7-27-2019

INFLUENCE OF LEADERSHIP STYLE ON CONFLICT MANAGEMENT IN PRIVATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES IN SOUTH WEST AND SOUTH-SOUTH, NIGERIA

Susan Udoaku Ogbuiyi
Babcock University, Ilishan-Remo, Ogun State, ogbuiyis@babcock.edu.ng

INFLUENCE OF LEADERSHIP STYLE ON CONFLICT MANAGEMENT IN PRIVATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES IN SOUTH WEST AND SOUTH-SOUTH, NIGERIA

Susan Udoaku OGBUIYI (PhD)

Babcock University Library illishan-Remeo, Ogun State Nigeria

ogbuiyi@babcock.edu.ng

Abstract

The study investigated the influence of leadership style on conflict management in private university libraries in South-West and South-South Nigeria. The study employed the descriptive research design. Total enumeration was adopted because of few numbers of librarians in private and structured questionnaire were used to collect data. The instrument was validated using Cronbach's Alpha. Data analysis involved both descriptive and inferential statistics such as percentage distributions, mean and standard deviation as well as regression analysis. The finding revealed that conflict management techniques used in the university libraries studied were collaborating and accommodating, followed by sharing. Avoidance and competing techniques were not frequently used by the librarians in the study. Also the study shows that leadership style (β = .312, F=17.410, P < .05) has significant influence on conflict management. The study recommends that the library administration should encourage the workers to do the right; individual interest must not reign supreme over the common goal and also there should be meetings by librarians of different cadre to address the issues affecting harmonious working relationship and service of the library.

Keywords: **Conflict, Conflict Management, Leadership Style, Private University Libraries**

Introduction

Organizations work together and interact with one another as social units. In order to achieve its objectives, organizational structure is formed, where people of different gender, age, educational background, perception, religion, and culture work together in different capacities as managers, subordinates, workers and co-workers in various departments. With these various background or settings, there may be some different perceptions that could lead to a conflict. Conflict is a complex phenomenon that occurs in every organization. As there exist conflicts in other organizations, libraries are not exempted from this phenomenon. Inspite of the fact that librarians are willing to attend to patrons in need of different information, conflict occurs on regular basis. This is why the

study tends to investigate the influence of leadership style on conflict management in private university libraries in South West, Nigeria.

Literature Research

According to Mavalla (2016), conflict is part and parcel of human relationships and occurs in all societies. Groups are dynamic, form change, and sometimes get disbanded. Certainly, there are differences among individuals even when placed in similar situation. Therein, its effect are enormous and varies according to the challenges, their management are multifarious and demanding. Conflict, which is closely related to aggression, is perceived incompatibility of goals that occurs when the desires of one party interfere with the desires of another party. It is seen every day in any social gathering, where interest and goals of participants are unrealized. Rahim (2002), Jambrek and Penic (2008) note that conflict is a process of social interaction and social situation, where interests, activities and differences of individual confront, block or attack the realization of other party's objectives. In the words of Hocker and Wilmot (2001), conflict is an expressed struggle between two or more interdependent parties perceiving incompatible goals and scarce resources. When conflicts occur the leaders need to understand conflict management issues and strategies.

Conflict management is a process of resolving dispute in order to bring mutual satisfaction of the parties. Conflict management refers to a range of forms of resolving disagreements which may be manifested at different levels of society. Conflict management implies intervention in a conflict situation in such a way as to contain it. Olajide (2011) defines conflict management as the process of reducing the negative and destructive capacity of conflict through a number of measures and by working with and through the parties involved in that conflict. It covers the entire area of handling conflicts positively at different stages including efforts made to prevent conflict by being proactive. Conflict management consists of diagnostic process interpersonal style, negotiation strategies and other intervention that are designed to avoid unnecessary conflict and resolve excessive conflict. Since human existence, conflicts exist, even when it is not expected. Therefore conflict management does not mean that all conflict will be eradicated, but applying wisdom to manage conflicts can decrease the odds of escalation. Conflict may be unavoidable, normal, and indispensable (Noll, 2003). Reychler (2001) is of the view that conflict is both positive and negative. However, when conflict becomes violent, it becomes grave and hazardous; hence there

is need for conflict management in order to bring harmony and serenity. Then, properly managed conflict can improve group outcomes (Bodhcer & Jameson, 2001, & Marks, 2001; Kuhu & Poole, 2000). A successful workplace conflict management strategy will reduce hostility and aggressiveness at work (Khan, Langove, Shan, & David, 2015).Therefore, proper handling of conflict becomes imperative in order for work to move amicably, so that workers will be satisfied with their working condition. The right leadership style must be adopted to enable peace and tranquility in the library which invariably leads to job satisfaction of workers and achievement of the management objectives.

The concept of leadership may differ from one person to the other and from location to situations. For Ogbah (2013) leadership is the manner in which the leader executes and motivates his subordinates towards accomplishing organizational goal. Buttressing this point, Diaro (2014) describes leadership as the act of influencing others to direct their will, abilities and efforts to the achievement of organizational goal. It is the process of influencing individual and group effort toward the optimum achievement of the organizational goals and objectives. The essence of leadership is to direct the forces of the organization to inspire people, coordinate effort and to direct the activities of the followers towards the achievement of the set goal. Many leaders do not understand the full significance of how influential their leadership style is on the performance and achievement of set goals of the administration.

To achieve any organizational goal, the leader may need to adopt one or more leadership styles such as transformational and transactional, according to situations surrounding the organization, in order to motivate the subordinate. A leader's style of direction is a powerful tool that can encourage subordinate to put in their best in any given organization. Workers attitude can change when appropriate leadership style method is applied. In addition, they can even affect employee's wellbeing by creating a stimulating work climate or one filled with tension and fear. The type of leadership style the university library administration chooses is crucial towards the achievement of the goals and objectives of the parent institution. Opaleke (2012) puts that the significance of any adopted leadership style is its ability to influence followership positively towards job performance. The effectiveness of a leader most of the times can be measured by the performance of his/her followers on the job and the extent to which such followers are committed in the line of activities done by the organization.

It seems that many leaders do not understand the full significance of how influential their leadership style can be on the performance and satisfaction of their employees. Leaders control both rewards and punishments that often shape employee behavior and influence employee's attitude. No wonder some scholars such as Fafrowicz and friends have also observed that managers and their leadership styles influence both their employees and organizational results (Fafrowicz, Mareck & Noworol,1993), sequentially, the potential consequences of leader's style should be understood and not be underestimated. Emery and Mcdonnough (2000) states that transformational leaders tend to encourage and motivate their followers to take on more responsibility and autonomy thereby enhancing employees' sense of accomplishment and satisfaction with their job. According to Chen (2005), transformational leaders set goals and incentives to push their subordinates to higher performance levels, while providing opportunities for personal and professional growth for each employee. Cohen and Leeford (2004) found that transformational leadership style has a strong influence with teamwork performance and that members in organization tend to perform better overtime rather than when a transaction leader serves as their head. However, the reverse was the case in the study of Garcia-morales, Jimenez-Barrionuevo and Gutierrez- Gutierrez (2012) who reported that there was a positive influence between transactional leadership style and organizational innovation. Chen (2005) stressed that organizational business management attributes their successes to leadership efficiency, that is, the leadership style of administrative supervisors has a considerable effect on the organizational performance. When leaders use their leadership style to show concern, care and love for subordinates it would boost zeal of employees to do their work and enable them achieve excellent performance, thereby influencing their work satisfaction completely?

Objectives of the Study

The main objective of the study is to investigate the influence of leadership style on conflict management in private university libraries in South-West and South-South, Nigeria. The specific objectives are to:

1. ascertain the techniques of managing conflict by librarians in private university libraries in South-West and South-South, Nigeria;
2. identify the leadership styles practiced by librarians in private university libraries in South-West and South-South, Nigeria;

Hypotheses

In order to achieve the objective of the study, the null hypotheses were tested at 0.05 levels of significance

H₀1   Leadership style has no significant influence on conflict management among librarians in the study locale

Methodology

The study adopted descriptive research design and structured questionnaire was used to collect data. Two (2) research questions guided the study and a hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance. The population for this study consisted of the 201 librarians in private universities in the South-West and South-South, Nigeria. Out of this number, one hundred and sixty three (163) questionnaires were returned for analysis. Data were coded and analyzed using the statistical package for the social scientists (SPSS) software to develop descriptive and inferential statistics.. Thus, Total enumeration technique was used to cover all the librarians in the two geopolitical zones.

Findings and Discussion

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics

Demographics	Items	Frequency	Percentage %
Name of Library	Babcock University	17	10.4
	Adeleke University	3	1.8
	Afe Babalola University	6	3.7
	Lead City University	4	2.5
	Bowen University	6	3.7
	Western Delta University	4	2.5
	Cresent University	4	2.5
	Fountain University	3	1.8
	Oduduwa University	4	2.5
	Augustine University	1	.6
	Crawford University	4	2.5
	Ajayi Crowther University	4	2.5
	Joseph Ayo Babalola University	7	4.3
	Covenant University	18	11.0
	Achievers University	4	2.5
	Caleb University	4	2.5
	Elizade University	3	1.8
	Redeemers University	10	6.1

	Hallmark University	1	.6
	Samuel Adeboyega University	5	3.1
	Pan African University	4	2.5
	Wesley University	7	4.3
	Obong University	4	2.5
	Benson Idahosa University	5	3.1
	Rhema University	5	3.1
	McPherson University	2	1.2
	Novena University	7	4.3
	Bells University	8	4.9
	Igbinedion University	9	5.5
	Total	163	100
Gender	Male	75	46.0
	Female	88	54.0
	Total	163	100.0
Age	20-30 years	19	11.7
	31-40 years	53	32.5
	41-50 years	45	27.6
	51 and above	40	24.5
	No Response	6	3.7
	Total	163	100
Job Designation	Library Officer	29	17.8
	Assistant Librarian	32	19.6
	Librarian II	24	14.7
	Librarian I	35	21.5
	Senior Librarian	20	12.3
	Principal Librarian	8	4.9
	Deputy University Librarian	3	1.8
	University Librarian	9	5.5
	No Response	3	1.8
	Total	163	100
Highest Educational Qualification	BLS/BSc	50	30.7
	MLS/MLIS/MIRM	87	53.4
	PhD	23	14.1
	No Response	3	1.8
	Total	163	100.0
Years of working Experience	0-5 years	37	22.7
	6-10 years	36	22.1
	11-15 years	39	23.9
	Above 15 years	44	27.0
	No Response	7	4.3
	Total	163	100

Result in Table 1 describes the demographic information of the respondents of librarians in university libraries in South-South and South-West Nigeria. Table 1 shows that 17 (10.4%) of the

respondents were from Babcock University, 3 (1.8%) of the respondents were from Adeleke University, 6 (3.7%) of the respondents were from Afe Babalola University, 4 (2.5%) of the respondents were from Lead City University, 6 (3.7%) of the respondents were from Bowen University, and another 4 (2.5%) of the respondents were from Western Delta University. The table also shows that 4 (2.5%) persons responded from Crescent University, 3 (1.8%) of the respondents from Fountain University, 4 (2.5%) of the respondents were from Oduduwa University, 1 (0.6%) respondent from Augustine University, and yet another 4 (2.5%) of the respondents were from Crawford University.

The result also shows that 4 (2.5%) of the respondents were from Ajayi Crowther University, 7 (4.3%) of the respondents were from Joseph Ayo Babalola University, 18 (11%) of the respondents were from Covenant University, 4 (2.5%) of the respondents were from Achievers University, 4 (2.5%) of the respondents were from Caleb University, 3 (1.8%) of the respondents are from Elizade University, 10 (6.1%) of the respondents were from Redeemers University, 1(0.6%) of the respondents was from Hall University, and 5 (3.1%) of the respondents were from Samuel Adeboyega University.

Finally, 4(2.5%) persons responded from Pan Africa University, 7 (4.3%) of the respondents were from Wesley University, 4(2.5%) of the respondents were from Obong University, 5 (3.1%) of the respondents were from Benson Idahosa University, 5 (3.1%) of the respondents were from Rhema University, 2 (1.2%) of the respondents are from Mcpherson University, 8 (4.9%) of the respondents were from Novena University, another 8 (4.9%) responded from Bells University, while 9 (5.5%) of the respondents were from Igbinedion University.

Table 1 also shows that 75(46.0%) of the total respondents were male while 88(54.0%) of the total respondents were female. The table shows that 19 (11.7%) of the total respondents were between 20-30years of age, 53 (32.5%) of them were between 31-40years, 45 (27.6%) of the total respondents were between 41-50years, and 40 (24.6%) of the total respondents were between 51 years and above, while 6(3.7%) of the respondents did not indicate their age range.

Table 1 also shows the job designation of the respondents and out of the 163 respondents, 29 (17.8%) were Library officers, 32 (19.6%) of the respondents were Assistant Librarians, and 24 (14.7%) of the respondents were librarian II. Also, 35 (21.5%) of the total respondents were Librarian I, 20 (12.3%) of them were senior librarians, 8 (4.9%) of the total respondents were

Principal Librarians, 3 (1.8%) of the total respondents were Deputy Librarians, and 9 (5.5%) of the respondents were University Librarians while 3(1.8%) of the respondents did not indicate their job designation.

The Table also shows that 50 (30.7%) of the respondents, highest educational qualification was BLS/BSC, 87(53.4%) of the respondents had MLS/MLIS/MIRM degree, and 23 (14.1%) of the total respondents highest educational qualification was PhD while 3(1.8%) of the total respondents selected none of the option.

The result in Table 1 shows that 37 (22.7%) of the respondents' years of working experience was between 0-5years, 36 (22.1%) of the respondents had been working for about 6-10years, 39 (23.9%) of the total respondents years of working experience was between 11-15years; also, 44(27.0%) of the total respondents years of working experience was above 15years while 7(4.3%) of the total respondents did not indicate their years of working experience.

Table 2: Techniques of Managing Conflict in University Libraries

Techniques of managing conflict	SA (%)	A (%)	D (%)	SD (%)	Mean	S.D
Collaborating						
I am a decision maker, but I make a point of listening to others to find the best solution possible in the library	84 (51.5)	71 (43.6)	8 (4.9)	-	3.47	.591
I explore issues with my colleagues to find solutions that meet everyone's needs in the library	82 (50.3)	71 (43.6)	9 (5.5)	1 (.6)	3.44	.629
When a conflict arises, I am usually willing to adjust my priorities to reach a resolution in the library	66 (40.5)	93 (57.1)	4 (2.5)	-	3.38	.535
During conflict I accept the recommendation of my colleagues in the library	53 (32.5)	102 (62.6)	8 (4.9)	-	3.28	.549
Grand Mean					3.39	
Accommodating						
When someone else thinks they have a good idea I cooperate and help them in the library	71 (43.6)	92 (56.4)	-	-	3.44	.497
I try to adjust my priorities to accommodate other people's needs in the library	70 (42.9)	90 (55.2)	3 (1.8)	-	3.41	.530
When there is a conflict in the library, I make it a point of presenting my view and I invite others to do the same.	61 (37.4)	98 (60.1)	3 (1.8)	1 (.6)	3.34	.549
I think it is more important to get along than to win an argument in the library	66 (40.5)	80 (49.1)	13 (8.0)	4 (2.5)	3.28	.714

	SA	A	D	SD	AM	SD
Grand Mean					3.37	
Sharing						
I like things to be done in such a way everyone will be satisfied in the library	60 (36.8)	85 (52.1)	18 (11.0)	-	3.26	.644
I try to negotiate and adopt a "give-and-take" approach to problem situations in my unit in the library	54 (33.1)	89 (54.6)	15 (9.2)	5 (3.1)	3.18	.719
I try to reach compromise through negotiation in the library	42 (25.8)	96 (58.9)	21 (12.9)	4 (2.5)	3.08	.694
I prefer to compromise when solving problems and just move on in the library	31 (19.0)	69 (42.3)	51 (31.3)	12 (7.4)	2.73	.854
Grand Mean					3.06	
Avoidance						
I sometimes avoid taking positions that would create controversy in the library	37 (22.7)	79 (48.5)	40 (24.5)	7 (4.3)	2.90	.798
Differences of opinion are not always worth worrying about, so I usually avoid them in the library	25 (15.3)	81 (49.7)	45 (27.6)	12 (7.4)	2.73	.809
I usually try to avoid trouble by keeping quiet in the library	32 (19.6)	60 (36.8)	54 (33.1)	17 (10.4)	2.66	.912
I avoid hard feelings by keeping my disagreements with others to myself in the library	20 (12.3)	76 (46.6)	55 (33.7)	12 (7.4)	2.64	.792
Grand Mean					2.73	
Dominating						
Whenever it comes to defend myself I am firm in the library	33 (20.2)	90 (55.2)	35 (21.5)	5 (3.1)	2.93	.733
I like to uphold my solutions to problems in the library	29 (17.8)	68 (41.7)	56 (34.4)	10 (6.1)	2.71	.829
I like to use my influence to win whenever there is conflict in the library	31 (19.0)	45 (27.6)	69 (42.3)	18 (11.0)	2.55	.924
I have high concern for myself therefore I like to win in the library	17 (10.4)	54 (33.1)	81 (49.7)	11 (6.7)	2.47	.772
Grand Mean					2.67	

Key: SA= Strongly Agree, A=Agree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree SD=Standard deviation AM=Average mean

Table 2 shows different techniques of managing conflict in the library. According to the researcher there were five techniques for managing conflict in the university libraries namely, competing, collaborating, accommodating, sharing and avoidance. The result shows that collaborating ranked

highest. Table 2 shows that majority of librarian 84 (51.5%) strongly agreed and 71 (43.6%) agree that they are decision makers, but they make it a point of listening to others to find the best solution possible in the library while 8 (4.9%) disagreed. But on the average, the respondents indicated that they agreed to the statement (mean=3.47, S.D=.591) Table 4.4 shows that 82 (50.3%) of the respondents strongly agree and 71 (43.6%) of the respondents agreed that they explore issues with colleagues to find solutions that meet everyone's needs in the library while 9 (5.5%) and 1 (.6%) disagreed. But on the average, the respondents indicated that they agreed to the statement (mean=3.44, S.D=.629).Also in table 4.4, 66 (40.5%) and 93 (57.1%) of the respondents indicated that they usually willing to adjust priorities to reach resolutions when conflict arises in the library while 4 (2.5%) of the respondents disagreed. But on the average, the respondents indicated that they agreed to the statement (mean=3.38, S.D=.535). The result also shows that 53 (32.5%) and 102 (62.6%) of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed respectively that they accept recommendations of colleagues during conflicts in the library while 8 (4.9%) of the respondents disagreed. But on the average, the respondents indicated that they agreed to the statement (mean=3.28, S.D=.549). The grand mean for collaborating technique as a method of managing conflict was 3.39

Result on Table 2 shows that accommodating ranked second as a technique for managing conflicts in the library. The details of the responses shows that 71 (43.6%) of the respondents strongly agreed while 92(56.4%) agreed that when someone else thinks they have a good idea, they cooperate and help them in the library. But on the average, the respondents indicated that they agreed to the statement (mean=3.44, S.D=.497). Also, 70 (42.9%) and 90 (55.2%) of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed respectively that they try to adjust priorities to accommodate other people's needs in the library, while 3 (1.8%) persons disagreed. The accommodating section of Table 4.4 also reveals that majority 61 (37.4%) and 98 (60.1%) of the respondents agreed that when there is a conflict in the library, they make it a point of presenting their view and invite others to do the same (mean=3.34, S.D=.549), while 3(1.8%) and 1(.6%) disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively to the statement. Again, out of the 163 respondents, 66 (40.5%) strongly think it is more important to get along than to win an argument in the library while 80 (49.1%) agreed that it is more important to get along than to win an argument in the library (mean=3.28, S.D=.714). However, 13(8%) and 4(2.5%) disagreed on the statement.

Table 2 equally shows the responses for sharing as a technique for managing conflicts in the library and it ranked third while it has a grand mean of 3.06. The result reveals that 60 (36.8%) and 85 (52.1%) of the participants like things to be done in such a way everyone will be satisfied in the library (mean=3.26). Majority 54 (33.1%) and 89 (54.6%) of the respondents as seen in table 4.4 under sharing technique indicated that they try to negotiate and adopt a "give-and-take" approach to problem situations in their units in the library (mean=3.18). As seen also, Table 4.4 shows that 42 (25.8%) of the respondents strongly agreed that they try to reach compromise through negotiation in the library, and 96 (58.9%) agreed that they try to reach compromise through negotiation in the library, (mean=3.08).

Result on table 2 in the sharing technique section shows that 31 (19%) and 69 (42.3%) of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed respectively that they prefer to compromise when solving problems and just move on in the library (mean=2.73). But 51 (31.3%) and 12 (7.4%) of the respondents indicated that they do not prefer to compromise when solving problems and just move on in the library.

The result on Table 2 equally shows the responses on avoidance as a technique for managing conflicts in academic libraries and it ranked fourth with the mean of 2.73.. The result shows that 37 (22.7%) strongly agreed and 79 (48.5%) agreed that they sometimes avoid taking positions that would create controversy in the library (mean=2.90), while 40 (244.5%) and 7 (4.3%) indicated that they don't sometimes avoid taking positions that would create controversy in the library. Table 4.4 also reveals that 25 (15.3%) of the respondents strongly believe that differences in opinion are not worth worryinsg about, so they usually avoid them in the library. In the same vein, 81 (49.7%) agreed that differences in opinion are not worth worrying about, so they usually avoid them in the library (mean=2.73). But 45 (27.6%) and 12 (7.4%) of the respondents have a contrary view as they indicated that differences in opinion are worth worrying about, so they usually do not avoid them in the library. The respondents also agreed and strongly agreed that they usually try to avoid trouble by keeping quiet in the library as indicated by 60 (36.8%) and 32 (19.6%) of the respondents respectively (mean=2.66). on that point also, 54 (33.1%) and 17 (10.4%) of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively.

Finally on Table 2, majority of the respondents 55(33.7%) disagreed and 12 (7.4%) strongly disagreed that they avoid hard feelings by keeping disagreements with others to their self in the library. The grand mean for avoidance technique responses as seen in the table is 2.73.

Dominating as a technique for managing conflicts has a grand mean of 2.67 and it ranked fifth. And in this, majority of the respondents 90 (55.2%) agreed that they are firm when it comes to defending themselves in the library (mean=2.93) and 33 (20.2%) of the respondents strongly agreed. However, 35 (21.5%) and 5 (3.1) do not believe that they can be firm in defending themselves in the library.

Also, 29 (17.8%) of the respondents strongly agreed while 68 (41.7%) agrees that they like to uphold their solutions to problems in the library. But, 56 (34.4%) and 10 (6.1%) indicated that they do not uphold their solutions to problems in the library (mean=2.71).

From the result presented as seen in the grand mean for each conflict management technique: Collaborating=3.39; Accommodating=3.37; Sharing=3.06; Avoidance=2.73 and lastly Dominating=2.67. The conflict management technique used in academic libraries in South-West and South-South, Nigeria were collaborating, accommodating, followed by Sharing.

Table 3: Leadership Styles Practiced in University Libraries

Leadership Styles	SA (%)	A (%)	D (%)	SD (%)	Mean	S.D
Transformational leadership style						
In my library the leadership is friendly and approachable	75 (46.0)	76 (46.6)	12 (7.4)	-	3.39	.622
In my library, the leadership gives room for team work.	59 (36.2)	92 (56.4)	10 (6.1)	2 (1.2)	3.28	.631
In my library the leadership accepts new ideas form subordinate	56 (34.4)	85 (52.1)	17 (10.4)	5 (3.1)	3.18	.736
In my library, the leader communicates well and gives good feedback.	54 (33.1)	86 (52.8)	17 (10.4)	6 (3.7)	3.15	.750
In my university, the leaders have the interest of the subordinates at heart.	48 (29.4)	94 (57.7)	19 (11.7)	2 (1.2)	3.15	.663
In my library the leadership is considerate about life outside work.	39 (23.9)	97 (59.5)	22 (13.5)	5 (3.1)	3.04	.706
In my library, the leadership does not penalize for different opinion	30 (18.4)	112 (68.7)	17 (10.4)	4 (2.5)	3.03	.623

	SA	A	D	SD	AM	SD
In my library the leadership accept subordinate to take part in decision – making process.	41 (25.2)	91 (55.8)	22 (13.5)	9 (5.5)	3.01	.782
In my library, the leadership allows subordinate complete freedom to solve problems on their own	29 (17.8)	93 (57.1)	32 (19.6)	9 (5.5)	2.87	.763
In my library the leadership does not impose policies.	26 (16.0)	84 (51.5)	40 (24.5)	13 (8.0)	2.75	.817
Grand Mean					**3.09**	
Transactional leadership style						
In my library, the leadership acknowledges good performance.	59 (36.2)	87 (53.4)	12 (7.4)	5 (3.1)	3.23	.714
In my library the leadership motivates subordinates to do work well.	59 (36.2)	83 (50.9)	19 (11.7)	2 (1.2)	3.22	.694
In my library the leadership gives recognition when work is properly done.	45 (27.6)	97 (59.5)	18 (11.0)	3 (1.8)	3.13	.668
In my library the leadership shows that much is expected from subordinates	22 (13.5)	111 (68.1)	27 (16.6)	3 (1.8)	2.93	.610
In my library the leadership knows the right time to reward.	25 (15.3)	101 (62.0)	34 (20.9)	3 (1.8)	2.91	.656
In my library, the leadership is very strict.	23 (14.1)	57 (35.0)	71 (43.6)	12 (7.4)	2.56	.825
In my library, the leadership always punishes if subordinates make mistakes	11 (6.7)	62 (38.0)	74 (45.4)	16 (9.8)	2.42	.760
In my library the leadership does not accept new ideas from subordinate.	16 (9.8)	36 (22.1)	68 (41.7)	43 (26.4)	2.15	.927
Grand Mean					**2.82**	

Key: SA= Strongly Agree, A=Agree, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree SD=Standard deviation AM=Average mean

Table 3 grouped leadership styles practiced in the university libraries into two- transformational and transactional leadership styles. The result shows that transformational leadership scored first with the grand mean of 3.09 while transactional came second with the average mean of 2.15. On transformational leadership style, 76 (46.6%) and 75 (46%) of the respondents agreed and strongly agreed that the leadership is friendly and approachable in their libraries, while 12 (7.4%) of the respondents disagreed. But on the average, the respondents indicated that they agreed to the statement (mean=3.39). The table also reveals that majority of the respondents agreed that the

leadership give room for team work in the libraries as seen in the proportions as follows; strongly agree 59 (36.2%), agree 92 (56.4%), however, 10 (6.1%) of the respondents disagreed and 2 (1.2%) strongly disagreed. But on the average, the respondents indicated that they agreed to the statement (3.28). Majority 85 (52.1%) and 56 (34.4%) of the respondents also agreed and strongly agreed that the library leadership accepts new ideas form subordinates respectively, while 17 (10.4%) disagreed and 5 (3.1%) respondents strongly disagreed. But on the average, the respondents indicated that they agreed to the statement (3.18). As seen also, 54 (33.1%) and 86 (52.8%) persons strongly agreed and agreed that in their library, the leader communicates well and gives good feedback. On the same point, 17 (10.4%) and 6 (3.7%) disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. But on the average, the respondents indicated that they agreed to the statement (mean=3.15).

The table equally reveals that 48 (29.4%) and 94 (57.7%) of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed respectively that in their library, the leaders have the interest of the subordinates at heart. while 19 (11.7%) and 2 (1.2%) of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. But on the average, the respondents indicated that they agreed to the statement (mean=3.15). Table 4.5 reveals that 39 (23.9%) of the respondents strongly agreed, 97 (59.5%) of the respondents agreed, 22 (13.5%) disagreed and 5 (3.1%) strongly disagreed that the library leadership is considerate about life after work, (mean=3.04). But on the average, the respondents indicated that they agreed to the statement (mean=3.04). The result in Table 4.5 also shows that 30 (18.4%) strongly agreed, and 112 (68.7%) of the respondents agreed the library leadership does not penalize for different opinion; while, 17 (10.4%) disagreed and 4 (2.5%) respondents strongly disagreed. But on the average, the respondents indicated that they agreed to the statement (mean=3.03). The library leadership accept subordinate to take part in decision – making process is also a factor for transformational leadership style as indicated by 41 (25.2%) of the respondents who strongly agreed and 91 (55.8%) of the respondents who agreed, (mean=3.01). But some of the librarians indicated that library leadership does not accept subordinate to take part in decision making process as seen in the response of 22 (13.5%) who disagreed and 9 (5.5%) who strongly disagreed. Table 3 also shows that the library leadership allows subordinate complete freedom to solve problems on their own as indicated by 29 (17.8%) who strongly agreed and 93 (57.1%) of the respondents who agreed, (mean=2.87). Yet, 32 (19.6%) and 9 (5.5%) of the respondents did not

agreed. But on the average, the respondents indicated that they agreed to the statement (mean=2.87).

Finally on transformational leadership style, 26 (16%) and 84 (51.5%) of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed respectively that in library, the leadership does not impose policies. While 40 (24.5%) and 13 (8%) of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed that in the library, the leadership does not impose policies. And the grand mean for transformational leadership style is 3.09.

Table 3 also shows the responses for transactional leadership style in the library. The table shows that 87 (53.4%) agreed while 59 (36.2%) strongly agreed that leadership of the library acknowledges good performance. Also, 12 (7.4%) of the respondents agreed while 5 (3.1%) strongly disagreed that the leadership of the library acknowledges good performance. But on the average, the respondents indicated that they agreed to the statement (mean=2.23). The table also shows that 59 (36.2%) and 87 (50.9%) strongly agreed and agreed that in the library, the leadership motivates subordinates to do work well, meanwhile, 19 (11.7%) and 2 (1.2%) of the respondents disagreed. But on the average, the respondents indicated that they agreed to the statement (mean=3.22). The respondents also indicated that the library leadership gives recognition when work is properly done (mean=3.13). This is seen in the responses of 45 (27.6%) and 97 (59.5%) persons who strongly agreed and agreed respectively. However, 18 (11%) and 3 (1.8%) disagreed that the library leadership gives recognition when work is properly done. Again as seen in Table 3 under transactional leadership style, 22 (13.5%) strongly agreed and 111 (68.1%) of the respondents agreed that in the library, the leadership shows that much expected from subordinates, (mean=2.93). While, 27 (16.6%) disagreed and 3 (1.8%) strongly disagreed that in the library the leadership shows that much is expected from subordinates. Table 3 also shows that 25 (15.3%) of the respondents strongly agreed and 101 (62%) agreed that in the library, the leadership knows the right time to reward, (mean=2.91). While, 34 (20.9%) and 3 (1.8%) of the respondents disagreed that in the library, the leadership knows the right time to reward. The Table equally shows that majority 71 (43.6%) of the respondents disagreed and 12 (7.4%) of the respondents strongly disagreed that the library leadership is very strict, (mean=2.56). While, 23 (14.1%) and 57 (35%) of the respondents agreed and strongly agreed respectively that the leadership of the library is very strict. The result also shows that 74 (45.4%) and 16 (9.8%) of the respondents disagreed that in the library, the leadership always punishes if subordinates make mistakes (mean=2.42) while 11

(6.7%) and 62 (38%) agreed that the library leadership always punishes if subordinates make mistakes.

Finally on transactional leadership style, 68 (41.7%) disagreed and 43 (26.4%) of the respondents strongly disagreed that library leadership does not accept new ideas from subordinate. Though, 16 (9.8%) and 36 (22.1%) of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed respectively that the leadership does not accept new ideas from subordinate in the library.

The grand mean for transactional leadership style is 2.82. From the result presented in Table 4.5, based on grand mean, one can say that the leadership style used more in the university libraries is the transformational leadership style while the transactional leadership style was less used. This implies that there was focus on team building, motivation and collaboration with workers which will eventually lead to good service to library patrons.

The study was guided by the following null hypotheses; tested at 0.05 level of significance.

Ho1: Leadership style has no significant influence on conflict management

Table 4: Test on influence of leadership style on conflict management

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	45.413	3.736		12.157	.000
	Leadership style	.289	.069	.312	4.173	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Conflict Management

ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	777.466	1	777.466	17.410	.000[b]
	Residual	7189.700	161	44.657		
	Total	7967.166	162			

R = .312
R square = .098

Adj. R Square = .092
F = (1,161) 17.410
P = .000

Table 4 shows that leadership style (β = .312, F=17.410, P < .05) has significant influence on conflict management. The result revealed that the independent variable (leadership style) can account for 9.2% of the changes that occur in the dependent variable (conflict management) (Adj. R square = .092, P <. 05). This therefore implies that the leadership style used by librarians influences the way conflict could be manage in the library. Based on this, the null hypothesis positing that there is no significant influence between leadership style and conflict management is therefore rejected and hereby restated: leadership style has significant influence on conflict management.

Conclusion

From the foregoing, it can be concluded that conflict management does not mean eradication of conflict completely. However when conflict arises, one should be able to manage it properly, so that it becomes a positive force rather than a negative one. Besides, the study confirms the fact that for private university libraries to have meaningful progress and achieve the objective of the parent institution, the librarians need to possess a good skills of conflict management techniques so as to be able to manage conflicting issues in the library effectively Therefore, leadership of any organization is essential factor that determines the success or failure of such institution in the society.

References

Bodhcer, A. M & Jameson, J. K. (2001). Emotion in conflict formation and its transformation: application to organizational conflict management. *The international Journal of Conflict Management, 3, 259-275*.

Chen, H. C. (2005). The influence of nursing directors' leadership styles on Taiwanese nursing faculty job satisfaction (Chan). Dissertation Abstracts International, 66(04), 1219A.

Cohen, S. & Ledford, G. (2004). The Effectiveness of Self-Managing Teams: *A quasi Experment in Human Relations, 49*, 643-676.

Diaro, O. (2014). Management Theory 11. Abeokut: Prime Palm Concepts

Emery, C. R. & Barker, K. J. (2007). *The effect of transactional and transformational leadership styles on the organizational commitment and job satisfaction of customer contact personnel. Journal of organizational culture, communicational & conflict, 11 (7), 77-90.*

Fafrowicz, M., Marek, T. & Noworol, C. (1993) Effectiveness of innovation as a function of creative style of behavior and type of leadership. Creativity and Consciousness: Philosopphical and psychological Dimensions, Vol. 31, pp.383.

Garcia-Morales, V. J., Jimenez-Barrionuevo, M. M. & Gutierrez, L. (2012) Transformational leadership influence on organizational performance through organizational learning and innovation. Journal of Business Research, vol.65, pp.1040-1050.

Hocker, J. & Wilmot, W. (2001). Interpersonal Conflict (6th ed) Dubuque Int: Brown Publishers

Khan, M. L. Langove, N. Shah, F. A. & David, M. U. (2015). The modes of conflicts and managerial leadership styles of managers. *Global Business and Management Research, 7*(2), 45

Kuhu, T, & Poole, M. S. (2000). Do conflict management styles affect group decision making? Human communication research 26, 558-590

Mavalla, A. G (2016) Practical mediation: a guide for learners and professionals. Old press Wurukum, makurdi.

Noll, D. (2003). Peacemaking: practicing at the intersection of law and human conflict. Telford: cascadia publishing.

Ogbah, E. L. (2013). *Leadership style and organizational commitment of workers in some selected Academic Libraries in Delta State. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and social Science, 3(7), 110-118.*

Olajide, Olabode (2011). *Towards the Resolution of Conflict for Research and sustainable Development the Developing Countries: The Role of Libraries and Information Centers. International Journal of Library and Information science 3(9), 195-198 Retrieved from http://www.academicjournals.org/article/articule/13796754 Olajide.pdf.*

Opaleke, J. S (2012) Influence of librarian leadership styles on job specific task proficiency, demonstrating efforts and team performance of subordinates. *Journal of Nigeria library association 45*(2), 96.

Rahim, A. (2002). *Towards a theory of managing Organizational conflict. The International Journal of Conflict Movement 13(3), 206-235.*

Reychler, L. (2001) From conflict to sustainable peace building concept and Analytical tools in Reychler, Luc and peace building concepts and Analytical Tools" in reycher, luer paffenholz, Thania eds peace building A field Guide London Rienner publishers pp. 3-15