
Conflict Handling Intensions among Teacher Trainees

Tajuddin Shaik & Dr. M. Esther Suneela,

¹Research Scholar, Department of Education, Acharya Nagarjuna University,

² Principal, A. L. College of Education, Chair Person, BOS in Education, Acharya Nagarjuna University,

Email:tajuddin1405.shaik@gmail.com.

Abstract:

The present study was intended to investigate the impact of gender, nature of course and locality of residence on conflict handling intensions of teacher trainees in Krishna district. A sample of 600 teacher trainees studying in different colleges of education was collected randomly. Conflict handling intensions of the teacher trainees were appraised Conflict style Questionnaire adopted from Johnson & Johnson. The obtained data were quantitatively analyzed by descriptive statistics such as Mean, S.D and inferential statistics such as ANOVA where ever necessary to test the hypotheses. The study revealed that there is significant impact of gender, nature of course and locality of residence on conflict handling intensions. Women, arts and rural teacher trainees are found to use Withdrawing, Smoothing and Compromising Conflict handling intensions more often when compare to men, science and urban teacher trainees. Men, science and urban teacher trainees use Forcing and Confronting Conflict handling intensions more frequently than women, arts and rural teacher trainees.

Key words: *Conflict handling intensions, Withdrawing, Smoothing, Compromising,*

Forcing,

Confronting and

Teacher trainees.

Introduction:

In our day to day life, Conflict has become a part and parcel of our lives. Conflicts in our life do not come to an end, because new ones keep on arising and also there is no end to problems in human life. In general, conflict is a state of mind in which two or more incompatible behavior trends are raised that cannot be satisfied simultaneously. Conflict affects our activities and decisions in one way or another. Conflict plays an essential role in the development of non-adjustive and maladjustive reactions. There are individual differences with respect to conflicts. The impact of conflict also differs from one individual to another. However, when conflict begins to pull back productivity and gives way to more conflicts, then conflict handling would be needed to overcome conflicting situations. Successful handling of the conflicts lead to better adjustment, may it be personally or professionally, contrary to this maladjustment results.

Objectives:

1. To study the Conflict handling intensions of teacher trainees.

2. To study the impact of gender, nature of course and locality of residence on Conflict handling intensions of teacher trainees.

Hypotheses:

Hypothesis-1: There would be no significant difference between men and women teacher trainees in their Conflict handling intensions.

Hypothesis-1A: There would be no significant difference between men and women teacher trainees in their Withdrawing Conflict handling intensions.

Hypothesis-1B: There would be no significant difference between men and women teacher trainees in their Forcing Conflict handling intensions.

Hypothesis-1C: There would be no significant difference between men and women teacher trainees in their Smoothing Conflict handling intensions.

Hypothesis-1D: There would be no significant difference between men and women teacher trainees in their Compromising Conflict handling intensions.

Hypothesis-1E: There would be no significant difference between men and women teacher trainees in their Confronting Conflict handling intensions.

Hypothesis-2: There would be no significant difference between arts and science teacher trainees in their Conflict handling intensions.

Hypothesis-2A: There would be no significant difference between arts and science teacher trainees in their Withdrawing Conflict handling intensions.

Hypothesis-2B: There would be no significant difference between arts and science teacher trainees in their Forcing Conflict handling intensions.

Hypothesis-2C: There would be no significant difference between arts and science teacher trainees in their Smoothing Conflict handling intensions.

Hypothesis-2D: There would be no significant difference between arts and science teacher trainees in their Compromising Conflict handling intensions.

Hypothesis-2E: There would be no significant difference between arts and science teacher trainees in their Confronting Conflict handling intensions.

Hypothesis-3: There would be no significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in their Conflict handling intensions.

Hypothesis-3A: There would be no significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in their Withdrawing Conflict handling intensions.

Hypothesis-3B: There would be no significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in their Forcing Conflict handling intensions.

Hypothesis-3C: There would be no significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in their Smoothing Conflict handling intensions.

Hypothesis-3D: There would be no significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in their Compromising Conflict handling intensions.

Hypothesis-3E: There would be no significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in their Confronting Conflict handling intensions.

Hypothesis-4: There would be no significant interaction among gender, nature of course and locality of residence with regard to Conflict handling intensions.

Sample:

The sample consisted of 600 teacher trainees selected from Krishna district of Andhra Pradesh on the basis of stratified random sampling method.

Tool used:

The Conflict handling intensions of the teacher trainees was assessed by using Conflict styles questionnaire developed by Johnson & Johnson (2006). It consists of 35 proverbs with 5 response categories. The reliability of the instrument was established by test re-test method and it is 0.79 and the validity is 0.89.

Statistical techniques used:

The obtained data were quantitatively analyzed by descriptive statistics such as Mean, S.D and inferential statistics such as ANOVA where ever necessary to test the hypotheses and interpret the data.

Results and discussion:

The data obtained from the sample of 600 teacher trainees are subjected to quantitative analysis to test the hypotheses formulated regarding

independent variables in the investigation and the results are presented in the following table-1.

Table-1: Consolidated table of F-values for five Conflict handling intensions.

Source of variation	Withdrawing	Forcing	Smoothing	Compromising	Confronting
Gender	770.38**	770.43**	838.34**	743.09**	593.38**
Nature of course	327.86**	335.78**	372.20**	319.82**	300.32**
Locality of residence	37.46**	147.71**	137.29**	31.64**	149.53**
Gender * Nature of course	2.27@	22.90**	6.25*	1.05@	5.49*
Gender * Locality of residence	23.27**	0.09@	52.43**	25.73**	0.57@
Nature of course * Locality of residence	23.27**	1.91@	42.14**	22.44**	0.10@
Gender * Nature of course * Locality of residence	141.64**	46.93**	101.94**	140.26**	37.53**

Note: * Significant at 0.05 level, ** Significant at 0.01 level, @ Not Significant.

DISCUSSION:

Hypothesis-1 stated that there would be no significant difference between men and women teacher trainees in their conflict handling intensions. The F-values of 770.38, 770.43, 838.34, 743.09, and 593.38 for the variable gender on Withdrawing, Forcing, Smoothing, Compromising, and Confronting conflict handling intensions respectively are all significant beyond 0.01 level, based on the results obtained the hypothesis-1 is not accepted and it is concluded that there is significant difference between men and women teacher trainees

in their conflict handling intensions. The results are not supported by the earlier findings of Terrel G. Manyak e t. al., (2008) who reveal no statistically significant difference exits in the way men and women with regard to conflict handling intensions.

The Hypothesis-1A stated that there would be no significant difference between men and women teacher trainees in their Withdrawing conflict handling intensions, based on the results obtained the hypothesis-1A is not accepted and it can be stated that there is significant difference between men and women teacher trainees in their

Withdrawing conflict handling intensions. Women teacher trainees are found to use withdrawing more frequently to avoid conflicts. Women teacher trainees give up their goals and relationships, they go way from the issues and the persons they are in conflict with, they believe it is helpless to try and easier to withdraw them to face it to avoid conflicts, they feel helpless compare to Men teacher trainees. As the hypothesis-1A is not accepted as warranted by the results, it is concluded that Women teacher trainees use Withdrawing Conflict handling intensions more frequently when compare to Men teacher trainees.

The Hypothesis-1B predicted that there would be no significant difference between men and women teacher trainees in their Forcing conflict handling intensions, based on the results obtained the hypothesis-1B is not accepted and it can be stated that there is significant difference between men and women teacher trainees in their Forcing conflict handling intensions. Men teacher trainees are found to use Forcing more frequently compare to women teacher trainees. Men teacher trainees give highly importance to their goals rather their relationships, they do not want to be liked and accepted by others, men teacher trainees try to win by attacking, overpowering, overwhelming and daunting compare to women teacher trainees. As the hypothesis-1B is not accepted as warranted by the results, it is concluded that men teacher trainees use Forcing Conflict handling intensions more frequently than women teacher trainees.

The Hypothesis-1C predicted that there would be no significant difference between men and women teacher trainees in their Smoothing conflict handling intensions, based on the results obtained the hypothesis-1C is not accepted and it can be stated that there is significant difference between men and women teacher trainees in their Smoothing conflict handling intensions. Women teacher trainees are found to use Smoothing more frequently compare to men teacher trainees. Women

teacher trainees do not want to hurt others, they like to smooth things over compare to men teacher trainees. As the hypothesis-1C is not accepted as warranted by the results, it is concluded that Women teacher trainees use Smoothing Conflict handling intensions more frequently than Men teacher trainees.

The Hypothesis-1D predicted that there would be no significant difference between men and women teacher trainees in their Compromising conflict handling intensions, based on the results obtained the hypothesis-1D is not accepted and it can be stated that there is significant difference between men and women teacher trainees in their Compromising conflict handling intensions. Women teacher trainees are found to use compromising more frequently to avoid conflicts compare to men teacher trainees. They try a conflict solution in which both sides gain something. As the hypothesis-1D is not accepted as warranted by the results, it is concluded that Women teacher trainees use Compromising Conflict handling intensions more often when compare to Men teacher trainees.

The Hypothesis-1E predicted that there would be no significant difference between men and women teacher trainees in their Confronting conflict handling intensions, based on the results obtained the hypothesis-1E is not accepted and it can be stated that there is significant difference between men and women teacher trainees in their Confronting conflict handling intensions. Men teacher trainees are found to use Confronting more frequently compare to women teacher trainees. Men teacher trainees perceive conflict as problem to be solved, they are not satisfy till a solution is found that both achieves their own and others goals. As the hypothesis-1E is not accepted as warranted by the results, it is concluded that men teacher trainees use Confronting Conflict handling intensions more frequently than women teacher trainees.

The Hypothesis-2 predicted that there would be no significant difference between arts and

science teacher trainees in their conflict handling intensions. The F-values of 327.86, 335.78, 372.20, 319.82, and 300.32 for the variable nature of course on Withdrawing, Forcing, Smoothing, Compromising, and Confronting Conflict handling intensions respectively are all significant beyond 0.01 level, based on the results obtained the hypothesis-2 is not accepted and it is concluded that there is significant difference between arts and Science teacher trainees in their conflict handling intensions.

The hypothesis-2A stated that there would be no significant difference between arts and science teacher trainees in their Withdrawing conflict handling intensions, based on the results obtained the hypothesis-2A is not accepted and it can be stated that there is significant difference between arts and science teacher trainees in their Withdrawing conflict handling intensions. As the hypothesis-2A is not accepted as warranted by the results, it is concluded that arts teacher trainees use Withdrawing Conflict handling intensions more often when compare to science teacher trainees.

The hypothesis-2B predicted that there would be no significant difference between arts and science teacher trainees in their Forcing conflict handling intensions, based on the results obtained the hypothesis-2B is not accepted and it can be stated that there is significant difference between arts and science teacher trainees in their Forcing conflict handling intensions. As the hypothesis-2B is not accepted as warranted by the results, it is concluded that science teacher trainees use Forcing Conflict handling intensions more frequently when compare to arts teacher trainees.

The hypothesis-2C stated that there would be no significant difference between arts and science teacher trainees in their Smoothing conflict handling intensions, based on the results obtained the hypothesis-2C is not accepted and it can be stated that there is significant difference between arts and science teacher trainees in their Smoothing

conflict handling intensions. As the hypothesis-2C is not accepted as warranted by the results, it is concluded that arts teacher trainees use Smoothing Conflict handling intensions more frequently than science teacher trainees.

The hypothesis-2D predicted that there would be no significant difference between arts and science teacher trainees in their Compromising conflict handling intensions, based on the results obtained the hypothesis-2D is not accepted and it can be stated that there is significant difference between arts and science teacher trainees in their Compromising conflict handling intensions. As the hypothesis-2D is not accepted as warranted by the results, it is concluded that arts teacher trainees use Compromising Conflict handling intensions more often when compare to Science teacher trainees.

The hypothesis-2E stated that there would be no significant difference between arts and science teacher trainees in their Confronting conflict handling intensions, based on the results obtained the hypothesis-2E is not accepted and it can be stated that there is significant difference between arts and science teacher trainees in their Confronting conflict handling intensions. As the hypothesis-2E is not accepted as warranted by the results, it is concluded that science teacher trainees use confronting Conflict handling intensions more frequently than arts teacher trainees.

The hypothesis-3 stated that there would be no significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in their conflict handling intensions. The F-values of 37.46, 147.71, 137.29, 31.64, and 149.53 for the variable locality of residence on Withdrawing, Forcing, Smoothing, Compromising, and Confronting Conflict handling intensions respectively are all significant beyond 0.01 level, based on the results obtained the hypothesis-3 is not accepted and it is concluded that there is significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in their conflict handling intensions.

The hypothesis-3A predicted that there would be no significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in their Withdrawing conflict handling intensions, based on the results obtained the hypothesis-3A is not accepted and it can be stated that there is significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in their Withdrawing conflict handling intensions. Rural teacher trainees are found to use withdrawing more frequently to avoid conflicts compare to urban teacher trainees. As the hypothesis-3A is not accepted as warranted by the results, it is concluded that rural teacher trainees use Withdrawing Conflict handling intensions more frequently than those of urban teacher trainees.

The hypothesis-3B predicted that there would be no significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in their Forcing conflict handling intensions, based on the results obtained the hypothesis-3B is not accepted and it can be stated that there is significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in their Forcing conflict handling intensions. Urban teacher trainees are found to use Forcing more frequently compare to rural teacher trainees. As the hypothesis-3B is not accepted as warranted by the results, it is concluded that urban teacher trainees use Forcing Conflict handling intensions more frequently than rural teacher trainees.

The hypothesis-3C predicted that there would be no significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in their Smoothing conflict handling intensions, based on the results obtained the hypothesis-3C is not accepted and it can be stated that there is significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in their Smoothing conflict handling intensions. Rural teacher trainees are found to use smoothing more frequently compare to urban teacher trainees. As the hypothesis-3C is not accepted as warranted by the results, it is concluded that rural teacher trainees use

Smoothing Conflict handling intensions more frequently than urban teacher trainees.

The hypothesis-3D predicted that there would be no significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in their Compromising conflict handling intensions, based on the results obtained the hypothesis-3D is not accepted and it can be stated that there is significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in their Compromising conflict handling intensions. Rural teacher trainees are found to use Compromising more frequently compare to urban teacher trainees. As the hypothesis-3D is not accepted as warranted by the results, it is concluded that rural teacher trainees use Compromising Conflict handling intensions more frequently compare to urban teacher trainees.

The hypothesis-3E predicted that there would be no significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in their Confronting conflict handling intensions, based on the results obtained the hypothesis-3E is not accepted and it can be stated that there is significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in their Confronting conflict handling intensions. Urban teacher trainees are found to use Confronting more frequently compare to rural teacher trainees. As the hypothesis-3E is not accepted as warranted by the results, it is concluded that urban teacher trainees use Confronting Conflict handling intensions more frequently than those of rural teacher trainees.

The hypothesis-4 stated that there would be no significant interaction among gender, nature of course and locality of residence with regard to conflict handling intensions. The F-values of 22.90, 6.25, and 5.49 for the first order interaction between gender and nature of course with regard to Forcing, Smoothing and Confronting Conflict handling intensions respectively are significant, it can be stated that there is significant interaction effect between gender and nature of course with regard to Forcing, Smoothing and Confronting Conflict

handling intensions, the F-values of 23.27, 52.43, and 25.73 for the interaction between gender and locality of residence with regard to Withdrawing, Smoothing, and Compromising Conflict handling intensions respectively are significant beyond 0.01 level, it is concluded that there is significant interaction between gender and locality of residence with regard to Withdrawing, Smoothing, and Compromising Conflict handling intensions, the F-values of 23.27, 42.14, and 22.44 for the interaction between nature of course and locality of residence with regard to Withdrawing, Smoothing, and Compromising Conflict handling intensions respectively are significant beyond 0.01 level, it is concluded that there is significant interaction between nature of course and locality of residence with regard to Withdrawing, Smoothing, and Compromising Conflict handling intensions, the F-values of 141.64, 46.93, 101.94, 140.26, and 37.53 for the second order interaction among gender, nature of course and locality of residence with regard to Withdrawing, Forcing, Smoothing, Compromising, and Confronting respectively are all significant beyond 0.01 level, it may be concluded that there is significant interaction effect among gender, nature of course and locality of residence with regard to Withdrawing, Forcing, Smoothing, Compromising, and Confronting Conflict handling intensions, where as the F-values of 2.27 and 1.05 for the first order interaction between gender and nature of course with regard to Withdrawing and Compromising Conflict handling intensions is not significant, it can be stated that there is no significant interaction effect between gender and nature of course with regard to Withdrawing and Compromising Conflict handling intensions, the F-values of 0.09 and 0.57 for the interaction between gender and locality of residence with regard to Forcing and Confronting Conflict handling is not significant, it is concluded that there is no significant interaction between gender and locality of residence with regard to Forcing and Confronting

Conflict handling intensions, the F-values of 1.91 and 0.10 for the interaction between nature of course and locality of residence with regard to Forcing and Confronting Conflict handling intensions are not significant, it is concluded that there is no significant interaction between nature of course and locality of residence with regard to Forcing and Confronting Conflict handling intensions. Therefore, based on the results obtained the hypothesis-4 is partially accepted.

Conclusions:

1. There is significant difference between men and women teacher trainees in their Withdrawing, Forcing, Smoothing, Compromising, and Confronting Conflict handling intensions.
 - 1A. Women teacher trainees use Withdrawing Conflict handling intensions more frequently when compare to Men teacher trainees.
 - 1B. Men teacher trainees use Forcing Conflict handling intensions more frequently than women teacher trainees.
 - 1C. Women teacher trainees use Smoothing Conflict handling intensions more frequently than men teacher trainees.
 - 1D. Women teacher trainees use Compromising Conflict handling intensions more often when compare to men teacher trainees.
 - 1E. Men teacher trainees use Confronting Conflict handling intensions more frequently than women teacher trainees.
2. There is significant difference between arts and Science teacher trainees in their Withdrawing, Forcing, Smoothing, Compromising, and Confronting Conflict handling intensions.
 - 2A. Arts teacher trainees use Withdrawing Conflict handling intensions more often when compare to science teacher trainees.

2B. Science teacher trainees are use Forcing Conflict handling intensions more frequently when compare to arts teacher trainees.

2C. Arts teacher trainees use Smoothing Conflict handling intensions more frequently than science teacher trainees.

2D. Arts teacher trainees use Compromising Conflict handling intensions more often when compare to Science teacher trainees.

2E. Science teacher trainees use Confronting Conflict handling intensions more frequently than arts teacher trainees.

3. There is significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in their Withdrawing, Forcing, Smoothing, Compromising, and Confronting Conflict handling intensions.

3A. Rural teacher trainees use Withdrawing Conflict handling intensions more frequently than those of urban teacher trainees.

3B. Urban teacher trainees use Forcing Conflict handling intensions more frequently than rural teacher trainees.

3C. Rural teacher trainees use Smoothing Conflict handling intensions more frequently than urban teacher trainees.

3D. Rural teacher trainees use Compromising Conflict handling intensions more frequently compare to urban teacher trainees.

3E. Urban teacher trainees use Confronting Conflict handling intensions more frequently than those of rural teacher trainees.

4. There is significant interaction effect between gender and nature of course with regard to Forcing, Smoothing and Confronting Conflict handling intensions, there is significant interaction between gender and locality of residence with regard to Withdrawing, Smoothing, and Compromising Conflict handling intensions, there is significant interaction between nature of course and locality of residence with regard to Withdrawing, Smoothing, and Compromising

Conflict handling intensions, there is significant second order interaction effect among gender, nature of course and locality of residence with regard to Withdrawing, Forcing, Smoothing, Compromising, and Confronting Conflict handling intensions, where as there is no significant interaction effect between gender and nature of course with regard to Withdrawing and Compromising Conflict handling intensions, there is no significant interaction between gender and locality of residence with regard to Forcing and Confronting Conflict handling intensions, there is no significant interaction between nature of course and locality of residence with regard to Forcing and Confronting Conflict handling intensions.

Implications:

1. Since it is found that Confronting is the dominant conflict handling intension, teacher trainees irrespective of their gender, nature of course and locality of residence may be encourage to use Confronting Conflict handling intensions in their attempt to resolve their conflict, work productively and fruitfully.

2. Women teacher trainees are found to use withdrawing, Smoothing and Compromising Conflict handling intensions and men use Forcing and Confronting Conflict handling intensions. It is suggested that women teacher trainees may encourage to use withdrawing, Smoothing and Compromising Conflict handling intensions and men teacher trainees may encourage to use Forcing and Confronting Conflict handling intensions in their attempts to resolve conflicts and confection effectively.

3. Arts teacher trainees are found to use withdrawing, Smoothing and Compromising Conflict handling intensions and science teacher trainees use Forcing and Confronting Conflict handling intensions. It is suggested that arts teacher trainees may encourage to use withdrawing, Smoothing and Compromising Conflict handling

intensions and science teacher trainees may encourage to use Forcing and Confronting Conflict handling intensions in their attempt to resolve conflicts.

4. Rural teacher trainees are found to use withdrawing, Smoothing and Compromising Conflict handling intensions and urban teacher trainees use Forcing and Confronting Conflict handling intensions. It is suggested that rural teacher trainees may encourage to use withdrawing, Smoothing and Compromising Conflict handling intensions and urban teacher trainees may encourage to use Forcing and Confronting Conflict handling intensions in their attempts to resolve conflicts and confection effectively.

5. Managements may be advised to appoint counselors in educational institutions to assess the Conflict handling intensions of teacher trainees. Counselors may help the teacher trainees in selecting or choosing the appropriate Conflict handling intensions to resolve their conflicts amicable.

6. Managements are advised to conduct programs for the students so as to enhance their Conflict handling intensions which in turn contribute to the excellence in their lives.

References:

1. Best, J.W and J.V. Kalin, (1992). Research in Education. New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Ltd.
2. Bhatia, H.R. (1995). A text Book of educational Psychology. New Delhi: Mc Millan India Ltd.
3. Chouhan, S.S. (1978). Advanced Educational Psychology. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.
4. Jorg Denzinger (2006). "Conflict Handling in Collaborating Search", Conflict aging Vol. 5(2) pp251-281.
5. Kothari, C.R. (1985). Research Methodology. New Delhi: New Age International (P) Ltd.
6. Koul, L. (1984). Methodology of Educational Research. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.
7. Mangal, S.K. (1993). Advanced Educational Psychology. New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Ltd.
8. M. Andrey Karsgaard et.al. (2010). A multilevel view of Intra group Conflict, Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory.