An Inquiry into Conflict Management Strategies:
Study of Higher Education Institutions of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.

Siraj ud Din & Bakhtiar Khan
Department of Business Administration, Gomal University, D.I.Khan, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.

Zainab Bibi
Institute of Management Sciences, University of Baluchistan, Quetta, Pakistan.

Abstract
The purpose of this paper is to gain an insight into the conflict management strategies (CMS) of faculty in the higher education institutions (HEIs) of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. To achieve the above mentioned purpose, survey method was used with the help of questionnaire. In this research, impact of CMS was assessed on the negative consequences and the impact of demographic variations on CMS was examined in higher education. Negative consequences were significantly explained by avoiding strategy and dominating strategy. This research has found significant differences in the dominating and obliging strategies among the male and female respondents. Regarding the designation, significant differences were found in the dominating strategy and avoiding strategy. While age of the respondents' also exerted significant influence on the compromising strategy.

Key words: Conflict, Conflict Management, Conflict Management Strategies (CMS), Higher Education

Introduction
Little research on conflict has been conducted in educational institutions but it is not tantamount to the absence of conflict in these institutions (Hearn & Anderson, 2002). In the view of Gmelch and Carrol (1991), conflict is "**sewn into the fabric**" of educational institutions due to functional, structural and relational characteristics of academic departments. According to Miklas and Kleiner (2003), HEIs are the "**perfect breeding ground for conflict**". Stanley and Algert (2007) state that administrators spend 40% of their time on managing conflict.

According to Folger and Shubert (1995) "colleges and universities are no longer seen as quiet enclaves free from the conflicts that arise in all hierarchical organizations. Differences in goals or plans for the allocation of resources, misinterpretation or inconsistent application of institutional regulations, breaches of formal or informal contracts, power struggles and personal antagonisms are all possible sources of conflict".

Robbins (1998) has developed the following definition of conflict: "A process that begins when one party perceives that another party has negatively affected, or is about to negatively affect, something that the first party cares about." (p. 434) While Esquivel and Kleiner (1997) has termed the conflict as disagreement about the interests or ideas.

Conflict is posing a great challenge to management (Adomi & Anie, 2005) and its management is one of the basic tasks of management. Conflict is an essential element of human relations and it is ever present process (Loomis & Loomis, 1965). It will be present as long as people vie for power, jobs, resources, security and recognition (Henry, 2009)

Every person handles conflict in a different way and this represents ones characteristic mode of handling conflict or conflict management style (Black & Mouton, 1964; Moberg, 1998). Different

scholars have developed different models of conflict management strategies. Out of these, models of Black and Mouton (1964) and Rahim and Bonoma (1979) are widely used in the conflict literature.

Literature Review

Conflict Management Strategies

Even though the experience of conflict is a common phenomenon but each individual deals with it differently. Strategies of conflict management are behavior patterns and characterized by general tendency for individual to exhibit a certain type of conflict behavior frequently and across situations (Cupach & Canary, 1997).

Rahim and Bonoma (1979) have classified the conflict management on five styles based on two basic dimensions: Concern for Self and Concern for Others. These five different styles of managing conflict are Competing, Integrating, Avoiding, Obliging and Compromising.

1. Competing / Dominating:
Competing style represents high concern for self and low concern for others and identified with a win-lose orientation. When someone uses this style, he or she tends to be very assertive and tries to win his position and disregard the interests and objectives of the other party (Rahim, 2000).

2. Integrating:
This style represents high concern for self and others and identified with a win-win orientation. When someone uses this style, he tries to satisfy the desires and concerns of all parties and search for equally advantageous outcome. This style is used when both parties' concerns are important and can't be compromised (Rahim, 2000; Robbins, 2001).

3. **Avoiding:**
This style represents low concern for self and low concern for others and identified with lose-lose orientation. This style is used when someone does not want to assert himself, does not cooperate or avoid the conflict altogether (Rahim, 2000; Robbins, 2001).

4. Obliging:
This style represents low concern for self and high concern for others and identified with a lose-win orientation. In this mode, one party tries to give priority to the concerns of his opponents without asserting one's own concerns and when the relationship preservation is more important than ones concerns / interests (Rahim, 2000; Robbins, 2001).

5. Compromising:
This style represents intermediate concern for self and others. In this style, each party to the conflict works cooperatively and gives up something to arrive at a compromised solution to the conflict. In this, there are no winners or losers (Rahim, 2000; Robbins, 2001).

Conflict may arise in the organization due to many factors but the demographic factors such as gender, designation and age may also contribute towards it (Rahim & Bonoma, 1979). Similarly CMS may also see variations due to these factors. A wide variety of research has contributed in finding out the real causes of variation in CMS but a little research has been conducted in the HEIs worldwide generally and Pakistan especially.

Havenga (2007) found that females use integrating style more than male counterparts when they deal with conflicts with their subordinates while the remaining four styles showed no significant difference. Many of the research has been conducted in the traditional organizations which have found gender differences in the CMS and those samples included non-managerial employees (for example e.g., Chanin & Schneer, 1984; Kilmann & Thomas, 1977; Ruble & Stander, 1990; Rosenthal & Hautaluoma, 1988) while the sample of managers have no such gender differences in CMS (Powell, 1988).

According to Berryman-Fink (1998) , the academic setting is totally different from other organizations. Faculty members are much more independent and work more autonomously than employees of other organizations. HEIs are the combination of different departments and institutes and in the words of

Barsky (2002) "rather than operate under the guise of a single institution, for instance, universities could perhaps be re-conceptualized as a federation of departments, institutes, and work units. Autonomy, common goals, and interdependence would have to be negotiated in a manner similar to state-to-state relations within an international context" (p. 173). Here the main concern of the researcher is to ferret out the gender, designation and age differences in HEIs regarding CMS when the faculty enjoys much more freedom than employees of other organizations.

Keeping in view the above research, we can hypothesize that
H1.   Demographic variation is responsible for differences in conflict management strategies.

H1.1   There is a significant difference in the CMS of both male and female faculty in the HEIs.
H1.2   Designation of the teaching faculty is responsible for the variation in the CMS.
H1.3   Age of the faculty is a key factor for the difference in the CMS

As we know that conflict may be negative or positive depending on the situation. Positive conflict is called functional conflict while negative conflict is called dysfunctional conflict. Similarly CMS may become negative or positive depending on the situation. Some of these strategies may be functional while some may be dysfunctional. All the CMS are not bound to bring positive or negative consequences all the time. Their effectiveness and usefulness may alter depending on the situation. Some strategies may bring positive results but these may not be liked by the majority of individuals depending on the nature of the strategy. Here the main concern of the researcher was to know about those strategies which are perceived by the faculty to increase negative consequences in the departments. Hence the hypothesis is

H2.   Conflict Management Strategies explain the variation in Negative consequences.

Methodology
The population of the project includes all universities of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa whether working in public or private sector excluding the engineering, medical and agriculture universities. According to the Higher Education Commission (HEC, 2012) there are twenty five (25) universities in the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa province. The target population was 21 universities with eleven (12) universities working in the public sector and eight (9) working in the private sector in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. Simple random sampling was done to select four universities, two from public sector and two from private sector. Two public sector universities were Peshawar University and Gomal University and two private sector universities were Qurtuba University and Sarhad University. After collection of data, the researcher coded it to facilitate quantitative analysis. All the analysis was done by using the SPSS 15 (Statistical Package for Social Sciences)

There are about 2025 teachers (Male Teachers = 1642, Female Teachers = 383) and 350 administrators in the higher education of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (Statistical Data HEC 2004-05). A pilot study was undertaken for developing the research project. The study included 25 teachers and 15 administrators. The statistics from the study were then used for determining the sample sizes for teachers and administrators with the help of formula given at the bottom of the table-1 given below.

Table 1. Sample Size Calculation

Pilot study (n)	N	SD	σ^2	SE(E) = $\sigma/\sqrt{n}$	E^2	Z@5%	Computed Sample Sizes
Teachers = 25	2025	0.73	0.5329	0.146	0.021316	1.96	92
Administrators= 15	350	0.69	0.4761	0.178157	0.03174	1.96	50
Formula used →		$n=[n_0/(1+n_0/N]$ Where $n_0=t^2*S^2/SE^2$					

Bartlett, Kotrlik & Higgins (2001)

In this study, the researcher used a self-designed, fixed-choice questionnaire. A new questionnaire was developed with the help of conflict literature and questionnaires developed by various scholars (Rahim, 1983; Jehn, 1995; Balay, 2006). The instrument was successfully used in the pilot study.

Analysis:

Table 2. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Demographic Characteristic	Frequency		Total	Percentage
	Public	Private		
Gender				
Male	81	38	119	83.8 %
Female	19	4	23	16.2 %
Designation				
Professor	20	7	27	19 %
Associate Professor	8	2	10	7 %
Assistant Professor	31	3	34	24 %
Lecturer	41	30	71	50 %
Age				
20-35 years	38	29	67	47.2 %
35-50 years	32	5	37	26.0 %
50-65 years	30	8	38	26.8 %

H1.   Demographic variation is responsible for differences in conflict management strategies.

Table 3   Sub-Hypotheses about Conflict Management Strategies

S.No	Category	Hypothesis
1.1	Gender	H1.1o is $\mu_m = \mu_f$ H1.1A is $\mu_m \neq \mu_f$
1.2	Designation	H1.2o is $\mu_1=\mu_2=\mu_3 = \mu_4$ H1.2A is $\mu_1\neq\mu_2\neq\mu_3 \neq \mu_4$
1.3	Age	H1.4o is $\mu_1=\mu_2=\mu_3$ H1.4A is $\mu_1\neq\mu_2\neq\mu_3$

H1.1   There is a significant difference in the CMS of both male and female faculty in the HEIs.

Table 4   t-tests (to compare means on the Conflict Management Strategies related to Gender)

Categorical Variable	Groups	N	Mean	df	t-value	p- value	Results
Compromising	Male	119	3.83	140	0.958	.339	Hypothesis is rejected
	Female	23	3.71				
Integrating	Male	119	4.06	140	0.724	.470	Hypothesis is rejected
	Female	23	3.97				
Dominating	Male	119	3.20	140	-2.302	.023	Hypothesis is accepted
	Female	23	3.59				
Obliging	Male	119	3.64	140	2.717	.007	Hypothesis is accepted
	Female	23	3.22				
Avoiding	Male	119	3.71	140	-0.114	.909	Hypothesis is rejected
	Female	23	3.73				

Table 2 shows the demographic characteristics of the respondents. Sub-hypotheses of major hypothesis No.1 are shown in Table 3. Table 4 shows that there is a significant difference in the dominating and obliging strategies. It shows that female faculty is more dominating (t= -2.302, p = .023) while male faculty is more obliging (t = 2.717, p = 0.007). The remaining strategies have no significant difference. Female faculty uses these strategies in the following order i.e. Integrating, Avoiding, Compromising

and then dominating. The male faculty uses these strategies in this order i.e. Integrating, compromising, avoiding and then obliging. Hence the hypothesis is accepted.

H1.2   Designation of the teaching faculty is responsible for the variation in the CMS.

Table 5   Mean and SD related to Designation about Conflict Management Strategies

Variable	Groups	N	Mean	SD
Compromising Strategy	Professor	27	3.7407	.4700
	Associate Professor	10	4.0333	.4674
	Assistant Professor	34	3.6863	.4562
	Lecturer	71	3.8732	.4495
Integrating Strategy	Professor	27	3.9753	.4576
	Associate Professor	10	4.4000	.4644
	Assistant Professor	34	4.1471	.4539
	Lecturer	71	3.9812	.4548
Dominating Strategy	Professor	27	3.0123	.4765
	Associate Professor	10	3.2667	.4681
	Assistant Professor	34	3.5784	.4762
	Lecturer	71	3.5589	.4691
Obliging Strategy	Professor	27	3.6420	.4598
	Associate Professor	10	3.9667	.4792
	Assistant Professor	34	3.5980	.4732
	Lecturer	71	3.4789	.4698
Avoiding Strategy	Professor	27	4.0928	.4585
	Associate Professor	10	4.2833	.4416
	Assistant Professor	34	3.6667	.4696
	Lecturer	71	3.6479	.4664

Table 6.   ANOVA applications (to compare means on the Conflict Management Strategies related to Designation)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Compromising Strategy	Between Groups Within Groups Total	1.430 44.465 45.894	3 138 141	0.477 0.322	1.479	0.223
Integrating Strategy	Between Groups Within Groups Total	2.032 43.068 45.099	3 138 141	0.677 0.312	2.170	0.094
Dominating Strategy	Between Groups Within Groups Total	6.894 72.085 78.979	3 138 141	2.298 0.522	4.399	0.005
Obliging Strategy	Between Groups Within Groups Total	2.329 66.864 69.192	3 138 141	0.776 0.485	1.602	0.192
Avoiding Strategy	Between Groups Within Groups Total	6.851 57.324 64.175	3 138 141	2.284 0.415	5.498	0.001

Table 7.   Tukey HSD applications (to find out where the mean differences in the Conflict Management Strategies related to Designation exist)

Tukey HSD (Multiple Comparisons)

Dependent Variable	(I) Designation	(J) Designation	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig
Dominating Strategy	Professor	Associate Prof	-0.25432	0.26755	0.778
		Assistant Prof	-0.56609*	0.18631	0.015
		Lecturer	-0.54657*	0.16341	0.006
	Associate Prof	Professor	0.25432	0.26755	0.778
		Assistant Prof	-0.31176	0.26000	0.628
		Lecturer	-0.29225	0.24412	0.630
Avoiding Strategy	Professor	Associate Prof	-0.19049	0.23859	0.855
		Assistant Prof	0.42617	0.16614	0.055
		Lecturer	0.44495*	0.14572	0.014
	Associate Prof	Professor	0.19049	0.23859	0.855
		Assistant Prof	0.61667*	0.23185	0.043
		Lecturer	0.63545*	0.21769	0.021

*. The mean difference is significant at 0.05 level.

Table 5 shows the mean and SD related to designation about Conflict Management Strategies. Table 6 of ANOVA reveals that there is significant difference in the dominating strategy and avoiding strategy. The table 7 shows post hoc results of these differences. It shows the significant differences among Professors and Lecturers and Assistant Professors. According to these results Lecturers and Assistant Professors employ dominating strategy compared to Professors. In the avoiding strategy, the results show that Professors and Associate Professors are more avoiding compared to Lecturers and Assistant Professors. Hence the Hypothesis is accepted.

H1.3.   Age of the faculty is a key factor for the difference in the CMS

Table 8   Mean and SD about Conflict Management Strategies related to Age

Variable	Groups	N	Mean	SD
Compromising Strategy	20-35 years	67	3.8358	.4970
	35-50 years	37	3.6306	.5815
	50-65 years	38	3.9561	.6445
Integrating Strategy	20-35 years	67	4.0050	.5140
	35-50 years	37	4.1712	.5007
	50-65 years	38	4.0088	.5952
Dominating Strategy	20-35 years	67	3.3284	.5645
	35-50 years	37	3.1712	.4959
	50-65 years	38	3.2456	.5757
Obliging Strategy	20-35 years	67	3.5025	.4726
	35-50 years	37	3.5405	.4954
	50-65 years	38	3.7281	.5467
Avoiding Strategy	20-35 years	67	3.7264	.4715
	35-50 years	37	3.6847	.4523
	50-65 years	38	3.7018	.5587

Table 9   ANOVA applications (to compare means on the Conflict Management Strategies related to Age)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Compromising Strategy	Between Groups Within Groups Total	2.044 43.851 45.894	2 139 141	1.022 0.315	3.239	0.042
Integrating Strategy	Between Groups Within Groups Total	0.744 44.356 45.099	2 139 141	0.372 0.319	1.165	0.315
Dominating Strategy	Between Groups Within Groups Total	0.609 80.844 81.453	2 139 141	0.304 0.582	0.524	0.594
Obliging Strategy	Between Groups Within Groups Total	1.286 67.907 69.192	2 139 141	0.643 0.489	1.316	0.272
Avoiding Strategy	Between Groups Within Groups Total	0.044 72.369 72.413	2 139 141	0.022 0.521	0.042	0.959

Table 10.   Tukey HSD applications (to find out where the mean differences in the Conflict Management Strategies related to Age exist)

Tukey HSD (Multiple Comparisons)

Dependent Variable: Compromising Strategy

(I) Age	(J) Age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig
20-35 years	35-50 years 50-65 years	0.20519 -0.12032	0.11504 0.11406	0.179 0.544
35-50 years	20-35 years 50-65 years	-0.20519 -0.32551*	0.11504 0.12972	0.179 0.035
50-65 years	20-35 years 35-50 years	0.12032 0.32551*	0.11406 0.12972	0.544 0.035

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

Table 8 shows the following rank order of CMS related to age based on the mean values and SD.

Rank order	20-35 years	35-50 years	50-65 years
1.	Integrating	Integrating	Integrating
2.	Compromising	Avoiding	Compromising
3.	Avoiding	Compromising	Obliging
4.	Obliging	Obliging	Avoiding
5.	Dominating	Dominating	Dominating

Table 9 of ANOVA results shows that there is slightly significant difference only in the compromising strategy. Table 10 of Tukey HSD test shows that aged faculty is more compromising as compared to lower age groups. Hence the hypothesis is accepted partially.

H2.   Conflict Management Strategies explain the variation in Negative consequences.

Table 11   Model Summary for Hypothesis No. 2

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.983	.966	.965	.74564

Table 12   ANOVA for Hypothesis No. 2

Moel		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2196.546	5	439.309	790.159	.000(a)
	Residual	76.169	137	.556		
	Total	2272.714	142			

a   Predictors: Avoiding Strategy, Dominating Strategy, Obliging Strategy, Compromising Strategy, Integrating Strategy

Table 13   Coefficients for Hypothesis No. 2

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	Compromising Strategy	.219	.117	.212	1.880	.062
	Dominating Strategy	.317	.111	.324	2.862	.005
	Integrating Strategy	.069	.084	.057	.822	.413
	Obliging Strategy	.030	.111	.027	.270	.788
	Avoiding Strategy	.393	.105	.371	3.750	.000

a Dependent Variable: Negative Consequences

Table 11 of model summary shows a statistic that measures "goodness of fit." R^2 is the coefficient of determination or explained variance which is .966. In this example, we can say that 96.6% of the variability in the negative consequences can be explained by compromising, integrating, dominating, obliging and avoiding strategies.

The second table 12 of ANOVA tests the null hypothesis that the true slope, β, equals 0. Here, with an F statistic in excess of 790 and significance level of 0, we reject the null and conclude that true slope β is not equal to 0.

Table 13 of coefficients gives us results of regression analysis for the five independent variables against the dependent variable i.e. negative consequences. It shows the standardized coefficients, or betas for each variable. These betas (or beta weights) allow us to compare the relative importance of each independent variable. In this case avoiding strategy (beta = .371) have greater impact on the negative consequences than do dominating strategy (beta=.324) and compromising strategy (beta = .212). In this case, avoiding and dominating strategies have low p-values (.000, .005), so we reject H_0 in these two cases and conclude that these two independent variables have statistically significant relationships to negative consequences.

If we look at the Beta column, we see that the negative consequences are significantly explained 37.1% by avoiding strategy and 32.4% by dominating strategy. Thus the Hypothesis 2 has been substantiated in negative consequences.

Discussion

Some researchers believe that different people have different preferences for conflict styles but it does not mean that those people always use these styles in all conflict situations they face. People may adopt others styles also depending on the situation (Ruble & Schneer, 1994). The present research tried to know the conflict management styles of individuals on different positions, qualifications and ages. According to style perspective to conflict management, individuals use the same conflict style across different conflict situations (Wilson and Waltman, 1988) but the contingency approach to conflict

management stresses that individuals use different styles depending on the conflict situation and contextual factors (Jameson, 1999).

This research has found significant differences in the dominating and obliging strategies among the male and female respondents. It showed that female faculty was more dominating while male faculty was more obliging. In another study conducted by Utley et al. (1989), there was a significant difference in the integrating and compromising styles between males and females. Females were more integrating and compromising than males. While for the other styles there was no significant difference. Some scholars found no difference in the conflict management styles on the basis of gender (Renwick, 1975, 1977; Eagly and Johnson, 1990). While Brahnam et al. (2005) finds that men are likely to use avoiding while women are likely to use Integrating. According to Chusmir and Mills (1989), there is no difference in the conflict management styles of men and women when the hierarchical rank is controlled.

Regarding the designation of faculty in the higher education institutions, this research has found significant differences in the dominating strategy and Avoiding strategy. According to these results Lecturers and Assistant Professors employ dominating strategy compared to Professors. In the avoiding strategy, the results show that Professors and Associate Professors are more avoiding compared to Lecturers and Assistant Professors.

Results of Thomas and Thomas (2008) showed that organizational level / designation was positively related to integrating and was negatively related to avoiding. It shows that higher the organizational level, higher the use of integrating and less use of avoiding but this study proves that designation / organizational level was negatively related with dominating and positively related with avoiding. Thus in the case of avoiding our findings are in contradiction to Thomas and Thomas (2008).

Regarding the age of respondents, slightly significant difference was found only in the compromising strategy. Aged faculty was more compromising as compared to other age groups. Balay (2007) found that older faculty is more likely to use integrating styles as compared to younger faculty. With the increase in the age, employees become more committed to organization (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990) and face lower levels of conflict (Ipek, 2003).
According to Havenga (2007), age have both positive and negative correlation with the conflict management styles. He found that younger subjects frequently make use of dominating conflict management styles than older group. But a study conducted by Antonioni (1998), it was revealed that age and gender has little effect on the conflict management styles pattern. He found age to be significantly related with the only two CMS i.e. Integrating and avoiding.

Havenga (2007) has also proved that age exert influence on the selection of conflict management styles. Dominating style was used differently by different age groups while the remaining styles were employed to the same extent. Dominating style was negatively related to the age. The older participants used less dominating, while young participants used more dominating CMS. Morris et al. (1998) have also found that age had a small effect only in the case of dominating.

The findings of this research shows that competing strategy exacerbate the negative consequences which are in line with previous studies. This strategy maximizes one's own interests and minimizes cooperation that breeds negative consequences and conflicting parties arrives at a dead end in case the parties have equal powers (Johns, 1996). This strategy has negative repercussions for the future conflicts. If a person at the position of power adopts the competing or forcing strategy in dealing with conflict, in future he is bound to face the same attitude from his rivals. It is clear that competing strategy does not solve the conflicts but push it in the future to settle the scores.

According to Manolescu and Deaconu (2009), this strategy is completely oriented towards power in which one tries to win his position by hook or crook. In some situations, this strategy becomes the best one but using this strategy is harmful and breeds negative consequences. This style is bound to step up the aggressiveness of the other party. If the administrator wishes to maintain a participatory climate in his educational institution then this approach is inappropriate as it could lead to resentment and bitterness.

According to Blake and Mouton (1964), this strategy is uncooperative and direct. Spitzberg, Canary and Cupach (1994) termed this strategy as the maximizing response because it maximizes the importance of one's own needs and minimizes the importance of others' needs. This strategy is inappropriate and ineffective (Lee, 2008). This method fails to solve the main causes of conflict, and the conflicts of similar nature may occur in the future. (Schermerhorn, 2002)

This research has also revealed that avoiding strategy is more dangerous than competing and invited the negative consequences more than this strategy. In avoiding strategy, the conflict is avoided altogether which means that the root causes are not addressed and the situation do not change for the conflicting parties. Our research shows that this state is more stressful for the faculty in the higher education institutions and breeds negative consequences more than any other strategy. Manolescu and Deaconu (2009) state that this strategy pushes the conflict in a latent state and becomes a waiting threat for both sides and the conditions which generates conflict are ignored completely.

In this strategy no party achieves their desires. Although it appears settled but actually it disappears for the time being and likely to recur in the future. According to Schermerhorn (2002), it is the extreme form of ignorance and non-attention. Sometimes when the matter is important, then avoiding style does not work because it can produce harmful effects for the party.

Conclusion:
This study has found very interesting relationship between CMS and negative consequences. Avoiding and competing strategies appear to be the most disliked strategies by the faculty and generated negative consequences. Higher education institutions are totally different from traditional organizations. Policies, procedures and strategies deemed appropriate for other organizations may prove unproductive for educational institutions. All our results are totally different and unique when compared to the previous research of conventional organizations. Thus educational administrators have to be careful in planning the strategies and policies. This study also provides educational administrators an opportunity to gain an insight about the CMS and their consequences in HEIs.

Recommendations
The following recommendations are offered on the basis of our research findings:
  i. All the faculty members should be given awareness about the beneficial use of conflict management in their departments.
  ii. Conflict management training programs should be designed for the faculty in general and administrators in particular.
  iii. Faculty in both public and private sector universities should be taught conflict management strategies. This will surely boost their performance and minimize the deadly aspects of conflict.
  iv. The organizations consist of people with interpersonal relationships. Administrators should acquire good understanding of relationship and conflict management.

Limitations:
The data was obtained from one province in Pakistan i.e. Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. So its findings cannot be generalized to the whole public and private sector universities in Pakistan. Moreover, the findings are based on the responses to the questionnaire which may be different from actual behaviour.

References

1. Adomi, E.E., & Anie, S.O. (2006). Conflict management in Nigerian university libraries. Library Management, 27(8), pp. 520-530. Emerald Group Publishing Limited. DOI 10.1108/01435120610686098.
2. Antonioni, D. (1998). Relationship between the big five personality factors and conflict management styles. International Journal of Conflict Management, 9(4), 336-354.
3. Balay, R. (2006). Conflict management strategies of administrators and teachers. Asian Journal of Management Cases, 3(1), 5-24.
4. Balay, R. (2007). Predicting conflict management based on organizational commitment and selected demographic variables. Asia Pacific Education Review, Vol. 8, No.2, 321-336.
5. Barsky, A. E. (2002). Structural sources of conflict in a university context. Conflict Resolution Quarterly, Vol. 20, no.2. pp.161-176.
6. Berryman-Fink C (1998). Can We Agree to Disagree? Faculty-Faculty Conflict. In Holton SA (Ed.). Mending the Cracks in the Ivory Tower: Strategies for Conflict Management in Higher Education. 141-163. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.
7. Bartlett, Kotrlik., & Higgins. (2001). Organizational research: Determining appropriate sample size in survey research. Information Technology, Learning, and Performance Journal, Vol. 19, No. 1.
8. Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). The managerial grid. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.

9. Brahnam, S.D., Margavio, M.T., Hignite, M.A., Barrier, B.T. & Chin, J. (2005). A gender-based categorization for conflict resolution. Journal of Management Development, Vol. 24 No. 3, pp. 197-219.
10. Chanin MN, Schneer JA (1984). A study of the relationship between Jungian personality dimensions and conflict-handling behavior. Hum. Rel., 37; 863-879.
11. Chusmir, L.H. & Mills, (1989). Gender differences in conflict resolution styles of managers: at work and at home. Sex Roles, 20 (3/4), pp. 149-65.
12. Cupach WR, Canary DJ (1997). Competence in interpersonal conflict. New York: McGraw-Hill.
13. Eagly, A.H., & Johnson, B.T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: a meta analysis. Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 108 No. 2, pp. 232-56.
14. Esquivel MA, Kleiner BH (1997). The importance of conflict in work team effectiveness. Team Perf. Manage., 3(2): 89-96.
15. Folger J, Shubert JJ (1995). Resolving Student-Initiated Grievances in Higher Education: Dispute Resolution Procedures in a Non-Adversarial Setting. National Institute for Dispute Resolution Report, no. 3. Washington, D.C.: National Institute for Dispute Resolution.
16. Gmelch WH, Carroll JB (1991). The three R's of conflict management for department chairs and faculty. Inn. Higher Educ., 16(2): 107–123.
17. Havenga W (2007) Gender and age differences in conflict management within small businesses. SA J. of Hum. Res. Manage., 6 (1); 22 – 28.
18. Hearn JC, Anderson MS (2002). Conflict in academic departments: An analysis of disputes over faculty promotion and tenure. Res. In Higher Educ. 43(5).
19. HEC (2012). www.hec.gov.pk
20. Henry O (2009). Organizational Conflict and its effects on Organizational Performance, Res. J. of Bus. Manage., 2(1); 16-24.
21. İpek, C. (2003). Organizational conflict and applicable organization developing apparatus in conflict management. In C.Elma & K. Demir (Eds.), Contemporary approaches in administration, pp. 219-242. Ankara: Anı Publication.
22. Jameson, J. K. (1999). Toward a comprehensive model for the assessment and Management of intra-organizational conflict: Developing the framework. International Journal of Conflict Management, 10, 268–294.

23. Jehn KA (1995). A multi-method examination of the benefits and detriments of intragroup conflict. Admin. Sci. Quart., 40: 256-282.

24. Johns, G. (1996). Comportament organizaþional. Înþelegerea s iconducerea oamenilor în procesul de muncã, Editura Economicã, Bucuresti

25. Johns, G. (1996). Comportament organizational. Întelegere si conducerea oamenilor în procesul de muncã, Editura Economicã, Bucuresti

26. Killmann RH, Thomas KW (1977). Developing a forced-choice measure of conflict-handling behavior: The "MODE" instrument. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 37, 309-325.

27. Lee, K.L. (2008). An Examination between the Relationships of Conflict Management Styles and Employees' Satisfaction, International Journal of Business and Management, Vol.3, No.9.

28. Loomis CP, Loomis ZK (1965). Modern Social Theories. Princeton. D.V.N Company, Inc.

29. Manolescu, A., Deaconu, A. (2009). Considerations Regarding the Conflict Management, Theoretical and Applied Economics. Pp.31.

30. Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and metaanalysis of the antecedents. correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. Psychological Bulletin, 108(2), 171-194.

31. Miklas EJ, Kleiner BH (2003). New Developments Concerning Academic Grievances, Manage. Res. News., 26 (2/3/4).

32. Moberg PJ (1998). Predicting conflict strategy with personality traits: Incremental validity and the five factor model. Int. J. of Con. Manage., 9(3); 258-285.

33. Morris, M.W., Williams, K.Y., Leung, K. and Larrick, R. (1998), "Conflict management style: accounting for cross-national differences", Journal of International Business Studies, Vol. 29 No. 4, pp. 719-29.

34. Morris, M.W., Williams, K.Y., Leung, K., Larrick, R., Mendoza, T., Bhatnagar, D., Li, J., Kondo, M., Luo, J.L., & Hu, J.C. (1998). Conflict Management Style: Accounting for Cross-National Differences. Journal of International Business Studies, 29(4), pp. 729-747.

35. Powell, G. N. (1988). Women and men in management. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

36. Rahim MA (2000). Managing conflict in organizations, Westport, CT, USA: Greenwood Publishing Group, Incorporated.

37. Rahim MA, Bonoma TV (1979). Managing organizational conflict: A model for diagnosis and intervention. Psy. Rep., 44: 1323-1344.

38. Rahim, M.A. (1983). A measure of styles of handling interpersonal conflict. Academy of Management Journal, 26(2), pp. 368-375.

39. Renwick, P.A. (1975). Perception and management of superior-subordinate conflict. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 13, pp. 444-56.

40. Renwick, P.A. (1977). Effects of sex differences on the perception and management of superior-subordinate conflict: an exploratory study. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 19, pp. 403-15.

41. Robbins SP (1998). Organizational behaviour. New Jersey: Simon & Schuster.

42. Robbins SP (2001). Organizational Behaviour (9th Edition), Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

43. Rosenthal, D. B., & Hautaluoma, J. (1988). Effects of importance of issues, gender, and power of contenders on conflict management style. Journal of Social Psychology, 128, 699-701.

44. Ruble TL, Stander NE (1990). Effects of role and gender on conflict-handling styles. A paper presented at the third conference of the International Association for Conflict Management, Vancouver, BC.

45. Ruble, T. L., & Schneer, J. A. (1994). Gender differences in conflict-handling styles: Less than meets the eye? In A. Taylor & J. B. Miller (Eds.), Conflict and gender (pp. 155-166). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

46. Schermerhorn Jr, JR (2002). Management. 7th Edition, John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

47. Spitzberg, B.H., Canary, D.J. and Cupach, W.R. (1994). A Competence-based Approach to the Study of Interpersonal Conflict. In D.D.Cahn. (Ed.), Conflict in Personal Relationships, pp: 183-202. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

48. Spitzberg, B.H., Canary, D.J., & Cupach, W.R. (1994). A competence-based approach to the study of interpersonal conflict. In D.D.Cahn. (Ed.), Conflict in Personal Relationships, pp: 183-202. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

49. Stanley CA, Algert NE (2007). An exploratory study of the conflict management styles of department heads in a research university setting. Inn. Higher Educat., 32: 49-65.

50. Thomas, K.W. & Thomas, G.F. (2008). Conflict styles of men and women at six organization levels. International Journal of Conflict Management, Vol. 14, Issue No. 2

51. Utley, M.E., Richardson, D., & Pilkington, C.J. (1989). Personality and interpersonal conflict management. Person. individ. Diff. 10(3). pp. 287-293.

52. Wilson, S. R., & Waltman, M. S. (1988). Assessing the Putnam-Wilson organizational communication conflict instrument (OCCI). Management Communication Quarterly, 1, 367-388.