrictions. Thus, supervisors help headteachers and teachers understand the context of their positions and find their own ways of teaching within that context.

Supervision as a deliberate approach to enhance and improve classroom instruction and to promote teachers professional growth. In providing a programme of supervision, the assumption is made that change is desirable, necessary, and indeed, inevitable. School programmes and methods of instruction must keep pace with changing times. If all headteachers and teachers were professionally dedicated enough to keep up- to- date in their fields, the need for supervision might diminish. Unfortunately, teaching has not reached a professional status. One assumption in supervision is that without assistance, some headteachers and teachers will not make changes. Further assumption can therefore be made that, supervisors are able to help headteachers and teachers to bring about changes. Educators may agree that there should be some internal consistency to sequences of subject matter and that there should be articulation between grades of a school and levels of the school system. A supervisor is the person in a school system that can help achieve the goals. The Circuit Supervisor, for example, moving from school to school knows what materials are being used in each class and what the teachers' objectives are in the various schools.

The constant and continuous process of more guidance tends to focus on one or more aspects of teaching and learning during instructional delivery. Some common shortfalls include: poor questioning techniques; gender insensitivity; failure to reinforce correct responses; illogical sequencing in lesson delivery; poor introduction and conclusion; poor management of mixed ability classes; poor classroom control and management as well as poor preparation of lesson notes.

Headteachers, who are the frontline supervisors at the school level, are supposed to assist teachers overcome the problems they face in their work. Circuit Supervisors are also to provide additional support to the teachers and in addition, ensure that both the headteachers and the teachers do their work effectively. In performing their functions as supervisors, both the school head and the circuit supervisor need to be circumspect in handling the problems of their supervisees in order to avoid conflict, which often results when supervisors and supervisees fail to interact in an effective and a healthy manner.

Conflict has been defined as an open disagreement between two people who have different goals. Conflict involves people's feelings as well as their objectives. G.E.S. Circuit Supervisors' Handbook, (page 20).

Both the headteacher and the circuit supervisor are exposed to conflict situations on a daily basis. However, the types of conflict that they are exposed to are not restricted to the school, and in many cases can involve the community and other stakeholders. Types of conflict that are likely to affect schoolwork adversely may include:

- Circuit supervisor-headteacher conflict;
- Circuit supervisor-teacher conflict;

- Headteacher-teacher conflict;
- .Teacher-teacher conflict;
- .Headteacher-parent conflict;
- Teacher-parent conflict;
- Teacher pupil conflict;
- Pupil-pupil conflict;
- Headteacher-Assembly person or PTA / SMC chairpersons conflict, etc

The Circuit Supervisor is expected to help headteachers and teachers maintain good interpersonal relationships in their schools, how they must handle complaints from their teachers, pupils and community members and how they can resolve conflicts in their schools.

Management of Education at the Circuit Level

Introduction

The circuit level is the second tier in the management system.

The Circuit Supervisor

The Circuit Supervisor is the officer in charge of the Circuit. He/She is expected to supervise 20 schools in urban centres, 15 in semi-urban centres and 10 in rural areas.

Circuit Supervisors are appointed from professional teachers not below the rank of Principal Superintendent. Before they are appointed, a panel appointed by the Regional or District Education Directorate interviews them.

A Circuit Supervisor is expected to visit each school, at least, three times per term. He/She is expected to supervise the work of heads of schools and

teachers with a view to helping them improve upon their professional performance and report to the District Director accordingly.

A Circuit Supervisor has a dual role in the Ghana Education Service:

- Curriculum adviser and teacher supporter, and
- Evaluator of teaching and learning in basic schools.

The Circuit Supervisor as Curriculum Adviser and Teacher Supporter

One of the roles of a Circuit Supervisor is to support teachers and headteachers through the provision of professional guidance and advice. For this reason he/she is sometimes described as "the critical friend" of teachers and headteachers, which means that he/ she is expected to work as a friend and colleague with headteachers and teachers to improve school management and classroom instruction with a view to enhancing learning. To do this successfully, the Circuit Supervisor must strive to build and maintain long-term relationships with the teachers and headteachers of his/her schools.

The Circuit Supervisor as Evaluator of Teaching and Learning

Another role of the Circuit Supervisor involves monitoring teaching and learning, evaluation of headteachers' management skills and teachers' professional competency and providing the needed support. Specifically, the Circuit Supervisor is expected to: -

- Examine headteachers' and teachers records;

- Test pupils / students in English and Mathematics to have some idea of their learning achievement;
- Examine pupils/students exercise books;
- Observe teachers teach;

Functions of the Circuit Supervisor

The functions of the Circuit Supervisor as spelt out in his/her job description include:

i. Promote effective teaching and learning in basic schools.

ii. Interpret educational policies to teachers and help them understand educational policy objectives.

iii. Promote effective school management

iv. Liaise between schools and the District Education Directorate.

v. Organize in-service training for the professional development of teachers.

vi. Promote healthy school-community relations.

vii. Monitor the achievement and performance of pupils and staff.

viii. Collate statistics on the schools in the circuit.

ix. Recommend headteachers and teachers for promotion and award.

x. Appraise the performance of headteachers.

xi. Prepare work schedule for approval of the District Director of Education and submit reports on individual schools to him/her with copies to the schools connected.

xii. Undertake other special assignments on request from the District Education Directorate, the school, or the community.

Purpose of School Visits

A Circuit Supervisor undertakes school visits to find out how schools are performing as against how they should perform.

When a Circuit Supervisor visits a school, he/she also tries to identify the factors hindering effective teaching and learning as well as effective school administration and management and then offer on-the-spot help, where possible. He / she is also expected to help prevent or resolve conflicts as and when they arise.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter focuses on the research methods used in the study. The methods explained here include the research design, the population, the sample as well as the sampling procedure. In addition, the research instrument, data collection and data analyses procedures have also been discussed.

The Research Design

The research design used in this study was the qualitative design. It was used because of the researcher's intention of evaluating the role of Circuit Supervisors in Conflict Management in Basic Schools in the Kumasi Metropolis in the Ashanti Region of Ghana. As part of this design, the researcher used the descriptive sample survey, which involved the use of questionnaire. The purpose was to generalise from a sample to a population so that inferences could be made about some characteristic, attitude or behaviour of the population.

The design was a cross-sectional survey. Thus, the survey information was collected at one point in time. It depended on direct contact with those persons whose characteristic behaviours or attitudes were relevant for the specific investigation.

The design's major advantage is that it has the potential to provide a lot of information obtained from quite a sample of individuals. It also provides a more accurate picture of events and seeks to explain people's perception and behaviour

on the basis of data gathered at a point in time. However, there is the difficulty of ensuring that the questions to be answered are clear and not misleading.

It is also possible that results can vary significantly depending on the exact wording of questions. It may also produce untrustworthy results because they delve into private matters that people may not be completely truthful about. In spite of these setbacks, the descriptive survey design was considered the most appropriate design for this research because of its qualitative nature and purpose- the desired information could not be obtained more easily and less expensively from any other sources.

Population

There were 189 Basic Schools in 15 out of the 16 Circuits in the Kumasi Metropolis. Headteachers and teachers in all the schools numbering 4,131 constituted the population. The supporting staff was not included in the respondents. The researcher concentrated on those who were directly connected with academic work. Thus, the main actors were the Head teachers (i.e. school Administrators or managers) and the teaching staff.

Description of the Sample

Out of a population of 189 basic schools, the researcher selected a sample size of 45 schools representing approximately 24% of the population. This was done because the entire population would have been too large. Again, the time available for the study, logistics and financial resources were limited.

For the purpose of this study, the schools were assigned code names for convenience sake. (See APPENDIX III) the Table showing the list of schools that

were involved in the study and their respective code names as well as circuits to which they belong.

Method for Selecting the Sample.

The Circuit Supervisor of each circuit from which schools were sampled was excluded from the sample. This is because it was the headteachers' and teachers' perception of the Circuit Supervisors' conflict management behaviour that was being studied. Selection of the 45 schools, i.e. 3 schools from each of the 15 out of the 16 circuits in the Metropolis that constituted the sample was done through simple random sampling. A single-stage sampling procedure was adopted. That is, the researcher had access to names of schools in the population and sampled the teachers and the headteachers directly.

Instruments.

Data were collected by means of a questionnaire containing 31 items. It was a close-ended questionnaire with possible responses provided in the questions so that the respondent merely had to select the category which came closest to his or her perception.

The basic structure of the questionnaire was based on the five-point Likert Scale as described by Best & Kahn (1995). It was a self-designed instrument made up of three parts namely; sections A, B and C (see Appendix I). The section A of the questionnaire sought information on the extent to which respondents perceived the existence of conflicts in the basic schools in the Kumasi Metropolis. The purpose of this section was to identify specific causes of inter-personal

conflict perceived by respondents. Under this section, a five-point Likert Scale was used. Respondents were required to show the extent to which they perceived the prevalence of the items listed in their respective schools. They were to indicate their perception by ticking one of 'never', 'rarely', 'sometimes', 'often' and 'very often'. Rating scale was to be used here, that is, from 'very often' to 'never'. Section B of the questionnaire contained items that dealt with conflict prevention techniques. On a five-point Likert Scale, respondents were to show how often the Circuit Supervisor used the conflict prevention techniques listed. They were to rank-order the scale from 'Very often' to 'Rarely'. Finally, Section C of the questionnaire was made up of items dealing with conflict resolution techniques.

Respondents were to show on a five-point Likert Scale, the extent to which the Circuit Supervisor employed the techniques listed. The rating scale was from 'very often' to 'seldom'. Since basic to the validity of a questionnaire is asking the right questions, all efforts were made to phrase the questions in the least ambiguous way. All terms were clearly defined so that they would have the same meaning to all respondents. With suggestions from colleagues and my supervisor, some ambiguities were removed from the questions, thereby ensuring content validity.

The questionnaire was used because the focal data for the research project were the attitudes and perceptions of individuals. Thus, the most direct and most fruitful approach was to ask the individuals themselves. Cannell & Kahn (1966) note that the interview schedule and the questionnaire appear as powerful

instruments for social research, and those perceptions, attitudes and opinions that cannot be inferred by observations are accessible through interviews.

Pilot Study.

The questionnaire was pre-tested in a pilot study at Asawasi MA Primary and JSS, Asawasi Methodist Primary and JSS and Asawasi St. Theresa's R/C Primary and JSS. The purpose was to establish the face validity of the instrument and to improve upon questions, format and scales. They were selected because of proximity.

The schools in which the pilot study was carried out and those in which the research was done are in the same Metropolis with similar environments. The headteachers and teachers in the schools where the research was carried out and those in the schools where the pilot study was conducted had similar qualifications and experiences.

Out of fifty one teachers, thirty five (i.e. 69%) were sampled and they voluntarily responded to the questionnaire for the pilot study. The pilot study revealed defects in the draft questionnaire and they were corrected. Items on the questionnaire that expressed identical concepts were corrected; others that were found to be ambiguous or incomprehensible were either deleted or made clearer. Personal interaction between the researcher and respondents during the pilot work and the analysis of the study resulted in a revision of the draft questionnaire. The revised questionnaire, that is, the final instrument, is attached as appendix 1. To avoid contamination, the schools that were used for the pilot study were excluded from the study.

Data Collection Procedure.

Before the data were collected, the researcher obtained an introductory letter from the Director of the Institute of Education of the University of Cape Coast. (See Appendix II).

The introductory letter helped the researcher to get the needed assistance and co-operation from the headteachers and teachers in the various schools in the Metropolis.

The researcher visited the schools on different days and dates to administer the questionnaire himself. Preliminary contacts were made with the headteachers of the schools in the Metropolis. The purpose and significance of the study were discussed with them. Their permission and support for the exercise were also sought. In each school, at the request of the researcher, the headteacher called a staff meeting at which members were briefed about the study. That enabled the researcher to establish the needed rapport with prospective respondents as well as seek their cooperation. After that, a staff list was obtained from which the sample was selected. Specific times were fixed during which respondents from each school were met. Copies of the questionnaire were distributed to the teachers and the instructions to the questionnaire and the items were carefully explained to them. There was question time, during which respondents asked questions pertaining to the completion of the questionnaire. The questions were answered to clear any doubts. A date was agreed upon during which the respondents handed over their completed Questionnaire to some volunteers who assisted in collecting them. The researcher later went for the completed questionnaire himself two weeks after its distribution.

The administration of the questionnaire entailed much travelling in the Metropolis. In some cases, the researcher had to visit certain schools on two or more occasions to collect the completed questionnaire because some respondents had either not completed the questionnaire or had not done it at all. However, this paid off very well since the return rate of 95.5% was obtained. That is, out of 670 copies of questionnaires distributed 640 were retrieved. (See APPENDIX III)

Procedure for the Analysis of Data.

The study was a descriptive survey, and the analysis was aimed at determining the following:

i) The presence of conflict in the basic schools in the Kumasi Metropolis;

ii) The extent to which Circuit Supervisors of the basic schools in the Kumasi Metropolis demonstrated prevention techniques;

iii) The conflict resolution techniques employed by the Circuit Supervisors in resolving conflicts in the schools.

Out of the 640 copies of the questionnaire that were retrieved, 15 were rejected owing to omissions in the responses. Thus, the total of number of cases for the study became 625. This represented 97.7% of the copies of questionnaire retrieved.

The record of each respondent was scored. The scoring was based on the Likert Scale as described by Best & Kahn (1995). Each item was scored according to the "weight" of the ratings. The unit of analysis was the school and not the individual. Tally cards were prepared for each school on which responses

of each of the respondents were scored according to the respective "weight". These were fed into the computer programme. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyse the data. From the computer printout, frequencies, percentages and means were used for the analyses. The main inferential statistic used to test the hypotheses was the Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Co-efficient. Two hypotheses were tested. Alpha level of 0.05 was employed in the testing of the hypotheses.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

This chapter is devoted to the analyses and discussions of the responses made by respondents in this study-that is, 'An Evaluation of the Role of Circuit Supervisors in Managing Conflicts in Basic Schools in the Kumasi Metropolis of the Ashanti Region of Ghana.

The analyses of data were based on examining the existence of interpersonal conflict, conflict prevention techniques as well as conflict resolution techniques demonstrated by the Circuit Supervisors of Basic Schools in the Metropolis. Where applicable, tables are provided to illustrate and support the findings.

Existence of Conflicts in the Schools in the Circuits

The researcher's interactions with the headteachers and teachers in the schools

sampled during the pilot study (page 48-49) and those used for the actual study (See APPENDIX III) revealed the existence of conflicts in those schools. There was though, rare occurrence of conflicts in most of the schools in the circuits within the Metropolis sampled for the research. However, in schools in ASOC, DIC and OTAC, the picture was different. A greater number of respondents in those circuits perceived that there was a high prevalence of conflicts in the schools.

Item 1 of Questionnaire

Table 1 shows the responses to item 1 of the questionnaire that sought views of respondents on the existence of subordinate conflict in the schools in the Circuits. Respondents were expected to indicate the how often there was conflict between the headteacher and a teacher or a group of teachers.

Table 1

Existence of Conflict between the Headteacher and a Teacher or a Group of Teachers.

Serial Number	School	Rarely %	Sometimes %	Often %	Total %
1	KWAC	80.3	19.7	---	100.0
2	ASEC	83.2	14.0	2.8	100.0
3	KEC	86.3	8.5	5.1	100.0
4	WEC	86.6	11.0	2.4	100.0
5	OFOC	85.9	12.1	2.1	100.0
6	AKOC	82.2	13.3	4.5	100.0
7	AKRC	86.9	13.1	---	100.0
8	BAC	79.9	20.1	---	100.0
9	ADBC	83.3	16.7	---	100.0
10	ASOC	62.4	17.6	20.0	100.0
11	DIC	55.8	17.4	26.8	100.0
12	AMAC	88.5	11.5	---	100.0
13	OTAC	61.8	15.5	22.7	100.0
14	ASTOC	82.8	15.2	2.1	100.0
15	SUAC	82.5	17.5	---	100.0
	Total	79.2	14.9	5.9	100.0

As Table 1 shows, in ASOC, DIC and OTAC, conflict between the headteacher and a teacher or a group of teachers was quite prevalent. 20.0% of respondents in ASOC, 26.8% in DIC and 22.7% in OTAC said this. It may be an indication that the Circuit Supervisors' conflict management behaviours were not desirable. In the rest of the Circuits, subordinate conflict was very rare.

Item 2 of Questionnaire

Responses to item 2 of the questionnaire are presented in Table 2. Respondents were asked to show the extent to which lateral conflict existed in their schools. They were expected to show how they perceived the presence of conflict between teachers or group of teachers in their schools.

Table 2

Existence of Conflict between Two Teachers or Among a Group of Teachers.

Serial Number	School	Rarely %	Sometimes %	Often %	Total %
1	KWAC	61.1	38.9	---	100.0
2	ASEC	71.1	28.9	---	100.0
3	KEC	72.5	27.5	---	100.0
4	WEC	78.6	21.4	---	100.0
5	OFOC	75.7	24.3	---	100.0
6	AKOC	62.8	29.4	7.8	100.0
7	AKRC	52.7	39.0	8.3	100.0
8	BAC	69.8	30.2	---	100.0
9	ADBC	78.3	21.7	---	100.0
10	ASOC	56.1	43.9	---	100.0
11	DIC	57.9	42.1	---	100.0
12	AMAC	58.1	34.6	6.7	100.0
13	OTAC	63.8	36.2	---	100.0
14	ASTOC	68.7	25.7	5.6	100.0
15	SUAC	67.5	32.5	---	100.0
	Total	62.3	35.9	1.8	100.0

A look at Table 2 reveals that there was a low prevalence of lateral conflict in all the circuits except ASOC (43.9%), DIC (42.1%) and OTAC (36.2%) where its prevalence was average.

Item 3 of Questionnaire

Table 3 gives the responses to the item 3 of the questionnaire. Here, respondents were required to express their view on the presence of conflict caused by unresolved prior conflict in their schools.

Table 3
Existence of Conflict Caused by Unresolved Conflicts.

Serial Number	School	Rarely %	Sometimes %	Often %	Total %
1	KWAC	73.9	21.7	4.4	100.0
2	ASEC	75.8	24.2	-	100.0
3	KEC	84.0	16.0	-	100.0
4	WEC	77.1	22.9	-	100.0
5	OFOC	81.0	19.0	-	100.0
6	AKOC	66.9	27.2	5.9	100.0
7	AKRC	72.4	27.6	-	100.0
8	BAC	73.1	26.9	-	100.0
9	ADBC	77.0	23.0	-	100.0
10	ASOC	55.0	19.6	25.5	100.0
11	DIC	53.7	25.9	25.5	100.0
12	AMAC	75.6	16.2	8.2	100.0
13	OTAC	60.5	21.3	18.2	100.0
14	ASTOC	86.9	13.1	-	100.0
15	SUAC	67.0	33.0	-	100.0
	Total	72.1	22.5	5.8	100.0

This type of conflict rarely occurred in all the circuits in the Metropolis except OTAC, ASOC and DIC. In OTAC, prevalence was 18.2% whilst in both ASOC and DIC it was 25.5% for each of them.

Item 4 of Questionnaire

Responses to item 4 of the questionnaire, which dealt with the existence of conflict caused by communication barriers, are presented in table 4.

Table 4

Existence of Conflict Caused by Communication Barriers.

Serial Number	School	Rarely %	Sometimes %	Often %	Total %
1	KWAC	78.9	21.1	-	100.0
2	ASEC	69.4	30.4	-	100.0
3	KEC	72.7	27.3	-	100.0
4	WEC	80.3	19.7	-	100.0
5	OFOC	78.0	22.0	-	100.0
6	AKOC	77.6	22.4	-	100.0
7	AKRC	62.2	28.5	9.3	100.0
8	BAC	83.2	16.8	-	100.0
9	ADBC	78.6	21.4	-	100.0
10	ASOC	49.7	23.3	27.0	100.0
11	DIC	62.2	19.3	18.5	100.0
12	AMAC	79.1	18.2	2.7	100.0
13	OTAC	52.9	24.4	22.7	100.0
14	ASTOC	75.2	21.1	3.7	100.0
15	SUAC	80.6	19.4	-	100.0
	Total	72.0	22.4	5.6	100.0

As revealed by Table 4, the occurrence of this type of conflict was rare in the all circuits except ASOC (27.0%), DIC (18.5%) and OTAC (22.7%). It was sometimes found to be present in ASEC (30.4%), KEC (27.3%) and AKRC (28.5%), just to mention a few.

Item 5 of Questionnaire

In Table 5, responses to item 5 of the questionnaire are given. Respondents were made to express their opinions on the presence of conflict caused by lack of participation in decision making in their schools.

Table 5

Existence of Conflict Caused by Lack of Participation in Decision-Making

Serial Number	School	Rarely %	Sometimes %	Often %	Total %
1	KWAC	76.1	23.9	-	100.0
2	ASEC	86.4	13.6	-	100.0
3	KEC	77.9	22.1	-	100.0
4	WEC	76.2	23.8	-	100.0
5	OFOC	72.9	27.1	-	100.0
6	AKOC	77.6	22.4	-	100.0
7	AKRC	65.8	30.0	4.2	100.0
8	BAC	76.2	23.8	-	100.0
9	ADBC	74.9	25.1	-	100.0
10	ASOC	55.0	25.0	20.0	100.0
11	DIC	50.2	27.5	22.3	100.0
12	AMAC	61.7	33.7	4.6	100.0
13	OTAC	54.2	21.6	24.2	100.0
14	ASTOC	77.8	22.2	-	100.0
15	SUAC	77.3	22.7	-	100.0
	Total	70.7	24.3	5.0	100.0

As usual, this type of conflict was often found in schools ASOC (20.0%), DIC (22.3%) and OTAC (24.2%). However, its prevalence in all the remaining circuits was low, except in AKRC (30.0%) and AMAC (33.7%) where it was sometimes average.

Item 6 of Questionnaire

Table 6 shows the responses to item 6 of the questionnaire. The item requested respondents to express their views on the presence of conflict caused by lack of trust for one another in their schools.

Table 6

Existence of Conflict Caused by Lack of Trust for One Another.

Serial Number	School	Rarely %	Sometimes %	Often %	Total %
1	KWAC	71.7	28.3	-	100.0
2	ASEC	83.6	16.4	-	100.0
3	KEC	76.7	20.3	-	100.0
4	WEC	78.3	21.7	-	100.0
5	OFOC	80.5	19.5	-	100.0
6	AKOC	80.7	19.3	-	100.0
7	AKRC	71.7	28.3	-	100.0
8	BAC	83.2	16.8	-	100.0
9	ADBC	79.2	20.8	-	100.0
10	ASOC	56.8	23.2	20.0	100.0
11	DIC	58.6	17.4	24.0	100.0
12	AMAC	78.9	21.1	-	100.0
13	OTAC	53.5	25.3	21.2	100.0
14	ASTOC	78.4	21.6	-	100.0
15	SUAC	78.2	21.8	-	100.0
	Total	74.2	21.5	4.3	100.0

Apart from ASOC, DIC and OTAC where there were high prevalence of 20.0%, 24.0% and 21.2% respectively, respondents from the remaining circuits

said that conflict caused by lack of trust for one another rarely occurred in their schools.

Item 7 of Questionnaire

Table 7 provides the responses to item 7 of the questionnaire. Respondents were asked to express their views on the presence of conflict caused by provision of different reward system by the headmaster/headmistress.

Table 7
Existence of Conflict Caused by Different Reward Systems provided by the Headmaster/Headmistress for Two or More Groups

Serial Number	School	Rarely %	Sometimes %	Often %	Total %
1	KWAC	78.1	17.5	4.3	100.0
2	ASEC	75.1	22.8	2.1	100.0
3	KEC	81.6	18.4	-	100.0
4	WEC	74.4	23.5	2.1	100.0
5	OFOC	81.6	18.4	-	100.0
6	AKOC	72.8	27.2	-	100.0
7	AKRC	69.7	26.7	4.2	100.0
8	BAC	79.9	20.1	-	100.0
9	ADBC	74.4	25.6	-	100.0
10	ASOC	57.0	19.6	23.2	100.0
11	DIC	57.0	22.7	20.4	100.0
12	AMAC	83.8	13.6	2.7	100.0
13	OTAC	49.1	26.6	24.2	100.0
14	ASTOC	70.3	29.7	-	100.0
15	SUAC	66.4	33.6	-	100.0
	Total	71.4	23.1	5.5	100.0

Majority of respondents for all the circuits except ASOC, DIC and OTAC expressed the view that this was rare. Those who expressed that view ranged between 2.1% (lowest) for school ASEC and WEC as well as 24.2% (highest) for OTAC.

Item 8 of Questionnaire

Responses to item 8 of the questionnaire are presented in Table 8. Respondents were asked to show how they perceive the presence of conflict caused by conflicting goals of special interest groups in their schools

Table 8

Existence of Conflict Caused by Conflicting Goals of Special Interest Groups

Serial Number	School	Rarely %	Sometimes %	Often %	Total %
1	KWAC	76.1	23.9	-	100.0
2	ASEC	78.2	21.8	-	100.0
3	KEC	77.9	22.1	-	100.0
4	WEC	71.7	28.3	-	100.0
5	OFOC	77.5	22.5	-	100.0
6	AKOC	72.8	27.2	-	100.0
7	AKRC	65.7	28.1	6.3	100.0
8	BAC	76.8	23.2	-	100.0
9	ADBC	78.6	21.4	-	100.0
10	ASOC	70.2	23.2	6.7	100.0
11	DIC	67.9	28.4	3.7	100.0
12	AMAC	71.8	24.9	4.0	100.0
13	OTAC	70.9	24.5	4.6	100.0
14	ASTOC	54.4	12.2	33.4	100.0
15	SUAC	80.6	19.4	-	100.0
	Total	72.7	23.4	3.9	100.0

Majority of the respondents from all the circuits expressed the opinion that the exercise of this type of conflict was rare. They ranged between 54.4% (lowest) for ASTOC and 80.6% (highest) for SUAC. It could be said that conflicting goals of special interest groups did not exist in the circuits so as to cause any significant conflict.

It is pertinent to observe that here; ASOC (6.7%), DIC (3.7%) and OTAC (4.6%) follow the norm. Elsewhere they are the exception to the general situation, it could be said that in this instance, the Circuit Supervisors do not occupy the

centre spot. In the other instances, they are the pivot of the conflicting situations. Respondents in ASTOC however indicated high prevalence of this in the circuit. That is, 33.4%.

Item 9 of Questionnaire

Table 9 gives responses to item 10 of the questionnaire. Respondents were asked to show how they perceived the presence of conflict caused by Headteacher's dependence on one party while the other party was sidelined

Table 9
Existence of Conflict Caused by Headteacher's Dependence on One Party while the Other Party is sidelined

Serial Number	School	Rarely %	Sometimes %	Often %	Total %
1	KWAC	71.9	28.1	-	100.0
2	ASEC	67.4	32.6	-	100.0
3	KEC	77.3	22.7	-	100.0
4	WEC	73.8	26.2	-	100.0
5	OFOC	83.1	16.9	-	100.0
6	AKOC	74.8	25.2	-	100.0
7	AKRC	67.6	28.2	4.2	100.0
8	BAC	76.8	23.2	-	100.0
9	ADBC	78.6	21.4	-	100.0
10	ASOC	58.7	22.7	18.6	100.0
11	DIC	53.5	28.0	18.5	100.0
12	AMAC	77.8	18.2	2.7	100.0
13	OTAC	54.5	19.8	25.7	100.0
14	ASTOC	76.1	23.9	-	100.0
15	SUAC	76.0	24.0	-	100.0
	Total	71.2	24.2	4.6	100.0

Respondents in ASOC, DIC and OTAC stated that this type of conflict was often present in the circuits. 18.6%, 18.5% and 25.7% were respectively indicated in these circuits. In all the remaining circuits, the occurrence of this type of conflict was rare. It could be said that the circuit supervisors of these circuits did not depend on one party to the extent that this could result in conflicting situations. In circuits AKRC and AMAC, respondents indicated some prevalence of this, but they were very low. 4.2% and 2.7% respectively.

Item 10 of Questionnaire

In Table 10, responses to item 10 of the questionnaire are provided. The item sought views from respondents on the existence of conflict caused by misinterpretation of the behaviour of others.

Table 10
Existence of Conflict Caused by Misinterpretation of the Behaviour of Others.

Serial Number	School	Rarely %	Sometimes %	Often %	Total %
1	KWAC	73.9	21.7	4.4	100.0
2	ASEC	77.4	22.6	-	100.0
3	KEC	80.8	19.8	-	100.0
4	WEC	71.7	28.3	-	100.0
5	OFOC	76.3	23.7	-	100.0
6	AKOC	71.3	24.8	-	100.0
7	AKRC	71.9	28.1	-	100.0
8	BAC	80.2	19.8	-	100.0
9	ADBC	69.2	30.8	-	100.0
10	ASOC	67.0	28.0	5.0	100.0
11	DIC	53.7	33.3	12.9	100.0
12	AMAC	71.5	21.7	6.8	100.0
13	OTAC	61.8	30.4	7.8	100.0
14	ASTOC	80.0	16.3	3.7	100.0
15	SUAC	72.5	27.7	-	100.0
	Total	71.9	25.4	2.7	100.0

Table 10 indicates, there were average prevalence of this type of conflict in circuits ASOC, DIC and OTAC. Its occurrence in all the others was rare. Obviously, it could be concluded that the tendency for some members of staff to misinterpret the behaviour of others did not exist in these schools.

Item 11 of Questionnaire

In Table 11, responses to item 11 of the questionnaire that dealt with the existence of conflict caused by competition are presented.

Table 11
Existence of Conflict Caused by Competition

Serial Number	School	Rarely %	Sometimes %	Often %	Total %
1	KWAC	78.3	21.7	-	100.0
2	ASEC	76.7	23.3	-	100.0
3	KEC	83.0	17.0	-	100.0
4	WEC	89.3	10.7	-	100.0
5	OFOC	83.0	17.0	-	100.0
6	AKOC	80.7	19.3	-	100.0
7	AKRC	78.2	21.8	-	100.0
8	BAC	79.3	20.7	-	100.0
9	ADBC	70.3	29.7	-	100.0
10	ASOC	68.3	25.0	6.7	100.0
11	DIC	73.4	22.9	3.7	100.0
12	AMAC	73.7	25.0	1.3	100.0
13	OTAC	81.7	18.4	-	100.0
14	ASTOC	83.2	16.8	-	100.0
15	SUAC	77.5	22.5	-	100.0
	Total	78.4	20.8	0.8	100.0

A look at Table 11 reveals that the presence of this type of conflict was rare in all the circuits sampled in the Metropolis including schools ASOC, DIC and OTAC. It should be noted that as far as this type of conflict is concerned, circuits ASOC, DIC and OTAC have for another time, conformed to the norm. It was likely that situations that might give rise for the staff to compete with one another did not exist in the circuits. Hence there was no likelihood for this type of conflict.

Item 12 of Questionnaire

Responses to item 12 of the questionnaire are presented in Table12. The item sought the view of respondents on the presence of conflict caused by dominance.

Table 12
Existence of Conflict Caused by Dominance

Serial Number	School	Rarely %	Sometimes %	Often %	Total %
1	KWAC	80.6	19.4	-	100.0
2	ASEC	72.9	27.1	-	100.0
3	KEC	69.9	30.1	-	100.0
4	WEC	69.4	30.6	-	100.0
5	OFOC	75.6	24.4	-	100.0
6	AKOC	72.8	21.2	-	100.0
7	AKRC	69.9	26.0	4.2	100.0
8	BAC	76.2	23.8	-	100.0
9	ADBC	77.0	23.0	-	100.0
10	ASOC	58.5	21.5	20.0	100.0
11	DIC	52.8	26.8	20.4	100.0
12	AMAC	76.3	23.7	-	100.0
13	OTAC	59.0	19.8	21.2	100.0
14	ASTOC	78.0	22.0	-	100.0
15	SUAC	78.2	21.8	-	100.0
	Total	71.3	24.2	4.4	100.0

Table 12 shows that generally, with the exception of ASOC, DIC and OTAC there was no dominance on the part of headteachers of the schools that could cause any significant conflict.

Summary

The analysis of the existence of conflict has revealed that generally there was rare occurrence of conflict in the schools within the circuits in the Metropolis. However, in ASOC, DIC and OTAC the picture was different. A greater number of respondents in those circuits perceived that there was a high prevalence of conflicts in the circuits. There were only three items of the questionnaire which most of the respondents contended that their presence in the circuits were rare. These were the existence of conflict caused by communication barriers (item 4), conflicting goals of special interest groups (item 8) and competition (item 11). Hence, on the whole, there was a low prevalence of conflicts in all but three of the circuits in the Kumasi Metropolis.

Comparison of Subordinate and Lateral Conflict

In order to answer research Question 2, responses to items 1 and 2 of the questionnaire presented in Tables 1 and 2 were compared. Generally, a study of Tables 1 and 2 shows that both subordinate conflict and lateral conflicts rarely occurred in all the schools in the metropolis. However, a comparison of the two types of conflict brings to light that subordinate conflict was more common than lateral conflict. This is because while 5.9% of the respondents in the metropolis said that subordinate conflict often occurred**,** 1.8% of them were of the view that lateral conflict was often present in the schools.

Circuit Supervisors' Conflict Prevention Techniques

This section addresses Research Question 3. The analysis of the data in this section shows the extent to which respondents perceived the conflict prevention techniques demonstrated by the Circuit Supervisors in the metropolis. Percentage responses for each individual statement or item are presented for each circuit. These are followed by item analysis.

In the same way, the other two categories 'No Importance' and 'Little Importance' were combined and labeled 'Little Importance'. The category 'Some Importance' was again made to stand alone to indicate a mid-point between 'Great Importance' and 'Little Importance'. This was done to clearly categorise views observed and to make the analysis more meaningful.

The number of respondents sampled from the three schools in each of the sixteen circuits in the metropolis were put together to represent their respective circuits for the analysis. The analysis is therefore based on the sixteen circuits instead of the forty-eight schools; and the respondents are made up of both headteachers and teachers.

Item 13 of Questionnaire

Table 13 provides responses to item 13 of the questionnaire. The item requested respondents to express their views on how often the Circuit Supervisor allows or facilitates free flow of information to headteachers and teachers.

Table 13

How often the Circuit Supervisor Allows / Facilitates Free Flow of Information to Headteachers and Teachers.

Serial Number	School	Rarely %	Sometimes %	Often %	Total %
1	KWAC	---	31.0	69.0	100.0
2	ASEC	---	36.2	63.8	100.0
3	KEC	23.1	25.6	51.3	100.0
4	WEC	12.2	26.5	61.3	100.0
5	OFOC	---	20.5	79.5	100.0
6	AKOC	---	21.6	78.4	100.0
7	AKRC	---	38.8	61.2	100.0
8	ASOC	32.3	48.4	19.3	100.0
9	BAC	---	33.3	66.7	100.0
10	ADBC	---	48.7	51.3	100.0
11	AMAC	10.7	35.7	53.6	100.0
12	DIC	15.4	30.8	53.8	100.0
13	OTAC	16.0	64.0	20.0	100.0
14	ASTOC	---	30.0	70.0	100.0
15	SUAC	---	45.0	55.0	100.0
	Total	7.3	35.7	56.9	100.0

Majority of respondents in all the circuits stated that their Circuit Supervisors attached great importance to ensuring that there was free flow of information to the schools in the circuits. As much as 64.0% of respondents in OTAC expressed that their Circuit Supervisor attached some importance to ensuring that there was free flow of information to the headteachers and teachers. This suggests that all the Circuit Supervisors except that of OTAC, made sure that information reached their headteachers and teachers.

Item 14 of Questionnaire

Table 14 gives the responses to item 14 of the questionnaire. Respondents were asked to show their perception of the extent of the Circuit Supervisor's sensitivity to feedback from the headteachers and teachers.

Table 14
Extent of Circuit Supervisor's Sensitivity to Feedback from the Headteachers and Teachers.

Serial Number	School	Rarely %	Sometimes %	Often %	Total %
1.	KWAC	---	42.9	57.1	100.0
2.	ASEC	---	42.6	57.4	100.0
3.	KEC	---	28.2	71.8	100.0
4.	WEC	---	20.4	79.6	100.0
5.	OFOC	---	31.8	68.2	100.0
6.	AKOC	---	23.5	76.5	100.0
7.	AKRC	18.4	30.6	51.0	100.0
8.	ASOC	16.1	51.6	32.3	100.0
9.	BAC	---	18.2	81.8	100.0
10.	ADBC	---	38.5	61.5	100.0
11.	AMAC	12.5	33.8	53.7	100.0
12.	DIC	23.1	34.6	42.3	100.0
13.	OTAC	10.0	50.0	40.0	100.0
14.	ASTOC	---	30.0	70.0	100.0
15.	SUAC	---	35.0	65.0	100.0
Total		5.3	34.1	60.5	100.0

Most of the respondents in all the circuits expressed the view that their Circuit Supervisors attached great importance to being sensitive to feedback from the headteachers and teachers of the schools in the circuits. These ranged from

53.7% of respondents in AMAC to 81.8% of respondents in BAC. In circuits ASOC, DIC and OTAC, the respondents noted that their Circuit Supervisors showed some importance to being sensitive to feedback from the staff.

Item 15 of Questionnaire

Table 15 provides the responses to item 15 of the questionnaire. The respondents were requested to express their views on the extent of the Circuit Supervisors' flexibility.

Table 15

The Extent of the Circuit Supervisors' Flexibility.

Serial Number	School	Rarely %	Sometimes %	Often %	Total %
1	KWAC	---	11.9	88.1	100.0
2	ASEC	---	10.6	89.4	100.0
3	KEC	---	25.6	74.4	100.0
4	WEC	---	20.4	79.6	100.0
5	OFOC	---	18.2	81.8	100.0
6	AKOC		21.6	78.4	100.0
7	AKRC	--	24.5	75.5	100.0
8	ASOC	66.1	21.0	12.9	100.0
9	BAC	---	30.3	69.7	100.0
10	ADBC	---	30.8	69.2	100.0
11	AMAC	---	28.6	71.4	100.0
12	DIC	--	23.1	76.9	100.0
13	OTAC	---	50.0	50.0	100.0
14	ASTOC	--	30.0	70.0	100.0
15	SUAC	-	37.5	62.5	100.0
	Total	4.4	25.6	70.0	100.0

As Table 15 shows, most of the respondents in all the circuits maintained that their Circuit Supervisors were flexible. The story was different in ASOC where the Circuit Supervisor did not demonstrate flexibility in dealing with the headteachers and teachers. This view was expressed by 66.1% of the respondents in the circuit.

Item 16 of Questionnaire

Table 16 provides the responses to item 16 of the questionnaire. The respondents were requested to express their views on the extent of the Circuit Supervisors' flexibility.

Item 16 of Questionnaire

Responses to item 16 of the questionnaire are given in Table 16. Respondents were asked to express their opinions on how often the Circuit Supervisor was accessible to the staff for discussion

Table 16

How Often the Circuit Supervisor was Accessible to the Staff for Discussion.

Serial Number	School	Rarely %	Sometimes %	Often %	Total %
1	KWAC	---	23.8	76.2	100.0
2	ASEC	---	29.8	70.2	100.0
3	KEC	---	38.5	61.5	100.0
4	WEC	---	36.7	63.3	100.0
5	OFOC	---	31.8	68.2	100.0
6	AKOC	---	31.4	68.6	100.0
7	AKRC	---	40.8	59.2	100.0
8	ASOC	62.9	27.4	9.7	100.0
9	BAC	---	39.4	60.6	100.0
10	ADBC	---	46.2	53.8	100.0
11	AMAC	---	28.6	71.4	100.0
12	DIC	19.2	23.1	57.7	100.0
13	OTAC	30.0	20.0	50.0	100.0
14	ASTOC	---	30.0	70.0	100.0
15	SUAC	---	30.0	70.0	100.0
	Total	7.5	31.8	60.7	100.0

Table 16 reveals that most of the respondents in all the circuits with the exception of ASOC showed that the doors of their Circuit Supervisors were always opened. Those who expressed this point of view ranged from 50.0% of the respondents in OTAC to 57.7% of respondents in DIC and 71.4% in AMAC. Thus, the headteachers and teachers could approach their Circuit Supervisors to discuss their problems. On the other hand, majority of respondents in ASOC (62.9%) indicated that their Circuit Supervisor was not accessible to the staff for discussion. This suggests that the headteachers and teachers in ASOC could not easily go to their Circuit Supervisor to get their problems solved for them.

Item 17 of Questionnaire

In Table 17, responses to item 18 of the questionnaire are presented. The views of respondents on how often the Circuit Supervisors ensured personal atmosphere of openness was sought.

Table 17

How Often the Circuit Supervisors Ensured Personal Atmosphere of Openness.

Serial Number	School	Rarely %	Sometimes %	Often %	Total %
1	KWAC	---	28.6	71.4	100.0
2	ASEC	---	31.9	68.1	100.0
3	KEC	---	25.6	74.4	100.0
4	WEC	---	38.5	61.5	100.0
5	OFOC	---	31.8	68.2	100.0
6	AKOC	---	41.2	58.8	100.0
7	AKRC	---	38 .8	61.2	100.0
8	ASOC	61.3	24.2	14.5	100.0
9	BAC	---	39.4	60.6	100.0
10	ADBC	---	48.7	51.3	100.0
11	AMAC	---	46.4	53.6	100.0
12	DIC	23.1	38.5	38.4	100.0
13	OTAC	58.0	28.0	14.0	100.0
14	ASTOC	---	30.0	70.0	100.0
15	SUAC	---	30.0	70.0	100.0
	Total	9.5	34.8	55.7	100.0

Apart from ASOC and OTAC, most of the respondents from all the circuits pointed out that their Circuit Supervisors attached great importance to

ensuring personal atmosphere of openness. Hence, whilst all the Circuit Supervisors of the other Circuits encouraged open and frank discussions of issues, this was not the case in ASOC and OTAC. As much as 61.3% of respondents in ASOC and 58.0% of respondents in OTAC indicated that their Circuit Supervisors attached little importance to ensuring personal atmosphere of openness.

Item 18 of Questionnaire

Table 18 provides the responses to item19 of the questionnaire. The opinions of respondents on how often the Circuit Supervisor encouraged the staff to work as a team were sought.

Table 18

How Often the Circuit Supervisor Encouraged the Staff to Work as a Team.

Serial Number	Circuit	Rarely %	Sometimes %	Often %	Total %
1	KWAC	---	33.3	66.7	100.0
2	ASEC	---	36.2	63.8	100.0
3	KEC	---	25.6	74.4	100.0
4	WEC	---	36.7	63.3	100.0
5	OFOC	---	31.8	68.2	100.0
6	AKOC	---	31.4	68.6	100.0
7	AKRC	---	40.8	59.2	100.0
8	ASOC	72.6	14.5	12.9	100.0
9	BAC	---	39.4	60.6	100.0
10	ADBC	---	43.6	56.4	100.0
11	AMAC	---	37.5	62.5	100.0
12	DIC	26.9	38.5	34.6	100.0
13	OTAC	20.0	40.0	40.0	100.0
14	ASTOC	---	34.0	66.0	100.0
15	SUAC	---	25.0	75.0	100.0
	Total	8.0	33.9	58.1	100.0

As revealed by Table 18, the Circuit Supervisors of all the Circuits with the exception of ASOC encouraged the staff to work as a team to achieve organizational goals. However, in ASOC, the Circuit Supervisor attached little or no importance to encouraging the staff to work as a team. This viewpoint was expressed by 72.6% of respondents in the Circuit. There was therefore the likelihood of individual headteachers and teachers working towards different goals.

Item 19 of Questionnaire

Table 19 shows responses to item 19 of the questionnaire. Respondents were requested to express their views how often the Circuit Supervisor delegated authority.

Table 19

How Often the Circuit Supervisor Delegated Authority.

Serial Number	Circuit	Rarely %	Sometimes %	Often %	Total %
1.	KWAC	---	47.6	52.4	100.0
2.	ASEC	---	42.6	57.4	100.0
3.	KEC	---	48.7	51.3	100.0
4.	WEC	---	44.9	55.1	100.0
5.	OFOC	---	40.9	59.1	100.0
6.	AKOC	---	41.2	58.8	100.0
7.	AKRC	---	44.9	55.1	100.0
8.	ASOC	77.4	12.9	9.7	100.0
9.	BAC	---	45.5	54.5	100.0
10.	ADBC	---	39.9	64.1	100.0
11.	AMAC	10.7	39.3	50.0	100.0
12.	DIC	---	42.3	57.7	100.0
13.	OTAC	---	56.0	44.0	100.0
14. .	ASTOC	---	30.0	70.0	100.0
15.	SUAC	---	40.0	60.0	100.0
	Total	5.8	41.1	53.2	100.0

Table 19 reveals that a greater number of respondents in all the circuits except ASOC maintained that their Circuit Supervisors delegated authority. It could therefore be said that the Circuit Supervisors of these circuits involved many headteachers and teachers in some of their activities.

It is important to note that they did this in the areas of information dissemination, distribution of letters, organization of teachers and community members for such activities as School Performance Appraisal Meetings (SPAM) and other important School-Community Meetings as well as organization of schools for quizzes and debates in the circuits.

It is also worthy to note that Circuit Supervisors did not delegate authority to headteachers and teachers to oversee the activities of other schools in the circuit other than their own schools in areas of monitoring and supervision to provide professional support to staff. On the other hand, all authority in ASOC was concentrated in the Circuit Supervisor. This viewpoint was expressed by 77.4% of respondents in that circuit. .Most respondents (56.0%) in OTAC also indicated this.

Item 20 of Questionnaire

Responses to item 20 of the questionnaire are expressed in Table 20. Respondents were required to express their opinions on how often the Circuit Supervisor was sympathetic to staff with personal problems.

Table 20

How Often the Circuit Supervisor Showed Sympathy to Staff with Personal Problems.

Serial Number	Circuit	Rarely %	Sometimes %	Often %	Total %
1.	KWAC	---	33.3	66.7	100.0
2.	ASEC	---	36.2	63.8	100.0
3.	KEC	---	46.2	53.8	100.0
4.	WEC	---	32.7	67.3	100.0
5.	OFOC	---	40.9	59.1	100.0
6.	AKOC	---	33.3	66.7	100.0
7.	AKRC	18.4	57.1	24.5	100.0
8.	ASOC	71.0	12.9	16.1	100.0
9.	BAC	---	30.3	69.7	100.0
10.	ADBC	---	38.5	61.5	100.0
11.	AMAC	7.1	39.3	53.6	100.0
12.	DIC	15.4	38.5	46.1	100.0
13.	OTAC	24.0	32.0	44.0	100.0
14.	ASTOC	---	34.0	66.0	100.0
15.	SUAC	---	30.0	70.0	100.0
	Total	9.1	35.7	55.2	100.0

From Table 20 most Circuit Supervisors attached were sympathetic to staff with personal problems. The situation was however different in two circuits. In AKRC, the Circuit Supervisor was sometimes sympathetic to staff with personal problems. 57.1% of respondents indicated this. In ASOC, the Circuit Supervisor was rarely sympathetic to subordinates with personal problems. As much as 71.0% of respondents expressed this view.

Item 21 of Questionnaire

The responses provided in Table 21 relate to item 21 of the questionnaire. Respondents were to indicate how often the Circuit Supervisor was fair in dealing with all members of staff.

Table 21

How Often the Circuit Supervisor Demonstrated Fairness in Dealing with all Members of Staff.

Serial Number	Circuit	Rarely %	Sometimes %	Often %	Total %
1	KWAC	---	35.7	64.3	100.0
2	ASEC	---	31.9	68.1	100.0
3	KEC	---	46.2	53.8	100.0
4	WEC	---	32.7	67.3	100.0
5	OFOC	---	31.8	68.2	100.0
6	AKOC	---	43.1	56.9	100.0
7	AKRC	---	38.8	61.2	100.0
8	ASOC	71.0	14.5	14.5	100.0
9	BAC	---	39.4	60.6	100.0
10	ADBC	---	48.7	51.3	100.0
11	AMAC	14.3	32.1	53.6	100.0
12	DIC	11.5	34.6	53.9	100.0
13	OTAC	16.0	44.0	40.0	100.0
14	ASTOC	---	40.0	60.0	100.0
15	SUAC	---	35.0	65.0	100.0
	Total	7.5	36.6	55.9	100.0

Most of the respondents from all the Circuits apart from ASOC were of the view that their Circuit Supervisors often treated them fairly. However, as much as 71.0% of respondents in ASOC indicated that not all members of staff were fairly treated by the Circuit Supervisor.

Summary

The analysis of this section has revealed that all the Circuit Supervisors in the Kumasi Metropolis demonstrated conflict prevention techniques. The only exception was ASOC and sometimes OTAC.

Techniques demonstrated by the Circuit Supervisors included: ensuring free flow of information; being sensitive to feedback from the staff; being accessible to the staff for discussion; encouraging the staff to work as a team; being fair in dealing with all members of staff.

As perceived by respondents, there was reduced intensity of conflict in these circuits.

However, the Circuit Supervisors for ASOC and sometimes OTAC consistently failed to use the conflict prevention techniques in the management of their circuits. As a result, in the opinion of the respondents, there were increased levels of conflict in the schools in the circuits.

Conflict Resolution Techniques of Circuit Supervisors

This section deals with Research Question 4.

The analysis of the data in this section shows how the Circuit Supervisors of ASOC and OTAC resolved the numerous conflicts that arose in their schools in their Circuits. In addition, how other Circuit Supervisors also resolved the few conflicts that arose in the schools in their circuits are also presented.

As perceived by respondents in the previous section the Circuit Supervisors of ASOC and OTAC did not appear to exhibit conflict prevention techniques and as a result had to contend with numerous conflict situations.

Percentage responses to the different conflict resolution techniques that were studied are provided in Tables 22 to 31.

In presenting the views expressed by respondents, the researcher merged the two categories, 'Never' and 'Seldom' and labelled them 'seldom'.

Furthermore, the other categories 'very often' and 'often' were combined and labelled 'often'. The category 'occasionally' was made to stand alone to serve as a mid-point between 'seldom' and 'often'. This was done to make the views expressed by respondents more distinct in the analysis.

Item 22 of Questionnaire

Responses to item 22 of questionnaire are presented in Table 22. Respondents were asked to indicate how they perceived their Circuit Supervisor's use of 'non-response' or 'withdrawal' in resolving conflicts.

Table 22

The Circuit Supervisor's Use of Non-Response or Withdrawal in Resolving Conflicts.

Serial Number	Circuit	Seldom %	Occasionally %	Often %	Total %
1.	KWAC	52.4	35.7	11.9	100.0
2.	ASEC	63.8	21.3	14.9	100.0
3.	KEC	74.4	25.6	---	100.0
4.	WEC	71.4	28.6	---	100.0
5.	OFOC	63.6	36.4	---	100.0
6.	AKOC	76.5	23.5	---	100.0
7.	AKRC	18.4	51.0	30.6	100.0
8.	ASOC	8.1	19.4	72.5	100.0
9.	BAC	60.6	24.2	15.2	100.0
10.	ADBC	74.4	15.4	10.2	100.0
11.	AMAC	64.3	21.4	14.3	100.0
12.	DIC	19.2	61.5	19.3	100.0
13.	OTAC	16.0	20.0	64.0	100.0
14.	ASTOC	66.0	34.0	---	100.0
15.	SUAC	67.5	32.5	---	100.0
	Total	53.1	30.0	16.9	100.0

Most of the respondents indicated that their Circuit Supervisors seldom used 'non-response' as a technique to resolve the few conflicts that arose in the schools in the circuits. Respondents in ASOC and OTAC however, expressed the view that their Circuit Supervisors often resorted to this technique in resolving conflicts. In ASOC and OTAC, 72.5% and 64.0% of respondents respectively expressed this view. In DIC and AKRC, majority of the respondents stated that the Circuit Supervisors occasionally employed the technique to resolve the few conflicts that occurred there.

Item 23 of Questionnaire

In Table 23**,** responses to item 23 of questionnaire are provided. The opinion of respondents in relation to their Circuit Supervisors' use of 'isolation' in resolving conflicts was sought.

Table 23

The Circuit Supervisor's Use of Isolation.

Serial Number	Circuit	Seldom %	Occasionally %	Often %	Total %
1	KWAC	66.7	33.3	---	100.0
2	ASEC	51.1	34.0	14.9	100.0
3	KEC	64.1	25.6	10.3	100.0
4	WEC	59.2	32.7	8.1	100.0
5	OFOC	54.5	29.5	16.0	100.0
6	AKOC	60.8	23.5	15.7	100.0
7	AKRC	61.2	20.4	18.4	100.0
8	ASOC	19.4	51.6	29.0	100.0
9	BAC	69.7	30.3	---	100.0
10	ADBC	74.4	12.8	12.8	100.0
11	AMAC	53.6	28.6	17.8	100.0
12	DIC	61.5	25.0	13.5	100.0
13	OTAC	20.0	60.0	20.0	100.0
14	ASTOC	50.0	30.0	20.0	100.0
15	SUAC	62.5	37.5	---	100.0
	Total	55.2	31.7	13.1	100.0

Majority of respondents in almost all the circuits pointed out that 'isolation' was seldom used by their Circuit Supervisors in resolving conflicts. The only exceptions were ASOC and OTAC, where the Circuit Supervisors were

perceived to have employed isolation occasionally as a technique for conflict resolution.

Item 24 of Questionnaire

Responses to item 24 of questionnaire are provided in Table 24. Respondents were requested to indicate their perception of their Circuit Supervisors' use of 'procrastination' in conflict resolution.

Table 24

The Circuit Supervisor's Use of Procrastination

Serial Number	Circuit	Seldom %	Occasionally %	Often %	Total %
1	KWAC	71.4	28.6	---	100.0
2	ASEC	53.2	34.0	12.8	100.0
3	KEC	53.8	33.3	12.9	100.0
4	WEC	51.1	34.7	14.2	100.0
5	OFOC	54.5	45.5	---	100.0
6	AKOC	62.7	37.3	---	100.0
7	AKRC	51.0	36.7	12.3	100.0
8	ASOC	12.5	19.4	68.1	100.0
9	BAC	69.7	21.2	9.1	100.0
10	ADBC	64.1	17.9	18.0	100.0
11	AMAC	60.7	25.0	14.3	100.0
12	DIC	51.9	28.8	19.3	100.0
13	OTAC	22.0	22.0	56.0	100.0
14	ASTOC	70.0	20.0	10.0	100.0
15	SUAC	62.5	25.0	12.5	100.0
	Total	54.1	28.6	17.3	100.0

A greater number of respondents in all the circuits with the exception of ASOC and OTAC contended that their Circuit Supervisors seldom employed

'procrastination' in conflict resolution. This suggests that there were little or no conflicts in those circuits that made its adoption necessary. In ASOC and OTAC, most of the respondents were of the opinion that their Circuit Supervisors often employed this technique when confronted with conflicts.

Item 25 of Questionnaire

Responses to item 25 of the questionnaire that dealt with how respondents saw their Circuit Supervisors' adoption of 'coercion' in conflict resolution are provided in Table 25.

Table 25
The Circuit Supervisor's Use of Coercion.

Serial Number	Circuit	Seldom %	Occasionally %	Often %	Total %
1	KWAC	76.2	23.8	---	100.0
2	ASEC	78.7	21.3	---	100.0
3	KEC	74.4	25.6	---	100.0
4	WEC	59.2	40.8	---	100.0
5	OFOC	54.5	36.4	9.1	100.0
6	AKOC	68.6	19.6	11.8	100.0
7	AKRC	49.0	30.6	20.4	100.0
8	ASOC	16.1	25.8	58.1	100.0
9	BAC	69.7	30.3	---	100.0
10	ADBC	59.0	25.6	15.4	100.0
11	AMAC	50.0	42.9	7.1	100.0
12	DIC	61.5	38.5	---	100.0
13	OTAC	50.0	26.0	24.0	100.0
14	ASTOC	60.0	40.0	---	100.0
15	SUAC	70.0	30.0	---	100.0
	Total	59.8	30.5	9.7	100.0

As the earlier findings indicate, apart from ASOC, conflicts rarely occurred in the circuits. There would therefore be no need to adopt this technique. As revealed by Table 26, most of the respondents expressed the view that their Circuit Supervisors seldom used 'coercion' in resolving conflicts. The Circuit Supervisor of ASOC was however noted to have occasionally resorted to 'coercion' in resolving conflicts.

Item 26 of Questionnaire.

The responses presented in Table 26 relate to item 26 of the questionnaire. Respondents were required to indicate their perception of their Circuit Supervisors' use of 'imposition' in finding solutions to conflicts.

Table 26
The Circuit Supervisor's Use of Imposition.

Serial Number	Circuit Circuit	Seldom %	Occasionally %	Often %	Total %
1	KWAC	71.4	28.6	---	100.0
2	ASEC	63.8	36.2	---	100.0
3	KEC	51.3	48.7	---	100.0
4	WEC	61.2	26.5	12.3	100.0
5	OFOC	68.2	22.7	9.1	100.0
6	AKOC	52.9	47.1	---	100.0
7	AKRC	61.2	20.4	18.4	100.0
8	ASOC	19.4	56.5	24.1	100.0
9	BAC	90.9	9.1	---	100.0
10	ADBC	51.3	23.1	25.6	100.0
11	AMAC	53.6	25.0	21.4	100.0
12	DIC	51.9	34.6	13.5	100.0
13	OTAC	20.0	54.0	26.0	100.0
14	ASTOC	80.0	20.0	---	100.0
15	SUAC	87.5	12.5	---	100.0
Total		59.0	31.0	10.0	100.0

Apart from ASOC and OTAC, a greater number of respondents in all the schools showed that their Circuit Supervisors seldom employed the technique; implying that there was rarely any conflicts in these circuits to warrant the adoption of ' imposition' in resolving them. Most respondents in ASOC and OTAC however, did indicate that the Circuit Supervisors occasionally resorted to 'imposition' as a means of resolving conflicts.

Item 27 of Questionnaire

Responses to item 27 of questionnaire are provided in Table 27. Respondents were requested to express their opinion on their Circuit Supervisors' use of 'persuasion' in conflict resolution.

Table 27

The Circuit Supervisor's Use of Persuasion.

Serial Number	Circuit	Seldom %	Occasionally %	Often %	Total %
1	KWAC	14.3	28.6	57.1	100.0
2	ASEC	14.4	31.9	53.7	100.0
3	KEC	15.4	28.2	56.4	100.0
4	WEC	16.3	22.4	61.3	100.0
5	OFOC	11.4	34.1	54.5	100.0
6	AKOC	---	33.3	66.7	100.0
7	AKRC	18.4	40.8	40.8	100.0
8	ASOC	61.3	25.8	12.9	100.0
9	BAC	18.2	30.0	51.8	100.0
10	ADBC	23.1	30.8	46.1	100.0
11	AMAC	21.4	33.9	44.7	100.0
12	DIC	28.8	32.7	38.5	100.0
13	OTAC	30.0	40.0	30.0	100.0
14	ASTOC	25.0	32.0	43.0	100.0
15	SUAC	25.0	30.0	45.0	100.0
	Total	21.5	31.6	46.9	100.0

With the exception of ASOC, all the Circuit Supervisors were noted to have often employed ‘persuasion’ to resolve the few conflicts that arose in the schools in the circuits. 61.3% of respondents in ASOC expressed the view that the Circuit Supervisor seldom resorted to this technique.

Item 28 of Questionnaire

Table 28 provides responses to item 28 of the questionnaire. The item sought the views of respondents on how they perceived their Circuit Supervisors’ adoption of ‘domination’ in conflict resolution

Table 28

The Circuit Supervisors' Use of Domination

Serial Number	Circuit	Seldom %	Occasionally %	Often %	Total %
1	KWAC	71.4	28.6	---	100.0
2	ASEC	68.1	31.9	---	100.0
3	KEC	71.8	28.2	---	100.0
4	WEC	71.4	24.5	4.1	100.0
5	OFOC	68.2	31.8	---	100.0
6	AKOC	68.6	31.4	---	100.0
7	AKRC	69.1	24.5	6.4	100.0
8	ASOC	12.9	25.8	61.3	100.0
9	BAC	60.6	39.4	---	100.0
10	ADBC	51.3	48.7	---	100.0
11	AMAC	51.8	33.9	14.3	100.0
12	DIC	51.9	35.7	12.4	100.0
13	OTAC	24.0	20.0	56.0	100.0
14	ASTOC	68.0	32.0	---	100.0
15	SUAC	70.0	30.0	---	100.0
	Total	58.6	31.1	10.3	100.0

Majority of respondents from all the circuits except ASOC and OTAC expressed the view that their Circuit Supervisors seldom employed 'domination' in conflict resolution. In the case of ASOC, 61.3% of respondents maintained that the Circuit Supervisor often used the technique in resolving conflicts. In OTAC, 56.0% of respondents also expressed the same view.

Item 29 of Questionnaire

The extent to which respondents perceived their Circuit Supervisors' adoption of 'compromise' was found out and shown in Table 29.

Table 29

The Circuit Supervisor's Use of Compromise.

Serial Number	Circuit	Seldom %	Occasionally %	Often %	Total %
1	KWAC	11.9	35.5	52.6	100.0
2	ASEC	12.8	29.8	57.4	100.0
3	KEC	12.8	35.9	51.3	100.0
4	WEC	8.2	32.9	58.9	100.0
5	OFOC	15.9	29.5	54.6	100.0
6	AKOC	7.8	31.4	60.8	100.0
7	AKRC	16.3	59.2	24.5	100.0
8	ASOC	64.5	24.2	11.3	100.0
9	BAC	9.1	30.3	60.6	100.0
10	ADBC	12.8	35.9	51.3	100.0
11	AMAC	14.3	21.4	64.3	100.0
12	DIC	19.2	28.8	52.0	100.0
13	OTAC	20.0	60.0	20.0	100.0
14	ASTOC	10.0	30.0	60.0	100.0
15	SUAC	15.0	22.5	62.5	100.0
	Total	16.7	33.8	49.5	100.0

As Table 29 reveals, there were not many conflicts in the metropolis apart from AKRC, ASOC and OTAC. The Circuit Supervisors of all the circuits except these were known to have often employed 'compromise' in resolving the few conflicts that occurred there. However, most of the respondents in AKRC and OTAC said that their Circuit Supervisors occasionally employed this technique.

In ASOC, 64.5% of respondents indicated that the Circuit Supervisor seldom adopted 'compromise' in conflict resolution.

Item 30 of Questionnaire

Table 30 provides the responses to item 30 of the questionnaire. The item sought the views of respondents on their Circuit Supervisors' use of 'collaboration' as a method for resolving conflicts.

Table 30

The Circuit Supervisor's Use of Collaboration.

Serial Number	Circuit	Seldom %	Occasionally %	Often %	Total
1	KWAC	---	40.5	59.5	100.0
2	ASEC	---	38.3	61.7	100.0
3	KEC	12.8	30.8	56.4	100.0
4	WEC	18.4	30.6	51.0	100.0
5	OFOC	11.4	20.5	68.1	100.0
6	AKOC	19.6	35.3	45.1	100.0
7	AKRC	18.4	24.5	57.1	100.0
8	ASOC	67.7	21.0	11.3	100.0
9	BAC	---	30.0	70.0	100.0
10	ADBC	23.1	30.8	46.1	100.0
11	AMAC	17.9	32.1	50.0	100.0
12	DIC	23.1	19.2	57.7	100.0
13	OTAC	30.0	56.0	14.0	100.0
14	ASTOC	10.0	36.0	54.0	100.0
15	SUAC	20.0	30.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	18.2	31.7	50.1	100.0

A greater number of respondents in the schools in all the circuits expressed the view that their Circuit Supervisors often used 'collaboration' in resolving the few conflicts that were present. The only exceptions were ASOC

and OTAC. While the Circuit Supervisor of ASOC was known to have seldom adopted the technique that of OTAC was also found to have occasionally used it.

Item 31 of Questionnaire

In Table 31, responses to item 31 of the questionnaire are presented. The opinions of respondents on the adoption of 'arbitration' as a conflict resolution technique by the Circuit Supervisors were sought.

Table 31
The Circuit Supervisor's Use of Arbitration.

Serial Number	Circuit	Seldom %	Occasionally %	Often %	Total %
1	KWAC	19.1	35.5	45.4	100.0
2	ASEC	21.3	29.8	48.9	100.0
3	KEC	15.4	35.9	48.7	100.0
4	WEC	14.2	32.9	52.9	100.0
5	OFOC	9.1	29.5	61.4	100.0
6	AKOC	17.6	31.4	51.0	100.0
7	AKRC	18.4	59.2	22.4	100.0
8	ASOC	56.5	24.2	19.3	100.0
9	BAC	15.2	30.3	54.5	100.0
10	ADBC	20.5	35.9	43.6	100.0
11	AMAC	53.6	21.4	25.0	100.0
12	DIC	23.1	28.8	48.1	100.0
13	OTAC	40.0	40.0	20.0	100.0
14	ASTOC	18.0	28.0	54.0	100.0
15	SUAC	17.5	25.0	57.5	100.0
	Total	24.0	32.5	43.5	100.0

As Table 31 shows, apart from the Circuit Supervisors of ASOC, AMAC and OTAC, who seldom employed 'arbitration' in conflict resolution, the rest often used it to resolve the few conflicts that arose in their schools.

Summary

With the exception ASOC and sometimes OTAC, conflicting situations rarely occurred in all the circuits in the metropolis. Whenever any did show up, the Circuit Supervisors, often employed such rational approaches as 'persuasion', 'compromise', 'collaboration' and 'arbitration' in resolving them.

Respondents perceived that there was reduced level of conflict intensity in the schools in the circuits.

The Circuit Supervisors of ASOC and sometimes OTAC were perceived to have often used avoidance techniques such as 'non-response', 'procrastination', 'coercion' and 'imposition' in conflict resolution. As a result, as perceived by respondents, they experienced higher levels of conflict intensity in their circuits.

Relationship between Conflict Management Behaviours and the Existence of Conflicts

The Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Co-efficient was used to find out the relationships between conflict prevention techniques and the existence of conflicts as well as conflict resolution techniques and presence of conflicts in schools and for that matter, the circuits in the metropolis.

Testing of Null Hypothesis 1

In order to test for the relationship between conflict prevention techniques and the existence of conflict in the schools within the circuits, the following hypothesis was formulated:

Test of hypothesis for difference between means was used.

Let μ_1 = mean value for the existence of conflict in 15 circuits, and

μ_2 = mean value for conflict prevention techniques.

H_0: $\mu_1 = \mu_2$ and H_1: $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$

The test statistic is $Z = \dfrac{\overline{x_1} - \overline{x_2} - 0}{\sqrt{\dfrac{\sigma_1^2}{n_1} + \dfrac{\sigma_2^2}{n_2}}}$

$\bar{X}_1 = 33.33,\ \sigma_1 = 28.87,\ n_1 = 36$ *and* $\bar{X}_2 = 33.39,\ \sigma_2 = 21.24,\ n_2 = 30$

$$Z = \frac{(\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2)}{\sqrt{\dfrac{\sigma^2_1}{n_1} + \dfrac{\sigma^2_2}{n_2}}}$$

$$Z = \frac{(33.33 - 33.39)}{\sqrt{\dfrac{28.87^2}{36} + \dfrac{21.24^2}{30}}}$$

$$= \frac{-0.06}{\sqrt{23.15 + 15.04}}$$

$$= \frac{-0.06}{\sqrt{38.19}}$$

$$= \frac{-0.06}{6.1798}$$

$$Z = -0.0097$$

At 95% confidence interval, Z= 1.96 from the standard normal table. Since the calculated value is less than 1.96, we accept the null hypothesis and conclude that, there is no significant difference at 95% confidence interval between the existence of conflict and conflict prevention techniques

It could be inferred from the analysis of the questionnaires that there is a significant negative relationship between conflict prevention techniques demonstrated by Circuit Supervisors and the existence of conflict in the schools and for that matter, the circuits in the metropolis. The following interpretation could be made:

The more often the Circuit Supervisors demonstrated conflict prevention techniques, the less the intensity of conflict that existed in the schools in the circuits.

The less attention a Circuit Supervisor paid to conflict prevention techniques, the greater the intensity of conflict that existed in the schools in the circuit.

The Circuit Supervisors of ASAC, KWAC, ASEC, DIC, ASTOC and a lot more of them more often demonstrated conflict prevention techniques. (See pages 58-69)

However, the Circuit Supervisors of ASOC, DIC and sometimes OTAC paid little or no attention to conflict prevention techniques. Consequently, as perceived by respondents, there was increased conflict intensity in those circuits.

Testing of Null Hypothesis 2

In order to test for the relationship between conflict resolution techniques, employed by Circuit Supervisors and the presence of conflicts in the schools in circuits, the following null hypothesis was formulated:

Test of hypothesis for difference between means.

Let μ_1 = mean value for the existence of conflict in the circuits, and

μ_2 = mean value for conflict resolution techniques.

H_0: $\mu_1 = \mu_2$ and H_1: $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$

$$\bar{X}_1 = 33.33,\ \sigma_1 = 28.87,\ \ n_1 = 36 \qquad \bar{X}_2 = 33.30,\ \sigma_2 = 15.12,\ \ n_2 = 33$$

The test statistic is $Z = \dfrac{\overline{x_1} - \overline{x_2} - 0}{\sqrt{\dfrac{\sigma_1^2}{n_1} + \dfrac{\sigma_2^2}{n_2}}}$

$$Z = \frac{(\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2)}{\sqrt{\dfrac{\sigma^2{}_1}{n_1} + \dfrac{\sigma^2{}_2}{n_2}}}$$

$$Z = \frac{(33.33 - 33.30)}{\sqrt{\dfrac{28.87^2}{36} + \dfrac{15.12^2}{33}}}$$

$$= \frac{0.03}{\sqrt{23.15 + 6.9277}}$$

$$= \frac{0.03}{\sqrt{30.0777}}$$

$$= \frac{0.03}{5.4843}$$

$$Z = 0.0054$$

At 95% confidence interval, Z= 1.96 from the standard normal table. Since the calculated value is less than 1.96, we accept the null hypothesis and conclude that, there is no significant difference at 95% confidence interval between the existence of conflict and conflict resolution techniques.

The data indicated that apart from ASOC, DIC and OTAC, conflicts were rare in the circuits. This notwithstanding, whenever any occurred, the Circuit Supervisors used such approaches as ‘compromise’ and ‘collaboration’ or ‘problem-solving’. as perceived by respondents, there were reduced levels of conflict intensity in the

schools in the circuits. This finding confirms the studies of Mosser (1987) and Byers (1987).

Mosser (1987) says that a significant negative relationship exists between the perception of conflict and the attribution of problem solving.

The study by Byers (1987) indicates that teachers' attribution of the Principal's conflict resolution behaviour is significantly related to teachers' perception of conflict and organizational commitment. He notes that teachers perceive the co-operative conflict handling models- as positively related to their commitment to the organization and negatively related to the levels of conflict.

On the other hand, the Circuit Supervisors of ASOC, DIC and OTAC employed such techniques as "non-response'', and "coercion" in conflict resolution. As perceived by respondents, there were increased levels of conflict intensity in the circuits. This finding confirms the study by Hoover (1990). Hoover's research indicates that higher conflict level schools were administered by Principals who were perceived to rely on forcing and avoiding behavior in conflict resolutions. This section on the relationship between conflict management behaviours and the existence of conflict has contributed to answering Research Question 5.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter is divided into three sections. Section 1 deals with the summary drawn from findings. Section 2 discusses the conclusion. Section 3 dwells on recommendations and areas of further research.

The study explored conflicting situations in Basic Schools in the Kumasi Metropolis, and how Circuit Supervisors of the circuits managed them. It was a descriptive survey. The respondents of the study were 601 teachers and 63 headteachers drawn from forty-five (45) Basic schools in the Kumasi Metropolis. The instrument used for the collection of data was questionnaire. Statistical techniques involving frequencies, percentages, means and correlation were used in the analysis.

Summary of the Study

1. Generally, there was a rare occurrence of conflicts in all but three of the circuits in the metropolis. It was only ASOC, DIC and OTAC that recorded high prevalence of conflicts. The types of conflicts that respondents in ASOC, DIC and OTAC perceived were caused by the following:

   i) Unresolved prior conflicts;

   ii) Lack of participation in decision-making;

   iii) Different reward systems for two or more groups; and

   iv) The Circuit Supervisors' dependence on one party while the other party is sidelined.

2. Subordinate conflict (i.e. conflict between the headteacher and a teacher or group of teachers) was found to be more common in the metropolis than that of lateral conflict (i.e. conflict between teachers or groups of teachers).

3. The general opinion expressed by respondents show that Circuit Supervisors of all the Circuits, except ASOC, DIC and OTAC often paid more attention to conflict prevention techniques. The analysis revealed that apart from these circuits mentioned above, the Circuit Supervisors were:

a) Sensitive to feedback from the staff or subordinates;

b) Fair in dealing with members of staff or subordinates;

c) Sympathetic to subordinates/ staff with personal problems; and

d) Encouraged open and frank discussion of issues;

Thus, a considerable amount of conflicts was believed to have been prevented.

On the contrary, however, most respondents in ASOC, DIC and OTAC contended that their Circuit Supervisors:

- Did not ensure free-flow of information to the staff;
- Were not flexible;
- Were not accessible to the staff for discussion; and
- Did not encourage the staff to work as a team.

4. With the exception of ASOC, DIC and OTAC, there was generally low prevalence of conflicts in the circuits in the metropolis. However, the Circuit Supervisors apart from those of ASOC, DIC and OTAC adopted such rational approaches as “compromise”, “collaboration” and “arbitration” in resolving the few conflicts that occurred. ASOC, DIC and OTAC recorded many conflicting

situations. In order to resolve them, the Circuit Supervisors used more of "coercion" and "withdrawal" and less of "compromise" and "collaboration."

5. The study has portrayed that the regular use of conflict prevention techniques by Circuit Supervisors led to reduced levels of conflict intensity. The neglect of conflict prevention techniques increased the levels of conflicts. Again, the adoption of such conflict resolution techniques as "compromise" and "collaboration" reduced the intensity of conflicts. On the other hand, the use of force and avoidance techniques was believed to have increased conflict intensity. These findings confirm the study carried out by Barker et al, (1988) that managers who used a combination of co-operative and confirming approaches were much more successful in conflict management than those using a competitive-avoidance approach (page 175).

The above observation is in line with the finding by Robbins (1983) that excessive levels of conflict can hinder the effectiveness of a group or an organization resulting in reduced satisfaction of group members, increased absence and high turn over rates and eventually, lower productivity (pages 347-8).

Conclusion

From the findings of the study, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Conflict is not a serious problem in most basic schools in the Kumasi metropolis.

2. The prevention of destructive conflict is the most desirable approach to conflict management. Circuit Supervisors who often paid more attention to conflict prevention techniques experienced reduced levels of conflict intensity.

3. By preventing destructive conflict, the Circuit Supervisors can resolve concerns before they become problems and save the schools and the subordinates from unnecessary stress.

4. If in spite of preventive measures, conflicts emerge, the Circuit Supervisors must resolve them, using rational approaches which include "compromise" and "collaboration". The Circuit Supervisors of ASOC, DIC and OTAC employed force and avoidance techniques in resolving conflicts. They were faced with increased levels of conflict intensity. This situation is in contrast with that in the other circuits where rational approaches were adopted in resolving the few conflicts that arose there.

5. The Circuit Supervisors who demonstrated openness, friendliness and cared for the welfare of their staff or subordinates employed rational approaches to conflict management. These Circuit Supervisors were successful in managing conflicts. On the other hand, the Circuit Supervisors who kept a closed atmosphere and were insensitive to staff or subordinate welfare and used avoidance and forcing techniques in conflict resolution, were inefficient in managing conflicts.

Recommendations for Practice

Based on the findings and conclusions outlined above, the following recommendations are made for prevention of conflicts:

a. It has been revealed that prevention of destructive conflicts is the most desirable approach to conflict management. Efforts should therefore be made by Circuit Supervisors to avoid tendencies that

could lead to conflicting situations. Accordingly, Circuit Supervisors should avoid being too authoritarian and insisting that they are always right. They should avoid engaging in divide and rule tactics, favouring one group against the other.

b. Rather, they should be open or transparent in their administration and involve the staff or subordinates in decision making whenever necessary. They should allow divergent views on issues. Experience has shown that people have a higher degree of respect and commitment to decisions they have helped to make than decisions imposed on them by their superiors. Participation in decision-making helps avoid dissent views that could lead to conflict.

c. In order to remove suspicions and mistrust, there should be adequate provision for effective communication in schools within the circuits. Headteachers and Teachers must be well informed about what is happening in the Ghana Education Service.

d. Further, Circuit Supervisors should be considerate to their subordinates. By consideration, it means understanding and empathising with members of staff or subordinates who have problems at work place or at home, away from work.

e. In addition, the study could inspire others to research into conflict management in basic schools in the other districts in the region.

It is also hoped, for example, that other researchers might want to study the management of conflicts between basic school

supervisors and sub-ordinates as well as among students and role conflicts.

On resolution of conflicts, the following are recommended:

i) Circuit Supervisors should try to maintain an objective and professional attitude towards disputants; since by so doing, their reaction, which might escalate the conflict, would be avoided. If the Circuit Supervisor is not part of the parties to the dispute, it will be easier to play the role of a mediator in resolving the conflict. It is however advised that a third party be invited if the two parties cannot resolve the issue themselves.

ii) Again, it is worthy to note that people have different values, beliefs, skills, attitudes and aptitudes. Circuit Supervisors should therefore have understanding and the dynamics of group work and skill in human relations. They must therefore develop the skill for bringing people together on congenial terms in the face of differences, which must be resolved. It could however be observed that some Circuit Supervisors do not have the requisite interpersonal skills, and do not also have time or the inclination to master such techniques as reflective listening or constructive expression of feelings. It is therefore recommended that in cases where Circuit Supervisors do not possess the necessary interpersonal skills to use a co-operative and confirming approach, a member of staff or a senior colleague who has these qualities should be designated to act as a communication facilitator.

iii.) Long lasting conflict resolution seldom occurs when one party to the dispute makes all the gains while the needs of the other party have not been accommodated in any way. It is important for Circuit Supervisors to recognise that a conflict between individuals or groups will seldom be

permanently resolved if some parties feel they were the only losers in the conflict. Circuit Supervisors must try to develop a conflict resolution technique in which there are no clear-cut winners or losers. To achieve this result requires compromise on the part of everyone involved in the conflict. To the greatest extent possible, the final resolution of a conflict should advance the interest of all parties.

iv.) Circuit Supervisors must be prepared to manage conflicts. In the light of this, it is recommended that there should be conflict management training for Circuit Supervisors as well as their subordinates (Headteachers and Teachers) as part of their orientation. Conflict management skills could be gained through internships, case studies, workshops and seminars, in addition to studying theory and research. Providing conflict management training for Circuit Supervisors, Headteachers and Teachers can go a long way to helping them to be effective and efficient managers of their schools and classrooms.

Recommendations for Further Research

The study was restricted to the management of destructive conflict between Headteachers and teachers or a group of teachers as well as between Circuit Supervisors and subordinates or a group of subordinates in the Kumasi Metropolis.

- The researcher therefore recommends that further research be conducted into conflict management in other metropolises, municipalities and districts in the country so that the findings of the present study could be generalized for Ghana.

- It is also recommended that a research be conducted into the management of conflicts between school authorities and students, since such conflicts do not only disrupt the academic programme of the school, but also sometimes lead to violence and in the extreme, resulting in destruction of state and private property as well as loss of human life.
- It is further recommended that the management of constructive conflict in schools should be researched into.

REFERENCES

Alfonso, R.J.: Furth, G.R. & Neville, R.F (1981*) Instructional Supervision: A Behaviour System* 2nd Ed. Boston. Allyn & Bacon.

Ambrosie, F. (1989). *The Case For Collaborative Versus Negotiated Decision-Making. The Journal for Middle Level and High School Administrators,* 73. 56-59.

Asiedu-Akrofi, K. (1978). *School organization in modern Africa*. Tema: Ghana Publishing Corporation.

Bailey, S.K. (1971). *Preparing administrators for conflict resolution*. Educational Record (Summer 1971), 233.

Barker, J., Tjosvold, D. & Andrew, R. I. (1988). Conflict approaches effective project managers: a field study in a matrix organization. *Journal of Management Studies, 2*. 167-176.

Best, J.W. & Kahn, J.V. (1995). *Research in education*. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India.

Blake, R.R. & Mouton, J. R. (1984). *Solving organizational conflicts*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Brett et al., (1984). "Breaking the Bonds of Reciprocity in Negotiations**";** R.A.Baron, "Reducing Organizational Conflict: An Incompatible Response Approach". *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 69 (1984). 272 - 279.

Canary, D. J., Cupach, W. R. & Messwong, S. J. (1995). *Relationship conflict: Conflict in parent-child, friendship, and romantic relationships.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Deutsch, M. (1973). *The resolution of conflict.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Dutton, J.M. & Walton, R.R. (1966). Interdepartmental conflict and Co-operation: Two contrasting studies. *Human organization,* 25, 207-220.

Early, PAGEC. & Northcraft, G.B. (1989). "Goal Setting, Resource Interdependence *Emerging realities for the workplace revolution.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Fisher, D. (1981). *Communication in organizations*. New York: West Publishing

Folger, J. P; Marshall, S. PAGE & Randall, K. S. (1998). *'Working through conflict.* 3rd Ed. MA: Addison-Wesley.

Gelles, R. & Straus, M. (1990). *Physical violence in American families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Gorton, R. A. & Snowden, PAGE E. (1993). *School leadership and administration.* Madison: Wm. C. Brown Communications, Inc.

Gottman, J. (1994b). *Why marriages succeed and fail: And how you can make yours last*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Hambrick, D.C., Davison, S.C., Snell, S.A. & Snow, C.C. (1998). *"When groups consist of multiple nationalities: towards a new understanding of the implications," Organization Studies* 19 (1998), 181-205.

Hampton, D. R., Summer, C. E., & Webber, R. F., (1978). *Organizational behavior and the practice management. Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company.*

Harris, B. M., (1985). *Supervising behaviour in education*. 3rd Ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Prentice Hall.

Hocker, J. & Wilmot, W. (1998). *Interpersonal conflict.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Hoover, D. R. (1990). Relationships among perceptions of principals' conflict management behaviors, levels of conflict and organizational climate in high schools. (Doctoral Dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1990) *Dissertation Abstracts International, 51,* (March, 1991) page 2942.

Kilmann, R., & Thomas, K. (1977). *Developing a force-choice measure of conflict handling behavior: The "mode" instrument.* Educational Psychological Measurement, 37, 309-325.

Knezevich, S. J. (1984). *Administration of public education*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.

Kotter, J. PAGE (1997*). What leaders really do.* Boston: Harvard Business Review

.

Kriesburg, L. (1973). *The Sociology of social conflicts*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Larson, Carl E. & LaFasto, Frank M. J. (1989). *Teamwork: What must go right, what can go wrong.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Likert, R. (1967). *The human organization*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Lindelow, J. & Scott, J. (1989), *Managing Conflict. School Leadership*: Handbook for Excellence. Educational Resources Information Centre Report (No. Ed. 309 519).

Lulofs, R. (1994). *Conflict: From theory to action*. Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.

Mc Shane, S.L. & Von Glinow, M.A. (2000). *Organizational Behaviour: Emerging realities for the workplace revolution. New York: McGraw Hill.*

Negben, R. (1978). *Management: A problem solving process*. Houghton: Mifflin Co.

Newhouse, R.R. & Neely, M. (1993). Conflict Resolution: An overview for Classroom Management. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 7. 4 - 8.

Notz, W.W., Starke, F.A. & Atwell, J. "The manager as arbitrator: Conflicts over scarce resources." In Bazerman & Lewicki (Eds.), *Negotiating in organizations.* 143-64.

Nye, R. D. (1973*). Conflict among humans*. New York: Springer Publishing Company. Pages339-355.

Robbins, S. PAGE (1983). *Organisational behaviour: Concepts, controversies and applications*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice- Hall Inc.

Roloff, M. E., & Cloven, D. H. (1990). *The chilling effect in interpersonal relationships: The reluctance to speak one's mind*. In D. Cohen (Ed.), *Intimates in conflict: A communication perspective.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Tennen D. (1991). *You Just Don't Understand*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Worfford, J. C. (1982). *Organizational behavior: Foundations for organizational effectiveness*. California: Kent Publishing Company.

APPENDIX I

PERCEIVED ROLE OF CIRCUIT SUPERVISORS IN MANAGING CONFLICT IN BASIC SCHOOLS IN THE KUMASI METROPOLIS.

Introduction

This questionnaire is designed to elicit information on the Perceived Role of Circuit Supervisors in Managing Conflicts in Basic Schools in the Kumasi Metropolis.

Kindly try to provide answers to the items that follow. Do not write your name. The information you provide will be treated as confidential and under no circumstance will your identity be disclosed to any other person with regard to your responses to the items.

Please respond to each item once.

SECTION A: EXISTENCE OF CONFLICT IN THE SCHOOLS IN THE CIRCUITS

Please indicate the extent to which the type of conflict mentioned below occurs in your school. Tick one of the responses below:

Serial No.	Item	Very often	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
1	Conflict between the Headteacher and a teacher or a group of teachers					
2	Conflict among teachers or a group of teachers or between two teachers					
3	Existence of Conflict Caused by Unresolved Conflict					
4	Existence of Conflict Caused by Unresolved Conflicts					
5	Existence of Conflict Caused by Lack of Participation in Decision-Making					
6	Existence of Conflict Caused by Lack of Trust for One Another.					
7	Existence of Conflict Caused by Different Reward Systems provided by the Headmaster / Headmistress for Two or More Groups.					
8	Existence of Conflict Caused by Conflicting Goals of Special Interest Groups					
9	Existence of conflict caused by Head teacher's dependence on					

	one party while the other party is sidelined					
10	Existence of Conflict Caused by Misinterpretation of the Behaviour of Others.					
11	Existence of Conflict Caused by Competition					
12	Existence of Conflict Caused by Competition					

SECTION B: CONLICT PREVENTION TECHNIQUES

Indicate how often your Circuit Supervisor exhibits/ reflects the behaviors/ attitudes below. Tick [ ] one of the following responses:

[ ] Very often
[ ] Often
[ ] Sometimes
[ ] Rarely
[ ] Never

Serial No.	Item	Very often	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
13	Allows or facilitates free flow of information to headteachers and teachers.					
14	Extent of Circuit Supervisor's sensitivity to feedback from headteachers and teachers					
15	Extent of Circuit Supervisor's flexibility.					
16	How often the Circuit Supervisor was accessible to staff for discussion					
17	How often the Circuit Supervisor ensured personal atmosphere of openness.					

18	How often the Circuit Supervisor encouraged the staff to work as a team.					
19	How often the Circuit Supervisor delegated authority.					
20	How often the Circuit Supervisor showed sympathy to staff with personal problems.					
21	How often the Circuit Supervisor demonstrated fairness in dealing with all members of staff.					

SECTION C: CONFLICT RESOLUTION TECHNIQUES

To what extent does the Circuit Supervisor employ the under listed conflict resolution techniques in finding solutions to conflicts that arise in the school? Indicate your response by ticking [ ] one of the following responses.

[ ] Very often

[ ] Often

[ ] Occasionally

[ ] Seldom

[ ] Never

Serial No.	Item	Very often	Often	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
22	Circuit Supervisor‘s use of non-response or withdrawal.					
23	Circuit Supervisor‘s use of Isolation i.e. Removing or reducing contact between conflicting parties.					
24	Circuit Supervisor‘s use of					

	procrastination.					
25	Circuit Supervisor‘s use of Coercion (i.e. Circuit Supervisor tries to make the other party yield from fear or by the use of threats).					
26	Circuit Supervisor‘s use of Imposition (i.e. the Circuit Supervisor settles the matter by forcing a solution).					
27	Circuit Supervisor‘s use of Persuasion (i.e. the Circuit Supervisor tries to convince the other(s) to accede to the goals he/she desires not out of fear or reward but because of their own interests and values).					
28	Domination (i.e. action by the Circuit Supervisor to settle the conflict without consultation with the party).					
29	Circuit Supervisor‘s use of Compromise (i.e. the Circuit Supervisor makes a search for an immediate position, splitting difference between the two groups. No one actually loses or wins).					

30	Circuit Supervisor‘s use of Collaboration (i.e. the Circuit Supervisor ensures that there is an open exchange of information regarding the problem as each side sees it, and works through their differences to arrive at a solution that is mutually beneficial to both parties).					
31	Circuit Supervisor‘s use of Arbitration (i.e. the Circuit Supervisor ensures that the disputants explain and support their claims before a third party).					

APPENDIX II

An introductory letter from the Director of the Institute of Education of the University of Cape Coast.

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST
CAPE COAST, GHANA

INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

TELEPHONE: (042) 33796 & 33793 Telegrams & Cables: UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST
FAX: 233-42-33793
E-mail: ieucc@africaonline.com.gh

Our Ref.: Med/D.2.3/Vol.1/27

Your Ref.: 21st July, 2004

Dear Sir/ Madam,

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

We wish to introduce to you Mr. Hans Christian Anderson who is pursuing M.Ed (Management) programme at the University of Cape Coast. As part of the requirement for the award of the degree he/she is required to submit a dissertation.

By this letter the University of Cape Coast is requesting you to kindly accord him all the necessary help to enable him/her meet the dead line of his project.

Thank you for your co-operation.

Yours faithfully,

Ernest Ampadu
For: Director

APPENDIX III

List of schools involved in the study, the circuits to which they belong and their circuit code names.

Circuit	Name Of School	Code
***1. ASAWASI CIRCUIT**	*** Asawasi Methodist Primary/ JSS** *** St. Theresa's R/C Primary/JSS** *** Asawasi M/A Primary/JSS**	**ASAC**
2. KWADASO CIRCUIT	1. Agric M/A JSS I 2. Nwamasi M/A Primary/JSS 3. Ohwimasi M/A Prim. II	KWAC
3. ASEM CIRCUIT	4. Asem Boys JSS 5. Asem Mixed Exp. Primary (A)/JSS 6. St. Augustine's Anglican Prim./JSS	ASEC
4. KEJETIA CIRCUIT	7. Forces Basic 8. Adum Presby JSS 9. St. Peter's R/C Primary	KEC
5.WEWESO CIRCUIT	10. Weweso M/A JSS 11. Kentinkrono M/A JSS 12. Anwomaso JSS	WEC
6. OFORIKROM CIRCUIT	13. Christian M/A JSS 14. Oforikrom Block (B) Primary 15. Oforikrom Block (A) JSS	OFOC
7. AKOSA CIRCUIT	16. Prempeh College JSS 17. Prempeh College Primary 18. 2nd Brigade JSS	AKOC
8. AKROM CIRCUIT	19. Akrom M/A JSS 20. Asokore Mampong R/C Primary 21. Sepe Timpom M/A JSS	AKRC
9. BANTAMA CIRCUIT	22. Bantama Methodist. JSS 23. State Boys JSS 24. Bantama Presby Primary	BAC

10. ADIEBEBA CIRCUIT	25. Opoku Ware M/A Primary	ADBC
	26. State Experimental JSS II	
	27. Danyame Primary	
11. ASOKWA CIRCUIT	28. Asokwa M/A Primary/JSS	ASOC
	29. Chireapatre R/C Primary/JSS	
	30. Ahinsan M/A Primary/JSS	
12. DICHEMSO CIRCUIT	31. Dichemso M/A Primary / JSS	DIC
	32. New Tafo M/A Primary / JSS	
	33. Yennyawoso Presby Primary / JSS	
13. AMANKWATIA CIRCUIT	34. Amankwatia M/A Primary I / JSS	AMAC
	35. T. I. Ahmadiya Primary B / JSS	
	36. Amakom Abrotia Basic	
14. OLD TAFO CIRCUIT	37. Rockanjie Presby Primary / JSS	OTAC
	38. Old Tafo M/A Primary / JSS	
	39. St. Bernadette's R/C Primary / JSS	
15. ASH TOWN CIRCUIT	40. Konadu Yiadom M/A Basic	ASTOC
	41. St. Anne's Anglican. Primary / JSS	
	42. Afia Kobi M/A Primary / JSS	
16. SUAME CIRCUIT	43. Suame M/A Basic	SUAC
	44. King Faisal Islamic Basic	
	45. Suame Methodist. Primary / JSS	

APPENDIX III (contd.)

NB:

*** Schools used for the pilot study**

APPENDIX IV

Teacher-Population of the Sampled Schools and the Sample Size.

		POPULATION			SAMPLE		
S/N.	**SCHOOL**	**MALE**	**FEMALE**	**TOTAL**	**MALE**	**FEMALE**	**TOTAL**
1	***ASAC I**	**10**	**13**	**23**	**5**	**7**	**12**
2	***ASAC II**	**3**	**9**	**12**	**3**	**9**	**12**
3	***ASAC III**	**10**	**6**	**16**	**5**	**6**	**11**
	TOTAL	**23**	**28**	**51**	**13**	**22**	**35**
1.	KWAC I	9	12	21	9	6	15
2.	KWAC II	2	11	13	2	6	8
3.	KWACIII	9	16	25	9	8	17
4.	ASEC I	11	14	25	6	7	13
5.	ASEC II	7	25	32	7	13	20
6.	ASEC III	10	19	29	5	10	15
7.	KEC I	12	8	20	6	8	14
8.	KEC II	11	14	25	6	7	13
9.	KEC III	2	15	17	2	8	10
10.	WEC I	9	19	28	9	10	19
11.	WEC II	9	10	19	9	5	14
12.	WEC III	7	9	16	7	9	16
13.	OFOC I	14	9	23	7	9	16
14.	OFOC II	6	22	28	6	11	17
15.	OFOC III	6	15	21	6	8	14
16.	AKOC I	14	20	34	7	10	17
17.	AKOC II	9	16	25	9	8	17
18.	AKOC III	12	15	27	6	8	14
19.	AKRC I	8	13	21	8	7	15
20.	AKRC II	8	16	24	8	8	16
21.	AKRC III	11	9	20	6	9	15
22.	ASOC I	9	23	34	9	12	21

23.	ASOC II	11	24	35	6	12	18
24.	ASOC III	9	22	31	9	11	20
25.	BAC I	11	5	16	6	5	11
26.	BAC II	11	4	15	6	4	10
27.	BAC III	4	10	14	4	5	9
28.	ADBC I	7	6	13	7	6	13
29.	ADBC II	9	9	18	9	9	18
30.	ADBC III	3	4	7	3	4	7
31.	AMAC I	7	24	31	7	12	19
32.	AMAC II	32	25	57	16	13	29
33.	AMACIII	5	10	15	5	5	10
34.	DIC I	5	13	18	5	7	12
35.	DIC II	9	18	27	9	9	18
36.	DIC III	9	14	23	9	7	16
37.	OTAC I	7	5	12	7	5	12
38.	OTAC II	9	25	34	9	13	22
39.	OTAC II	4	11	15	4	6	10
40.	ASTOC I	3	13	16	3	7	10
41.	ASTOC II	8	15	23	8	8	16
42.	ASTOC III	9	18	27	9	9	18
43.	SAUC I	5	7	12	5	7	12
44.	SAUC II	3	14	17	3	7	10
45.	SUAC III	7	14	21	7	7	14
	TOTAL	**382**	**640**	**1022**	**305**	**365**	**670**

Source: Field work, 2004.

APPENDIX IV (contd.)

NB:

***Schools used for the pilot study**

APPENDIX V

Distribution and Retrieval of Questionnaire.

NO. OF QUESTIONNAIRE DISTRIBUTED				NO. OF QUESTIONNAIRE RETRIEVED			
SCHOOL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	% RETURN
***ASAC I**	**5**	**7**	**12**	**5**	**7**	**12**	**100.0**
***ASAC II**	**3**	**9**	**12**	**3**	**9**	**12**	**100.0**
***ASAC III**	**5**	**6**	**11**	**5**	**5**	**10**	**90.9**
TOTAL	**13**	**22**	**35**	**13**	**21**	**34**	**97.0**
KWAC I	9	6	15	9	6	15	100.0
KWAC II	2	6	8	2	6	8	100.0
KWAC III	9	8	17	8	7	15	88.2
ASEC I	6	7	13	6	6	12	92.3
ASEC II	7	13	20	7	9	16	80.0
ASEC III	5	10	15	5	10	15	100.0
KEC I	6	8	14	6	8	14	100.0
KEC II	6	7	13	5	7	12	92.3
KEC III	2	8	10	2	8	10	100.0
WEC I	9	10	19	7	9	16	84.2
WEC II	9	5	14	9	5	14	100.0
WEC III	7	9	16	7	9	16	100.0
OFOC I	7	9	16	7	9	16	100.0
OFOC II	6	11	17	4	9	13	76.5
OFOC III	6	8	14	6	6	12	85.7
AKOC I	7	10	17	7	10	17	100.0
AKOCII	9	8	17	9	8	17	100.0
AKOCIII	6	8	14	6	8	14	100.0
AKRC I	8	7	15	8	7	15	100.0
AKRC II	8	8	16	8	8	16	100.0

AKRC III	6	9	15	6	9	15	100.0
ASOC I	9	12	21	8	10	18	85.7
ASOC II	6	12	18	6	12	18	100.0
ASOC III	9	11	20	9	11	20	100.0
BAC I	6	5	11	6	5	11	100.0
BAC II	6	4	10	6	4	10	100.0
BAC III	4	5	9	4	5	9	100.0
ADBC I	7	6	13	7	6	13	100.0
ADBC II	9	9	18	9	7	16	88.9
ADBC III	3	4	7	3	4	7	100.0
AMAC I	7	12	19	7	9	16	84.2
AMAC II	16	13	29	12	13	25	86.2
AMAC III	5	5	10	5	5	10	100.0
DIC I	5	7	12	5	7	12	100.0
DIC II	9	9	18	9	9	18	100.0
DIC III	9	7	16	9	7	16	100.0
OTAC I	7	5	12	7	5	12	100.0
OTAC II	9	13	22	9	13	22	100.0
OTAC III	4	6	10	4	6	10	100.0
ASTOC I	3	7	10	3	7	10	100.0
ASTOC II	8	8	16	8	8	16	100.0
ASTOC III	9	9	18	9	9	18	100.0
SUAC I	5	7	12	5	7	12	100.0
SUAC II	3	7	10	3	7	10	100.0
SUAC III	7	7	14	7	7	14	100.0
TOTAL	318	387	705	307	368	675	96.6

Source: Field work, 2004.

APPENDIX V (contd.)

NB:

***Schools used for the pilot study**