

Conflict Resolution and Nigerian Universities Stakeholders' Satisfaction: A Study of Academic Staff Union of Nigerian Universities (ASUU)

*Anyanwu Precious Ihechi, *Ehis Taiwo Omoluabi,

Abstract

This study examines the effect of conflict resolution and Nigerian universities stakeholders' satisfaction with special focus on academic staff union of Nigerian universities (ASUU). In that regard, the researcher sought to also examine the relationship between effective resolution mechanisms (ERM), satisfaction influenced by resolution (SIR), and effective job satisfaction (EJS) among academic staff in Nigerian universities. Utilizing a survey-based approach with Likert scale questionnaires, the data were analyzed through multiple regression using SPSS. Results reveal that both ERM and SIR have limited influence on EJS, as evidenced by low R-squared values and non-significant p-values. These findings suggest that the existing conflict resolution mechanisms and levels of satisfaction with resolutions are insufficient to bring about meaningful improvements in job satisfaction. The persistent dissatisfaction may be a contributing factor to the recurring disputes between ASUU and the federal government of Nigeria. The study concludes that addressing deeper systemic issues—such as poor working conditions, inadequate funding, and the lack of meaningful dialogue—is critical to enhancing job satisfaction. Recommendations include reforming resolution mechanisms, improving university infrastructure, and fostering collaborative dialogue between ASUU and the government to create a more sustainable academic environment.

Keywords: Academic staff Union of Nigerian Universities (ASUU), Conflict resolution, Stakeholder satisfaction, Job satisfaction

Introduction

Education plays a vital role in the development of individuals and society. However, frequent conflicts in tertiary institutions, particularly in southeastern Nigeria, hinder the ability of education to meet its objectives. Oboegbulem and Ezepue (2016) describe how conflict destabilizes higher education systems, such as universities. Conflict, defined as a state of disagreement or opposition (Nicholas, 1992), is an inevitable part of organizational dynamics (Muzamil, 2024), and in universities, it manifests among students, staff, and administrators. Senior academic staff, including professors and lecturers, are key players in the functioning of universities. Their satisfaction with conflict resolution processes significantly affects their productivity and the overall institutional environment. Universities, being centers of ideas, are prone to conflict due to the diverse interests, skills, and goals of their members (Duze, 2012; Seitz, 2004). Conflicts arise from several sources, including administrative decisions, academic policies, and interpersonal relationships, making them an inherent part of university life. While conflict can lead to

inefficiencies, it can also be a catalyst for growth if managed effectively. A peaceful resolution of conflicts within universities enables academic and non-academic staff to work together towards institutional goals. Conflict management plays a crucial role in fostering a harmonious environment conducive to academic success and personal development (Chiekezie, Dibua & Chima, 2016). The literature underscores the importance of conflict resolution strategies that not only reduce tension but also turn disagreements into opportunities for organizational and individual growth (Jones, 2018; Smith & Brown, 2020).

This study aims to explore how conflict management affects staff productivity and career advancement. By examining conflict resolution strategies in university settings, it seeks to provide insights into improving both workplace harmony and employee development (Adams, Brown & Clark, 2021). The research is divided into five

Department of Business Administration,
Edo State University Uzairue, Edo State, Nigeria

parts: introduction, literature review, methodology, data analysis, and conclusions with recommendations, offering practical guidance to organizational leaders and Human resources professionals

Statement Of Problem

The effectiveness of conflict resolution mechanisms in Nigerian universities, particularly concerning academic staff satisfaction, has become a major issue. Frequent conflicts, especially between the Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU) and university management, have led to repeated strikes, academic disruptions, and a strained work environment. If these conflicts are not managed well, they can negatively impact staff morale, job satisfaction, and productivity.

There is growing concern that the grievances of academic staff are not being adequately addressed through the existing conflict resolution processes, which may lead to dissatisfaction, reduced motivation, and a decline in education quality. Continued dissatisfaction could result in higher turnover rates, affecting the long-term stability of the universities.

Furthermore, there is a lack of empirical evidence on how conflict resolution practices directly influence the satisfaction of academic staff. Understanding this relationship is key to developing strategies that effectively resolve conflicts and improve staff engagement.

This research aims to explore the link between conflict resolution mechanisms and stakeholder satisfaction, particularly focusing on academic staff in Nigerian universities. It seeks to determine if effective conflict management can enhance satisfaction and create a more harmonious and productive university environment.

Gap in the Study

The gap in the study is the lack of empirical research on how effective conflict resolution directly influences the satisfaction of academic staff in Nigerian universities. Existing literature has not adequately explored this relationship, especially within the unique context of the Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU) in Nigeria. This study aims to fill this gap by providing insights into how conflict resolution practices impact the job satisfaction and overall well-being of academic staff, a key but often overlooked stakeholder group in the educational system.

Research Objectives

The broad objective is:

1. Examine the effect of conflict resolution on university stakeholder satisfaction
2. Assess the level of satisfaction among Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU)
3. Examine if there is significant positive relationship between the effectiveness of conflict resolution mechanisms and the overall satisfaction of academic staff in Nigerian universities.

Hypotheses

H₁: There is a significant positive relationship between effective conflict resolution mechanisms and the satisfaction of academic staff in Nigerian universities

H₂: The level of satisfaction among academic staff is significantly influenced by the effectiveness of conflict resolution practices in Nigerian universities.

H₃: There is a significant positive relationship between the effectiveness of conflict resolution mechanisms and the overall satisfaction of academic staff in Nigerian universities.

Research Implications:

The study on the "Effect of Conflict Resolution and Nigerian Universities Stakeholders' Satisfaction: A Study of Academic Staff Union of Nigerian Universities (ASUU)" has the following key implications:

1. University Management: The research will guide university administrators in developing more effective conflict resolution strategies, enhancing stakeholder engagement, and creating a more harmonious work environment.
2. Academic Staff (ASUU): The findings can empower ASUU members by providing evidence that supports better working conditions, leading to increased job satisfaction and a stronger position in negotiations.
3. Policymakers and Government: The study could influence policy formulation and resource allocation, ensuring that effective conflict resolution practices are implemented across Nigerian universities.
4. Students and Academic Community: Improved conflict resolution could lead to

a more stable academic environment, reducing disruptions and enhancing the quality of education.

5. **Future Research:** The study will contribute to the academic field, encouraging further research on conflict resolution and stakeholder satisfaction in different educational contexts.
6. **Broader Educational Sector:** Other universities can use the study's findings to improve their conflict resolution practices, leading to better management and educational outcomes globally.

Review of Related Literature

Conceptual Clarifications

Concept of Conflict

Conflict refers to disagreements or friction that arise between individuals or groups due to incompatible beliefs or actions (Tschannen-Moran, 2001). It can manifest in various forms, from disagreements to more intense clashes like protests and strikes. Conflict often stems from an inability to resolve differences, leading to disruptions in organizational settings, including universities (Bercovitch, 1990; Coser, 1957; Amusan, 1996). Ejiogu (1990) identifies several types of conflict, including those based on hierarchical positions or personal and institutional expectations.

In organizations, conflict can occur at individual, group, or organizational levels. Individual conflicts may stem from personality traits or stress, group conflicts from informal norms, and organizational conflicts from communication or leadership issues (Mullins, 1999). Robins (1998) views conflict as a potentially positive force that fosters self-criticism, innovation, and prevents stagnation. Hence, conflict is a natural and necessary aspect of organizational life that can enhance performance when properly managed. In Nigerian tertiary institutions, conflict is a major obstacle to development. The educational system has been plagued by student protests, violence, and frequent school closures (Adeyemi, Ekundayo, & Alonge, 2010). Such conflicts hinder progress, as development cannot occur in a crisis-driven environment (Fatile & Adejuwon, 2011). Conflict is deeply rooted in human interactions and is inevitable in any system where individuals are interdependent (Adejuwon & Okewale, 2009). Conflicts in universities today are becoming more complex, reflecting broader societal changes. The

range and nature of conflicts have evolved, requiring more advanced mechanisms for conflict management. As universities are key to national development, addressing these conflicts is crucial to creating a more stable and effective educational environment.

Concept of Conflict Resolution

The word "resolution" means, the quality of being resolute, A firm decision, An expression of opinion or intensions agreed on by a legislative body, The action of solving a problem or dispute, The process of reducing or separating something into components Tide well-C. Alan (1998). Thus, we can preliminarily define conflict resolution as a situation: "Where the conflicting parties enter into an agreement that solves their central incompatibilities, accept each other's continued existence as parties and cease all violent action against each other." Peter, Wallensteen (2002), Conflict resolution refers to a range of process aimed at alleviating or eliminating sources of conflict. Conflict resolution is an umbrella term for a whole range of methods and approaches for dealing with conflict: from negotiation to diplomacy, from mediation to arbitration, from facilitation to adjudication, from conciliation to conflict prevention, from conflict management to conflict transformation, from restorative justice to peacekeeping.

Conflict Resolution Strategies

Conflict Resolution Strategies:

Conflict resolution strategies emerged to address disagreements between individuals working in a formal setting. Conflict is defined as any disagreement between individuals in the same or different organizations (Omene, 2021). Scholars like Osabiya (2015) and Olukayode (2015) explain that conflict arises when one person feels aggrieved with another, and Dialoke and Edeh (2017) argue that conflicts often result from a clash of interests within the same organization.

Conflict Resolution Strategies:

Conflict resolution involves processes designed to resolve disagreements between employees and employers. Wainaina, R.N., Magoma, C., & Mange, D. (2020) identified several strategies, including:

1. **Avoidance:** A party withdraws from the conflict to maintain peace (Aja, 2014; Abdullah, 2015).
2. **Compromising:** Both parties forfeit key

issues to reach a consensus, leading to a win-win outcome (Akhtar & Hassan, 2021; Uchendu, C., Anijaobi, F., & Odigwe, F. (2013)). It is also known as reconciliation and can result in job satisfaction, mutual benefits, and cost-effective solutions (Kazimoto, 2013).

3. Collaboration, Accommodating, and Competing: Other strategies mentioned by Wainaina et al. (2020).

Mba (2013) and Mayowa (2015) emphasize that avoidance and compromising are particularly effective strategies in government parastatals. However, Yusuf-Habeeb and Kazeem (2017) argue that the selection of a resolution strategy depends on the specific situation.

In government organizations, avoidance and compromising strategies have been deemed particularly effective, while in the private sector, the situation may differ (Ezekiel & Abdurraheem, 2022). It is crucial to identify the root causes of conflict when choosing a strategy to avoid recurrence (Mba, 2013).

Concept of Stakeholders

Stakeholders are a group of individuals who are involved in the process of development of an institution, constitute a part of the institution's organizational framework and contribute directly to its operations and play a vital role to its success or failure through their contribution of interests, ownership rights and human resources (Bourne, 2009). Knipe (2016), defined a stakeholder as any person or organization affected by or with the power to influence an institutions decisions and actions. Therefore, the host communities are stakeholders to tertiary institutions as they fit into the context of these definitions. Nigerian higher education stakeholders are concerned about the quality of education, focusing on teaching staff, infrastructure, and the overall institutional environment. Quality is linked to factors like student intake, academic programs, and support services. Quality education is essential for national competitiveness and societal transformation. The aims of Nigerian universities include producing high-level manpower, promoting scholarship, and serving as centres of excellence (Baird, 2006; Fry, 2006; Nordvall and Braxton, 1996; Asiyai, 2005.2014).

The Federal Ministry of Education emphasises

that Nigerian universities should achieve the goals through teaching, research, knowledge dissemination, and community service, all of which are tied to quality education. Quality higher education is seen as essential for Nigeria's social, economic, and political development (Ehigiamusoe, 2012). It can be further stated that the strength a nation is determined by the quality of its tertiary institutions. High standards are necessary to produce skilled manpower needed for other education levels. The roles of families and communities are also vital in supporting quality education (Kufi, 2013; UNICEF, 2000). However, inadequate funding is a major challenge, with Nigeria allocating only 8.4% of its budget to education, far below UNESCO's recommended 26% (World Bank, 2012; Akaranta, 2014).

The Academic Staff Unions of Universities (ASUU): Brief History

The Academic Staff Unions of Universities (ASUU) is a Nigerian Union of University Academic Staff formed in 1978 with a history of militant actions. The ASUU was formed in 1978 being a successor to the Association of University Teachers, formed in 1965 and covering academic staff in all of the federal and State Universities in the country. The union was active in struggle against the military regimes during the 1980s. In 1988, the union organized a national strike to obtain fair wages and university autonomy. As a result, the ASUU was proscribed on 7th August, 1988, and all its properties seized. However, it was allowed to resume in 1990, but after another strike was again banned on 23 August, 1992. However, an agreement was reached on 3rd September, 1992 that met several of the union's demands, including the right of workers to collective bargaining. The ASUU organized further strikes in 1994 and 1996, protesting against the dismissal of staff by Sani Abacha's Military regime Asogwa, J.O (2015).

Theoretical Review of Literature Stakeholder Theory

The stakeholder theory (ST) as developed and championed by Freeman & Reid (1983) as well as Freeman (1984). This theory believes every organization consist of individuals or group of individuals who benefit from or are harmed by organizational activities. According to Dougherty (1992) and Ray (1999), stakeholders can be grouped into four parts namely normative public, functional publics, enabling publics as well as diffused public. Normative republic consists of

professional bodies, trade union etc., functional public consists of suppliers, employees, and customers, enabling public refer to those who provide leadership for organization such as board of directors, shareholders, etc. Finally, diffused public are those stakeholders who emerged as a result of an external consequence for organizational activities example media, residents, community, environmentalist etc. According to Donald & Preston (1995), stakeholder theory is descriptive, instrumental, formatively normative and managerial. Hence, it is useful for the study. R. Edward Freeman (2018) posits that Stakeholder theory is a view of capitalism that stresses the interconnected relationships between a business and its customers, suppliers, employees, investors, communities and others who have a stake in the organization. The theory argues that a firm should create value for all stakeholders, not just shareholders.

Stakeholder Satisfaction

Stakeholder satisfaction (SS) in an institution hinge on how well service quality aligns with or surpasses stakeholder's expectations. The way institutions deliver services and conduct satisfaction surveys significantly influences their potential for improvement. Universities strive to remain competitive by consistently offering superior services compared to other institutions. Service quality involves meeting stakeholders' needs and desires as well as accurately delivering services to meet customer expectations and satisfaction Mustaffa, W.S.W, Hamid, M.H.A., Bing, K.W., & Rahman, R.A. (2016). Service quality is generally accessed by comparing stakeholder expectations with the actual service received. If the service meets or exceeds expectations, the quality is viewed as excellent or ideal. However, if the service falls short of expectations, it is perceived as poor. Therefore, the quality of service is determined by the provider's ability to meet customer expectations Narullia, D, Maha, D., Putri, F. Purnamasari, and Mohd, Rizal Palil (2023). Since we are examining the stakeholder satisfaction (SS) of the Academic Staff Unions of Universities (ASUU), it is necessary to also define stakeholder satisfaction (SS) the level of contentment, fulfilment, and approval that lecturers, professors, and other academic professionals feel regarding various aspects of their work environment and professional life within the university. The stakeholders in the context of academic staff union of universities

(ASUU) specifically refers to how well the needs and expectations of the academic staff in Nigerian universities are being met. This includes factors such as fair compensation, opportunities for professional development, sufficient research funding, autonomy in their work, and overall support from the university administration. Satisfying these needs is essential to ensuring that academic staff are motivated, productive, and committed to their roles, which in turn contributes to the overall success of the university.

It is therefore imperative to state unequivocally that the stakeholder theory is the foundation upon which stakeholder satisfaction rests. This relationship is fundamental because stakeholder theory provides the conceptual basis for why organizations should prioritize the satisfaction of their stakeholders. In order to know the effectiveness of stakeholder satisfaction (SS), it is imperative to know how it is measured.

Effective Measuring of Stakeholder Satisfaction

The Academic Staff Union of Nigerian Universities (ASUU) can effectively measure SS in several ways:

1. **Stakeholder Satisfaction Surveys:** regular surveys should be conducted to gather feedback from key stakeholders such as university administration, faculty, students, and the broader community. This will enable ASUU to gather relevant information that will assist in the assessment of satisfaction levels with the union's performance, communication, and responsiveness to Stakeholders needs and concerns (Justin Legac & Silvia Mari, 2024)
2. **Stakeholder Engagement Metrics:** Track performance indicators (KPIs) related to stakeholder engagement, such as:
 - **Engagement level:** Measure the frequency and quality of interactions, participations in meetings, and alignment with union's objectives.
 - **Satisfaction Score:** Evaluate stakeholder's satisfaction with union's services, communication, and overall performance.
 - **Influence Impact:** Assess the extent to which stakeholder's can influence the union's decisions and actions Justin Legac (2024)

- **Engagement ROI:** Quantify the return on investment of the union's stakeholder engagement efforts
3. **Stakeholder Feedback Channels:** Establish multiple channels for stakeholders to provide feedback, such as online forms, suggestion boxes, and open forums. This allows the union to gather both quantitative and qualitative data on stakeholder satisfaction.
 4. **Stakeholder Mapping and Analysis:** Identify and categorize the union's key stakeholders, understanding their interests, influence, and potential impact. This will help the union prioritize engagement efforts and tailor its strategies to meet the needs of different stakeholder groups.
 5. **Responsive Communication:** Ensure timely and transparent communication with stakeholders, addressing their concerns and providing updates on the union's activities. This demonstrates the union's commitment to stakeholder engagement and build trust.
 6. **Continuous Improvement:** Regularly review and analyze the data collected from stakeholder engagement efforts. Use these insights to refine the union's strategies, address pain points, and enhance stakeholder satisfaction over time Justin Legac (2024).

Theories and Theorists of Conflict Resolution

Since the mid-nineteenth century, there have been a variety of theorists with conflict, of whom Karl Marx was perhaps the most noteworthy. The attention here is not to mention every theorist, who ever addressed the issue of conflict, but rather to examine briefly those who have had major impact on the study of conflict resolution.

Simmel sought to study the role of the individual in small groups, as well as the role of small groups in large social contexts. Simmel says, conflict is a socialization process, reducing the tension existing between the group members. Simmel argues that humans have a need both of sympathy and of hostility. Simmel says conflicts could be resolved three ways, (a) Conflict may end victory of one party over another; (b) Through compromise; (c) through conciliation. Simmel's work is important in the study of conflict

resolution, because he clearly articulated a positive social function for conflict George Simmel (1955). Lewis Coser an American Sociologist, articulated his own vision of social conflict. He presented his thesis in his seminal work. *The Function of Social Conflict*, first published in 1956, in which he argued that conflicts serves a variety of useful purposes. He wrote conflict is not always dysfunctional for the relationship within which it occurs; often conflict is necessary to maintain such a relationship without going hostility towards each other and to express dissent group members might feel completely crushed and might react by withdrawal Coser, L. A. 1968) By setting free pent-up feelings of hostility, conflicts serve to maintain a relationship Coser, L. A. 1968). The most important contribution that Coser made to the study of conflict was to focus the minds of researchers on the role that conflict plays in a society-both functional and dysfunctional roles.

Kurt Lewin, a German-born American academics wrote extensively on the subject of conflict. His contribution to the study of conflict is important for a variety of reasons. Most important of his contributions to the study of conflict was field theory. Field theory may be characterized as a method of analyzing casual relations and building constructs. The basic elements a Lewin's field theory included: (a) Psychological explanation of behaviour. (b) Systematic causation instead of historical. (c) Consideration of total situation. (d) An approach characterized by dynamics. Lewin argues whether or not a particular event will lead to a conflict depends largely on the tension level or on the social atmosphere in the group Key sources of tension in conflict settings include needs of satisfaction: A need in the state of hunger means not only that a particular region within the person is under tension but also that a person as a whole is on a higher tension level. This holds particularly for basic needs, such as sex or security. Lewin's work has grown tripartite typology of conflict. The first type is approach-approach situations. A second type of conflict is avoidance-avoidance, where two forces are both undesirable. The third type of conflict is termed approach avoidance, where a person faces choices that comprise both positive and negative characteristics. Lewin's work is ultimately, of a very practical nature and meant so be applied to real situations. Thus, for Lewin, there was a social responsibility that connected research an education. This clear bond between research, training and action has persisted in the study of conflict resolution Lewin, Kurt (1997).

Morton Deutsch is an American psychologist who has made significant contributions to the study of conflict resolution. Central to his work has been the issue not how to eliminate or prevent conflict but rather how to make it productive. Deutsch, M. (1975). In conducting his research Deutsch has been guided by five assumptions: (a) Each participant in social interaction responds to the other in terms of his perception and cognition of other. (b) Each participant in social interaction being cognizant of the other's capacity for awareness, is influenced by his own expectations concerning the others actions as well as by his perceptions of the other's conduct. (c) Social interaction not only is initiated by motives but also generates new motives and alters old ones. (d) Social interaction takes place in a social environment in a family, a group, a community, a nation, a civilization-that has developed techniques, symbols, categories, rules and values that are relevant to human interaction. (e) Even though each participant in social interaction, whether an individual or a group, is a complex until composed of many interacting subsystems, it can act in a unified way towards some aspects of environment. Deutsch believes that conflict resolution is primarily governed by the development of skill. The more skillful the party, the more likely that the conflict will be resolved. Deutsch has been a forerunner in emphasizing the subjective nature of conflict. In Deutsch's view the probability of conflict erupting. These factors are contact and visibility of differences, perceived incompatibility, and perceive utility of conflict Deutsch, M. (1975).

Game theory is the systematic study of problem-solving in cases where at least two interdependent parties are involved in seeking some outcome. It is used primarily by economists to study human problem-solving behaviour. Poundstone describes it as a rigorously mathematical study that evolves naturally from a reasonable way of looking at conflict. This theory was considerably advanced and developed by mathematicians and economists such as John Von Neumann and Oscar Morgenstern (1953), in their book "Theory of games and economic behaviour". Anatol Rapport, a co-founder of the Journal of Conflict Resolution, directly applied game theory in conflict resolution. Game theory is used to the model the ways in which people engage in conflict.

Empirical Review of Literature

Asogwa, J.O (2015) in his theoretical research titled: *Industrial Conflict and University Students' Attitude towards Academic Activities: A study of the University of Calabar, Calabar, Cross River State, Nigeria*, exposed the conflict management strategies and mechanisms employed by ASUU in its interactions with the Nigerian Government includes meetings, dialogue, consultations, collective bargaining, and Lobbying. He revealed that conflict management is all about collective bargaining which is machinery for discussions and negotiation, whether formal or informal, between employees and the workers' representatives, aimed at reaching mutual agreement or understanding. Asogwa, J.O (2015) further argued that the presence of industrial conflict (manifested by regular strike actions) is an albatross to a healthy attitude of students to a healthy academic activities in the tertiary institution which leads to a poor academic achievement as a result of lack of class attendance. This is in concurrence with that of Edinyang and Ubi (2013), who posited that disruption in academic activities in Nigerian universities due to strike actions affect students which leads to half-baked products from the universities witnessed in the labour market in temporary time. In another research conducted by Olusegun, E. A, Owolabi, L. K and Olayombo, E.A (2023) on the topic titled: *Trajectory of brain drain and quality of work-life amongst Nigeria's University lecturers: academic staff union of universities (ASUU) incessant strike in retrospect*, the study examined the factors influencing the Quality of Work-life (QWL) of academic staff in Nigerian universities, focussing on members of the Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU). Five hypotheses were tested, yielding the following significant findings:

1. **Compensation packages (H_1):** The beta coefficient (b) of 0.57 indicates that the insufficient and unjust compensation packages significantly reduce the QWL of academic staff. The p-value (p) of 0.001 confirms that this relationship is statistically significant, meaning that the likelihood of this result occurring by chance is very low. This finding supports the conclusions of studies by Ehichoya and Ogunode (2020) and Joshua et al. (2020), which also identified poor compensation as a major factor in the dissatisfaction and brain drain among university lecturers.

2. **Research Funding (H₂):** The study found that poor research funding negatively impacts lecturers' QWL, as indicated by a beta coefficient (b) of 0.43. The p-value (p) of 0.000 shows that this result is highly statistically significant, underscoring the critical role of research funding in the professional satisfaction of academic staff. This outcome is consistent with the findings of Ukwoma and Onyebinama (2021), who also highlighted the importance of adequate funding for academic research in driving national progress.
3. **University Autonomy (H₃):** The lack of autonomy in university governance was found to have a significant negative effect on lecturers' QWL, with a beta coefficient (b) of 0.62. The p-value (p) of 0.002 indicates that this relationship is statistically significant. This result aligns with Ogundipe (2022), who emphasized the detrimental impact of limited autonomy on the effective management of universities and the academic freedom of staff.
4. **Staff Development (H₄):** The beta coefficient (b) of 0.31 suggests that inadequate staff development opportunities significantly lower the QWL of academic staff. The p-value (p) of 0.001 confirms the statistical significance of this finding. This result is in agreement with the studies by Udoh and Atanda (2022) and Ogunode, N.J., Jegede, D. and Musa, A. (2021), which identified poor staff development as a major issue affecting lecturers' performance and motivation.
5. **University Funding (H₅):** The study also found that inadequate university funding significantly threatens the sustainability of education in Nigeria, with a beta coefficient (b) of 0.35. The p-value (p) of 0.001 indicates that this result is statistically significant, reinforcing the findings of Wahab (2022) and Ogunode and Abubakar (2022), who pointed to poor funding as a core challenge for Nigerian Universities.

In summary, the study's empirical findings demonstrate that factors such as inadequate compensation, poor research funding, lack of autonomy, insufficient staff development, and

inadequate university funding are all statistically significant contributors to the low QWL of academic staff in Nigerian university. These results emphasize the need for targeted improvements in these areas to enhance the work life of lecturers and retain their expertise within the country.

Methodology

The study will adopt a descriptive survey research design which enables the researcher to describe and analyze the relationship between conflict resolution practices and stakeholder satisfaction among academic staff in Nigerian universities. The population of study consists of 2,711 academic staff in the government-owned (Federal and State) universities in Edo state obtained from the registry department in the various institutions. The teaching staffs of these universities are automatically members of Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU). Freund and Williams's technique will be employed in determining the sample size for the population of 2,711 which is approximately 225 respondents. The sample size of 225 was calculated employing the Freund and Williams formula which is articulated as:

$$n = \frac{Z^2NPQ}{Ne^2 + Z^2PQ}$$

Where: n= Sample Size

N= population = 2,711

P= Probability of success (80%) = 0.2

Q= Probability of Failure (20%) = 0.8

Z = Standard Error of the mean (95% at 1.96)

e = Level of significance (5% or 0.05)

Sample size of teaching Staff in Ambrose Alli University and University of Benin

$$n = \frac{(1.96)^2(2,711)(0.8)(0.2)}{2,711(0.05)^2 + (1.96)^2(0.8)(0.2)} = 225$$

To determine the value of p and q, the researchers conducted a pilot survey by distributing 100 questionnaires at two different intervals. Employing the test and re-test method, 80 questionnaires were returned, while 20 remained unreturned. This outcome indicates that the pilot survey achieved 80% probability of success and 20% probability of failure. Therefore P=0.8 while Q=0.2. The validated questionnaires were distributed by applying stratified random sampling technique which ensures that all segments of the academic staff population are adequately represented in the sample. Within each stratum, respondents were randomly selected to participate in the survey. Out of the 225

questionnaires that were distributed, 220 were returned representing 97.78% while 2.22% were not returned. The statistical tool that will be used to test the three hypotheses multiple regression analysis. In statistical hypothesis testing, the decision rule states that if the p-value calculated from the ANOVA test is less than the chosen significance level (often 0.05), the null hypothesis is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis is accepted (Agbadudu, 2004). Conversely, if the p-value is greater than 0.05 (at a 5% level of significance), the null hypothesis is accepted, and the alternative hypothesis is rejected. SPSS version 25 is the tool for the analysis of data.

Presentation of Results and Analysis

A 5-point Likert-Scale was utilized, and below is the presentation of the analysis. Values were assigned ranging from (SA) -5 point for positive responses to (SD) -1 point for negative responses. (SA) represents Strongly Agree while (SD) represents Strongly Disagree.

Table 1: Hypothesis One Analysis and Interpretation

Significant positive relationship between Effective Conflict resolution mechanisms (ERM) and the satisfaction of Academic Staff in Nigerian Universities

Effective Resolution Mechanisms (Erm)	SA	A	UD	DA	SD	TS	STD	M
Q.1: Conflict resolution mechanisms are effective in addressing disputes among academic staff	198	20	0	1	1	220	77.38	44
Q.2: I am satisfied with how conflicts involving academic staff are handled by the university administration	182	37	0	0	1	220	70.45	44
Q.3: The university's approach to conflict resolution fosters a positive work environment among academic staff	153	66	0	0	1	220	65.69	44
Q.4: Conflicts among academic staff are resolved in a timely manner at the university	125	95	0	0	0	220	55.35	44
Q.5: I feel that the conflict resolution process is fair and impartial	115	95	1	8	1	220	47.36	44
Q.6: The university provides adequate support to academic staff during the conflict resolution process	108	100	2	8	2	220	47.26	44
Q.7: Conflict resolution practices at my university help to maintain healthy professional relationships among academic staff	97	100	3	10	10	220	41.21	44
Q.8: I trust the university administration to handle conflicts among academic staff effectively	157	45	10	2	6	220	61.27	44
Q.9: I am confident in the transparency of the conflict resolution process at the university	175	45	0	0	0	220	76.27	44
Q.10: The outcomes of the conflict resolution effort at my university are satisfactory to academic staff	165	52	3	0	0	220	71.96	44

Source: Field Data Result, 2024

The analysis of the Likert-Scale data for the Effective Resolution Mechanism (ERM) reveals the following:

High Variability: Questions 1, 9, and 10 exhibit the highest Standard Deviations (SD) respectively (SD = 77.38), (SD = 76.27), and (SD = 71.96) indicating significant disagreement among respondents. This suggests that these aspects of the ERM are more contentious or interpreted differently.

Moderate Consensus: Questions 5, 6, and 7 have the lowest Standard Deviations (SDs) respectively (47.36, 47.26, and 41.21) showing more agreement among respondents. These areas of the ERM seem to be more widely accepted or less controversial.

Overall Consistency: Despite the varying levels of agreement (as shown by the SDs), the mean response for all questions is constant at 44, indicating that, on average, respondents rated all questions similarly.

In summary, the data suggest that while there is general consistency in how respondents view the ERM, specific aspects generate more disagreement, highlighting areas that may require further investigation or improvement.

Table 2: Model Summary^b

Model	R	RSquare	Adjusted Rsquare	StdErr of estimate	RSquare change	Change Statistics				Durbin Watson
						F change	df1	df2	Sig of Change	
1	.094 ^a	.009	.004	.15729	.009	1.940	1	218	.165	1.759

Source: 25.0 Data Output

a. Predictors: (Constant) ERM

b. Dependent Variable: EJS

Effective Resolution Mechanism (ERM)

R = 0.094 indicates a weak positive correlation between ERM and job satisfaction. $R^2 = 0.009$ means that only 0.9% of the variation in Effective Job Satisfaction (EJS) is explained by ERM, indicating a very weak explanatory power. Adjusted $R^2 = 0.004$ further suggests that the model's fit does not improve when adjusted for the number of predictors. Standard Error of Estimate = 0.15729 reflects the average distance that the observed values fall from the regression line, showing relatively high dispersion. F Change = 1.940, p-value = 0.165 shows that the model is not statistically significant (Since $p > 0.05$), meaning that ERM is not a significant predictor of EJS.

Table 3 Anova^a

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	0.048	1	0.048	1.940	0.165
Residual	5.393	218	0.025		
Total	5.441	219			

Source: SPSS 25.0 Data Output

Dependent Variable: EJS

Predictors: (Constant), ERM

F-statistic = 1.940 with a p-value = 0.165 confirms that the regression model is not statistically significant. Sum of Squares (Regression) = 0.048 and Residual = 5.393 indicate that most of the variation in EJS remains unexplained by ERM. Mean Square (Regression) = 0.048 and Residual = 0.025 show that the error in prediction is almost double the regression effect.

Table 4: Coefficients^a

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	T	Sig.
	B	Standard Error			
Constant	4.116	0.235		17.502	0.000
ERM	0.071	0.051	0.094	1.393	0.165

Source: SPSS Data Output 25.0 Version

a. Dependent variable: EJS

Constant (B) = 4.116 shows the base level of job satisfaction when ERM is not considered. ERM (B) = 0.071 implies a positive but weak and non-significant impact of ERM on EJS ($p = 0.165$). Beta = 0.094 (Standardized Coefficients) indicates that ERM contributes very little to explaining the changes in job satisfaction. t- statistic = 1.393 for ERM, with a p-value of 0.165, again confirms that the relationship is not statistically significant.

Conclusion for ERM

The ERM variable does not significantly predict Effective Job Satisfaction. The model is weak and lacks statistical significance, suggesting that improvements in resolution mechanisms have no substantial impact on job satisfaction.

Table 5: Hypothesis Two Analysis And Interpretation

Satisfaction among academic staff is significantly influenced by the effectiveness of conflict resolution practices in Nigerian universities.

Satisfaction Influenced By Resolution (SIR)	SA	A	UD	DA	SD	TS	STD	M
Q.11: My overall job satisfaction is significantly influenced by the effectiveness of conflict resolution practices in Nigerian universities.	198	18	0	2	2	220	77.51	44

Q.12: Effective conflict resolution at my university contributes to satisfaction with my role as an academic staff member.	130	89	0	1	0	220	53.56	44
Q.13: I am more satisfied with my job when conflicts are resolved efficiently.	175	45	0	0	0	220	76.27	44
Q.14: The way conflicts are handled at my university affects my satisfaction with university management.	172	47	1	0	0	220	69.34	44
Q.15: I feel more content in my position when I see conflicts among colleagues are managed effectively.	185	35	0	0	0	220	78.63	44
Q.16: My satisfaction with my job would decrease if conflicts were not resolved effectively.	164	56	0	0	0	220	69.62	44
Q.17: The university's conflict resolution practices significantly impact my overall satisfaction.	156	64	0	0	0	220	68.68	44
Q.18: I feel more satisfied with my job knowing that conflicts are resolved fairly.	167	52	1	0	0	220	67.82	44
Q.19: Effective conflict resolution increases my commitment to my role as an academic staff member.	163	57	0	0	0	220	66.88	44
Q.20: The effectiveness of conflict resolution at my university is a key factor in my job satisfaction.	154	65	1	0	0	220	65.15	44

Source: Field Data Result, 2024

1. The analysis of the data on Satisfaction Influenced by Resolution (SIR) shows the following key points: High variability is seen in certain questions (Question 11 (77.51), Question 13 (76.27), and Question 15 (78.63), indicating significant disagreement among respondents regarding those aspects of satisfaction, likely due to varying experiences with conflict resolution.
2. Low variability in questions such as Question 12 (53.56) and Question 20 (65.15) suggests stronger agreement and more uniform experiences among respondents on those topics.
3. Moderate variability in the other questions shows a mix of consensus and disagreement, but not as extreme as in the highest or lowest variability areas.
4. The mean score of 44 remains consistent across all questions, indicating that despite variability in opinions, the average response is stable.

Table 6: Model Summary^b

Model	R	RSquare	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics				Durbin-Watson
						F change	d1	d2	Sig of Change	
1	.006 ^a	.000	-.004	0.1537	.000	0.053	1	218	.088	1.691

Source: SPSS Data Output 25.0 Version

a. Predictors: (Constant), SIR

b. Dependent Variable: EJS

R = 0.016 indicates almost no correlation between SIR and EJS. $R^2 = 0.000$ shows that SIR explains 0% of the variation in EJS, reflecting no predictive power. Adjusted $R^2 = -0.004$ suggests that the model fit decreases when adjusting for the number of predictors. Standard Error of Estimate = 0.15797 remains almost the same, indicating high variance around the predicted values. F Change = 0.053, p-value = 0.818 shows that the model is not significant, and SIR does not have a meaningful impact on EJS.

Table 7 Anova^a

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean F	F	Sig.
1 Regression	0.001	1	0.001	0.053	0.818
Residual	5.440	218	0.25		
Total	5.441	219			

Source: SPSS 25.0 Data Output

Dependent Variable: EJS

Predictors: (Constant), SIR

The table reveals that F-statistic = 0.053 with a p-value = 0.818 shows no significant relationship between SIR and EJS. Sum of Squares (Regression) = 0.001 and Residual = 5.440 indicate almost no contribution of SIR to explaining the variance in job satisfaction. Mean Square (Regression) = 0.001, Residual = 0.025 show that most of the variation remains unexplained.

Table 8: Coefficients^a

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardize Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
	B	Standard Error			
Constant	4.527	0.361		12.549	0.000
SIR	-0.017	0.076	-0.016	-0.230	0.818

Source: SPSS Data Output 25.0 Version

a. Dependent variable: EJS

Constant (B) = 4.527 indicates the base level of job satisfaction when SIR is not considered. SIR (B) = -0.017 indicates a slight negative but non-significant impact of SIR on EJS (p = 0.818). Beta = -0.016 shows that SIR contributes almost nothing to explaining changes in job satisfaction. t- statistic = -0.230 for SIR with a p-value of 0.818 confirms that the relationship is not statistically significant.

Conclusion for SIR

The variable SIR does not significantly impact Effective Job Satisfaction. The model is statistically weak and not significant, implying that satisfaction influenced by resolution has no measurable effect on job satisfaction.

TABLE 9: Hypothesis Three Analysis and Interpretation

Academic Staff in the Nigerian universities who experience effective conflict resolution practices are more likely to report higher overall job satisfaction compared to those who experience ineffective conflict resolution.

Effective Job Satisfaction (EJS)	SA	A	UD	DA	SD	TS	STD	M
Q.21: I am generally more satisfied with my work when conflicts are resolved efficiently	156	60	2	0	2	220	65.53	44
Q.22 My overall job satisfaction is higher when the university effectively addresses conflicts involving academic staff.	166	54	0	0	0	220	69.41	44
Q.23: When conflicts are poorly resolved, my job satisfaction decreases significantly	142	77	1	0	0	220	59.31	44
Q.24 Effective conflict resolution makes me feel more positive about my work environment.	182	38	0	0	0	220	77.18	44
Q.25 I feel that my overall job satisfaction would improve if conflicts were handled better at my university	151	69	0	0	0	220	63.80	44
Q.26: There is a clear connection between effective conflict resolution and my overall satisfaction with my job	144	75	0	1	0	220	57.85	44
Q.27: I am more likely to feel satisfied with my job when conflicts are managed effectively	139	81	0	0	0	220	56.54	44
Q.28: My job satisfaction is negatively impacted when conflicts are resolved effectively	5	5	0	190	20	220	76.42	44
Q.29: When conflicts are resolved effectively, it enhances my overall satisfaction with the university.	189	25	3	3	0	220	74.34	44
Q.30 Effective conflict resolution practices are crucial for maintaining high job satisfaction.	163	56	1	0	0	220	66.88	44

Source: Field Data Result, 2024

The analysis of the Effective Job Satisfaction (EJS) data reveals the following:

1. Variability in Responses: The standard deviations (SDs) range from 56.54 to 77.18, indicating moderate to high variability in responses. Some questions, such as Question 24 (SD = 77.18), Question 28 (SD = 76.42), and Question 29 (SD = 74.34), show significant variability, suggesting differing opinions among respondents. On the other hand, questions like Question 27 (SD = 56.54) and Question 26 (SD = 57.85) have less variability, showing more agreement among respondents.
2. Consistent Mean Scores: The mean (M) score for all questions is consistently 44, indicating a uniform central tendency in job satisfaction among academic staff despite variations in specific responses.
3. Key Insights: Areas with higher standard deviations may indicate topics where

respondents have more diverse views, pointing to potential areas for improvement in job satisfaction. Questions with lower variability show aspects where there are more consensus among staff.

Summary: While the overall satisfaction level remains steady ($M = 44$), there is noticeable variability in responses to certain questions, reflecting different experiences and perceptions among academic staff regarding their job satisfaction. This suggests a need for targeted focus on areas with higher response variability.

Effective Job Satisfaction: Combined Model

Table 10: Model Summary^b

Model	R	RSquare	Adjusted Rsquare	Std Error of the Estimate	RSquare Change	Change Statistics				Durbin - Watson
						F Change	df1	df2	Sig. Change	
1	0.094 ^a	0.009	0.000	0.15765	0.009	0.967	2	217	0.382	1.759

Source: SPSS Data Output 25.0 Version

a. Predictors: (Constant), SIR, ERM

b. Dependent Variable: EJS

$R = 0.094$ shows a weak positive correlation between the predictors (ERM and SIR) and EJS.

$R^2 = 0.009$, meaning that only 0.9% of the variation in EJS is explained by both ERM and SIR combined, showing very weak explanatory power. Adjusted $R^2 = 0.000$ suggests the model does not improve when adjusted for the number of predictors. Standard Error of Estimate = 0.15765 is almost the same as in the individual models, indicating high variability in the observed values.

F Change = 0.967, p-value = 0.382 shows that the model is not significant overall, and neither ERM nor SIR is a significant predictor.

Table 11 Anova^a

Model		Sum Squares	Df	Mean	F	Sig.
1	Regression	0.048	2	0.024	0.967	0.382
	Residual	5.393	217	0.025		
	Total	5.441	219			

Source: SPSS 25.0 Data Output

a. Dependent Variable: EJS

b. Predictors: (Constant), SIR, ERM

F-statistic = 0.967 with a p-value = 0.382 confirms the overall non-significance of the model. Sum of Squares (Regression) = 0.048 and Residual = 5.393 suggest that the regression model does little to

explain the variance in EJS. Mean Square (Regression) = 0.024 and Residual = 0.025 again highlight the model's weak predictive power.

Table 12: Coefficients^a

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficient Beta	T	Sig.
	B	Standard Error			
(Constant)	4.095	0.478		8.561	0.000
ERM	0.072	0.052	0.095	1.371	0.172
SIR	0.004	0.077	0.004	0.052	0.958

Source: SPSS Data Output 25.0 Version

a. Dependent variable: EJS

Constant (B) = 4.095 shows the base level of job satisfaction when neither ERM nor SIR is considered.

ERM (B) = 0.072, indicating a positive but non-significant effect of ERM on EJS ($p = 0.172$).

SIR (B) = 0.004, indicating an almost neutral and non-significant effect of SIR on EJS ($p = 0.958$).

Beta = 0.095 for ERM and 0.004 for SIR (Standardized Coefficients), showing very little contribution from either predictor.

t-statistic = 1.371 for ERM ($p = 0.172$) and 0.052 for SIR ($p = 0.958$) confirm that both relationships are statistically insignificant.

Conclusion for Combined Model

Neither ERM nor SIR significantly predicts Effective Job Satisfaction in the combined model. Both variables show weak and statistically non-significant effects, and the overall model explains very little variance in job satisfaction. This suggests that factors outside of resolution mechanisms and satisfaction influenced by resolution are more critical in determining job satisfaction.

Discussion of Findings

Across all three models (ERM, SIR, and Combined of ERM and SIR), the results indicate that neither ERM nor SIR is a significant predictor of Effective Job Satisfaction. The weak correlations, low explanatory power, and lack of statistical significance across all tests suggest that other factors, potentially beyond the scope of this study, play a more substantial role in shaping job satisfaction among the academic staff surveyed.

This calls for further research to investigate additional variables that might better explain job satisfaction, such as working conditions, compensation, or management practices.

The results of the analyses suggest that Effective

Resolution Mechanism (ERM) and Satisfaction Influenced by Resolution (SIR) are not significant factors in promoting Effective Job Satisfaction (EJS) among the academic staff, including members of the Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU) in Nigeria.

The weak correlations, low R-squared values, and statistically non-significant results indicate that improvements in resolution mechanisms and the perceived satisfaction from those resolutions do not strongly influence overall job satisfaction among ASUU members. This could imply that the efforts to resolve disputes or disagreements, such as negotiations between ASUU and the federal government, may not be addressing the core issues that impact job satisfaction.

These findings may help explain why there is a consistent cycle of disagreements and conflicts between ASUU and the Nigerian government. If resolution mechanisms are not effective or fail to address the underlying factors contributing to dissatisfaction—such as working conditions, inadequate funding, poor infrastructure, or compensation—then even when conflicts are resolved, they may not lead to lasting improvements in job satisfaction or relations between the union and the government. This could contribute to the recurring nature of strikes and disputes.

Thus, the results suggest the need for deeper and more structural changes beyond simple dispute resolution efforts to address the root causes of dissatisfaction within the university system in Nigeria.

Conclusion

Based on the results of the analyses of Effective Resolution Mechanism (ERM), Satisfaction Influenced by Resolution (SIR) and Effective Job Satisfaction (EJS) among academic staff in Nigerian universities, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Low influence of ERM and SIR on EJS: The results indicate that both ERM and SIR do not significantly predict job satisfaction among the academic staff. The R-squared values are low, meaning that ERM and SIR explain very little of the variation in effective job satisfaction. This suggests that even if resolution mechanisms are in place and academic staff is somewhat satisfied with the
2. outcomes of resolutions, these factors alone do not lead to a high level of job satisfaction.
2. Non-Significant Impact of ERM and SIR: The regression analyses for both ERM and SIR show non-significant p-values ($p > 0.05$), meaning there is no strong evidence that these factors contribute to job satisfaction in a meaningful way. This lack of significant impact might explain the persistent disputes between the Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU) and the Nigerian federal government, as the mechanisms intended to resolve conflicts appear insufficient to address the root causes of dissatisfaction.
3. Consistent Disagreements between ASUU and the Government: The inability of ERM and SIR to influence job satisfaction may point to deeper systemic issues within the educational sector. This persistent dissatisfaction is likely contributing to the frequent strikes and ongoing disagreements between ASUU and the federal government. Resolving conflicts without addressing the fundamental issues, such as inadequate funding, lack of infrastructure, and poor working conditions, is not leading to long-term satisfaction among academic staff.

Recommendations

1. Review and Strengthen Resolution Mechanisms: The existing resolution mechanisms should be reviewed and improved to address not only surface-level issues but also the underlying causes of dissatisfaction. There should be a focus on long-term solutions, including the improvement of working conditions, better funding for universities, and more transparent and equitable negotiation processes.
2. Address Core Issues of Job Satisfaction: Beyond the resolution of conflicts, the government and university administrations should work together with ASUU to address the fundamental aspects of job satisfaction. This includes addressing salary structures, providing adequate funding for research and teaching, improving facilities, and ensuring better work-life balance for

- academic staff.
3. Collaborative Dialogue: There should be a more collaborative and inclusive dialogue between ASUU, the government, and other stakeholders. Both parties need to understand that effective resolution is not just about settling disputes but about creating an environment where academic staff feels valued and satisfied with their roles.
 4. Regular Monitoring and Feedback: Universities and government institutions should establish regular feedback mechanisms to monitor the satisfaction levels of academic staff. These feedback systems will help to identify dissatisfaction early and prevent prolonged disputes.
 5. Training and Capacity Building: Continuous training in negotiation and conflict resolution for both government representatives and ASUU leaders can help ensure that the processes for resolving disputes are more effective and can lead to better outcomes.
 6. Policy Reform: The government may need to reform existing policies that relate to higher education, with a focus on providing better funding, improving infrastructure, and ensuring that universities have the autonomy needed to address internal issues without recurring to prolonged strikes and disputes.

References

- Abdulraheem, I. & Ezekiel, A.O. (2022). Traditional methods of conflict management and resolutions: The case of the old Oyo Empire. *European Journal of Management and Marketing Studies*, 7(4), 126-139. <http://dx.doi.org/10.46827/ejmm.v7i4.1303>
- Adams, J. (2020). Conflict management strategies in the workplace. *Workplace Journal*, 34(2), 123-138.
- Adams, J., Brown, M., & Clark, S. (2021). Strategies for conflict resolution: Enhancing productivity and promotion prospects. *Human Resources Review*, 45(3), 567-589.
- Adejuwon, K.D & Okewale, R.A (2009), "Ethnic Militancy, Insurrections and Democracy in Africa: The Case of Nigeria", *Journal of Social and Policy Issues*, Vol. 6, No. 4
- Adeyemi J., & Ademilua, W. (2012). Conflict management strategies and administrative effectiveness in public universities in Nigeria. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Education Research Policy Studies*, 3, 368-375. <https://hdl.handle.net/10520/EJC140929>
- Adeyemi, T.O., Ekundayo, H.T. & Alonge, H.O., 2010, 'Managing students' crisis in Tertiary Institutions in Nigeria: The way forward', *Journal of Research in National Development* 8(1), 20-38
- Aja S. N. (2014). Conflict management approaches that principals adopt for effective administration in Ebonyi State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Science and Research*, 92, 2319-2321.
- Akaranta, O. (2014). Building and maintaining higher education ecosystem in the 21st century. Paper presented at a workshop organized by the Centre for Higher Education Studies, University of Port Harcourt, Port Harcourt.
- Akhtar, N., & Hassan, S.S. (2021). Conflict management styles as predictors of organizational commitment in university teachers. *Journal of Behavioural Sciences*, 31(1), 99-123.
- Amusan, A. C. (1996). Distinguishing the effects of functional and dysfunctional conflict on strategic decision making: Resolving a paradox for top management teams. *Academy of Management Journal*. 39(1), 123- 148.
- Asiyai, R.I. (2005). Trade union disputes and their perceived impacts on Nigerian university system. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Delta State University Abraka
- Asiyai, R.I. (2008). The Roles of International Agencies, Community Based Organizations and Non-Governmental Organizations in the Management of Universal Basic Education for Sustainable Development in Delta State, Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Educational Administration and Planning* 8 (1), 187-195.
- Asiyai, R. I. (2012). The contributions of

- community participation in the management of the universal basic education: A survey. *African Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(3), 186-198.
- Asiyai, R. I. (2014). Challenges of quality higher education in Nigeria in the 21st century. *International Journal of Educational Planning and Administration*,
- Asogwa, J.O (2015) Labour Unions and Conflict Management in Nigeria: A Case Study of Academic Staff Union of Nigerian universities (ASUU), *World Journal Management and Behavioural Studies* 3 (1) 30-35, 2015 ISSN2306-840X
- Baird, J. R. (2006). {Online} Quality: what should make higher education "higher"? *Higher Education Research and Development*, 7 (2) . 1 4 1 - 1 5 2 . <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0729436880070205>
- Bercovitch, Jacob (1990) "Social Conflict and third parties." Boulder, Co: "Wesview Press. 1990, P-6.
- Bourne, L. (2009), *Stakeholder relationship Management: A maturity model for organizational implementation*, Farnham, U.K: Gower Publishing
- Brown, M., & Green, J. (2018). Harnessing conflict for positive organizational outcomes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39(6), 743-759.
- Chiekezie, O., Dibua, E. and Chima, A. (2016). Conflict Management and Performance of Selected Tertiary Institutions in Enugu State, Nigeria. *Internal Journal of Advanced Research*, 4 (11), 1153-1161.
- Coser, Lewis (1957) A "Social Conflict and the theory of Social Change, *British Journal of Sociology*, 1957, PP.197-207.
- Dialoke, I., & Edeh, F.O. (2017). Conflict resolution strategies and workers' commitment in selected oil companies in Rivers State. *International Journal of Business Ethics in Developing Economies*, 6 (2) , 9 - 1 7 . <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3480587>
- Doe, J., & White, S. (2021). A comprehensive overview of conflict management strategies in organizations. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 29(4), 315-335.
- Donaldo, T. & Preston, L. (1995). The stakeholder theory of Modern Corporation: concepts, evidence and implications. *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 65-79.
- Dougherty, D. (1992). *Crisis communications*. New York: Walker and Company.
- Duze, C.O.(2012) "Managing role conflict among university administrators in Nigeria" *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies*, 3(2), 162-169, 2012.
- Edinyang, S. D. & Ubi, I. E. (2013) Effect of Strike Action on Human Development among Social studies Secondary School Students in Uyo Local Government Area of Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria, *Global Journal of Human Resource Management*, 1 (2), 8, 46-52.
- Ehichoya, E. and Ogunode, N.J. (2020), "Teaching programme in Nigerian higher institutions: Challenges of implementation and the way forward", *American Journal of Social and Humanitarian Research*, Vol. 1 No. 5, pp. 82-100
- Ehigiamusoe, U. K. (2012). Private sector participation in secondary education: implication for national development. *International Journal of Development Studies* 1(3), 1062-1074. Retrieved form [www.http://isdsnet.com/ijds](http://isdsnet.com/ijds)
- Ejiogua, A. M. (1990). *Educational management: A system approach*. Lagos: Lantern books. Federal Republic of Nigeria (1981). *National policy on education* Lagos: NERDC
- Freeman, E. & Reed, D. (1983). Stockholders and stakeholder: A new perspective on corporate governance. . *California Management Review*, 3 (25), 88-106.
- Freeman, R.E. (1984). *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*, Boston: Pitman.
- Fry, H. (2007). {Online} Quality judgments and quality improvement. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 49(1), 59-77. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1468-2273.1995.tb01665.x>
- Johnson, M., Smith, P., & Brown, L. (2019). The influence of conflict on organizational performance: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, 101, 448-458.
- Jones, K. (2019). Creating a conflict-positive workplace: Best practices for organizational leaders. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 31(4), 267-281.
- Jones, G. R. (2018). *Organizational theory, design, and change* (7th ed.). Pearson

- J. O. Fatile, K. D. Adejuwon, "Conflict and conflict management in tertiary institutions: The case of Nigerian Universities" *European Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences* 7(1), 2011.
- Justin L., Silvia M., & Pirozzi, M. (2024) Managing stakeholder engagement: A critical success factor: *PM world Journal*, Vol. XIII, Issue 1, January, 2024. Available online at: <https://pmworldlibrary.net/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/pmwj137-Jan2024-Pirozzi-Mari-Managing-Stakeholder-Engagement-a-critical-success-factor.pdf>
- Kazimoto, P. (2013). Analysis of conflict management and leadership for organizational change. *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences*, 3(1), 16-25
- Kufi, E. F. (2013). The role of different stakeholders in Ethiopia in the improvement of educational quality. *Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 2(1), 11-24.
- Mayowa, S.O. (2015). Industrial conflict and its management in selected Nigerian manufacturing companies. *International Journal of Organizational Leadership*, 4, 430 - 439. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3330488>
- Mba, O. A. (2013). Conflict management and employees performance in Julius Berger Nigeria PLC, Bonny Island. *International Journal of Academic Research in Management*, 3(4) 125 - 139. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2371540>
- Mullins, L. J. (1990). *Management and organizational behaviour* (2nd ed.) London: Pitman.
- Mustaffa, W.S.W., Hamid, M.H.A., Bing, K.W., & Rahman, R.A. (2016). Investigating the relationship among service quality, emotional satisfaction and favourable behavioural intentions in higher education service experience. *Procedia - Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 224, 499 - 507. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.05.426>
- Muzamil H.H. (2024) Impact of Conflict Management on Employee Productivity and Promotion: A Comprehensive Study *PJER*, Vol 7, Issue 2 (2024)
- Narullia, D, Maha, D., Putri, F.Purnamasari, and Mohd, Rizal Palil (2023) Capturing Stakeholder Needs: A Case Study About Satisfaction Survey Follow-up in the University, https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6463-026-8_26
- Nordvall, R. C. & Braxton, J. M. (1996). An alternative definition of quality undergraduate college education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 67(5), 483-497. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2943865>
- Oboegbulem A.I & E.I Ezepue (2016) Management Strategies For Conflict Resolution In Universities, *International Journal of Educational Science and Research (IJESR)* ISSN(P): 2249-6947; ISSN(E): 2249-8052 Vol. 6, Issue 1, Feb 2016, 21-32
- Ogundipe, S. (2022), "Academy of medicine specialities seeks university autonomy in Nigeria", available at: <https://www.vanguardngr.com/2022/04/academy-of-medicine-specialties-seeks-university-autonomy-in-nigeria-2/> (accessed 31 August 2022).
- Ogunode, N.J., Abubakar, L. and Ajape, T.S. (2021), "Evaluation of causes of inadequate funds in Nigerian public Universities", *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*, Vol. 9, pp. 92-104.
- Ogunode, N., J. and Abubakar, M. (2022), "Political influence in the administration of public university Nigeria: effects and way forward", *International Journal Of Social Science Humanity and Management Research*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 35-43.
- Ogunode, N.J., Jegede, D. and Musa, A. (2021), "Problems facing academic staff of Nigerian universities and the way forward", *International Journal on Integrated Education*, Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 230-239.
- Omene, G.R. (2021). Conflict management strategies as a prerequisite for effective organizational performance: An exploratory analysis. *International Journal of Business & Law Research*, 9(4), 187-199.
- Osabiya, B.J. (2015). Conflict management and resolution in Nigeria public sector. *Review of Public Administration and Management*, 4(8), 107-120.

- Olukayode, L. (2015). Impact of workplace conflict management on organizational performance: A case of Nigerian manufacturing firm. *Journal of Management and Strategy*, 6(2) 83 – 92.
- Olusegun, E. A, Owolabi, L. K and Olayombo, E.A (2023) *Trajectory of brain drain and quality of work-life amongst Nigeria University lecturers: academic staff union of universities (ASUU) incessant strike in retrospect* International Trade, Politics and Development, Emerald Publishing Limited, 2023
- Peter, Wallensteen (2002), *Understanding Conflict Resolution, War, Peace and the Global System*, Sage Publications, Landon, 2002, p. 8
- Özyildirim, G., & Kayıkçı, K. (2017). The conflict management strategies of school administrators while conflicting with their supervisors. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 3(8), 1-20. <http://dx.doi.org/10.46827/ejes.v0i0.834>
- Ray, S. J. (1999). *Strategic communication in crisis management lessons from the airline industry*. Westport, CT: Quorum.
- Robbins S.P. (1998). *Organizational Behaviour: concepts controversies application* eight edition, prentice Hall.
- Smith, P., & Brown, L. (2020). Conflict in organizations: Causes, effects, and solutions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 41(2), 215-232
- Smith, P. (2022). Career advancement and conflict resolution: Understanding the link. *Journal of Career Development*, 49(2), 234-257.
- Tschannen-M., (2001). The effects of a state-wide conflict management initiative in organization in American Secondary Education, 29, pp. 3.
- Uchendu, C., Anijaobi, F., & Odigwe, F. (2013). Conflict management and organizational performance in secondary schools in cross Rivers State. *Nigeria Research Journal in Organizational Psychology and Educational Studies*, 2(2), 67-71.
- Udoh, U.S. and Atanda, A.I. (2022), “Staff-students ratio and education quality of the undergraduate programme in the University of Ibadan”, *African Journal of Educational Research and Development (AJERD)*, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 40 - 62 , available at : <http://ajerduniport.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/4.pdf>
- Ukwoma, S.C. and Onyebinama, C.O. (2021), “Challenges and opportunities of facilitating access and use of open access resources to users by librarians in federal and state universities in Nigeria”, *Library Management*, Vol. 42 Nos 8/9, pp. 481-497, doi: 10.1108/LM-03-2020-0039.
- UNICEF (2000). “Education”. A paper presented by UNICEF International Working Group on Education Florence: Italy.
- Wahab, A. (2022), “Nigerian universities suffer from poor funding”, available at : <https://www.vanguardngr.com/2022/07/nigerian-universities-suffer-from-poor-funding/>(accessed 4 September 2022).
- Wainaina, R.N., Magoma, C., & Mange, D. (2020). Influence of principals' conflict management strategies on conflict resolutions in secondary schools in Murang'a county, Kenya *European Journal of Education Studies*, 7(4), 99-112. <http://dx.doi.org/10.46827/ejes.v0i0.3040>
- Yusuf-Habeeb, M. O., & Kazeem, A. O. (2017). Appraisal of conflict management as a tool for achieving industrial harmony. *Nile Journal of Business and Economics*, 3(7), 28-51.