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Abstract

Schools are institutions where human relations are intensive due to the existence of different individuals and groups. Therefore, as in every organization, it is natural to have conflicts in schools due to different human profiles and changing views. While it is a natural situation to have conflicts, the main thing to focus on is how to manage the conflict rather than the existence of the conflict. At this point, administrators, who are leaders in schools, have big duties. The response and conflict management strategies that managers will give to the conflict are directly related to the leadership styles of the preventors. In this study, it was aimed to determine the strategies used by school administrators with paternalist leadership style, which is one of the leadership styles sought in contemporary education approach, during conflict resolution or management. In the research prepared using the qualitative method. The sample of the research consisted of 5 teachers (25 teachers) each who worked in the schools of 5 administrators working in private and public primary schools affiliated to the TRNC Ministry of Education in the academic year 2019-2020. The sample of the research is in accordance with the “purposeful sampling” approach. During the analysis of the data, “content analysis” method was used. According to the results of the research, according to the opinions of the teachers, it was understood that the most common method of conflict resolution, 

Resumen

Las escuelas son instituciones donde las relaciones humanas son intensivas debido a la existencia de diferentes individuos y grupos. Por lo tanto, como en todas las organizaciones, es natural tener conflictos en las escuelas debido a los diferentes perfiles humanos y las opiniones cambiantes. Si bien es una situación natural tener conflictos, lo más importante es enfocarse en cómo manejar el conflicto en lugar de la existencia del conflicto. En este punto, los administradores, que son líderes en las escuelas, tienen grandes deberes. Las estrategias de respuesta y manejo de conflictos que los gerentes darán al conflicto están directamente relacionadas con los estilos de liderazgo de los preventivos. En este estudio, se buscó determinar las estrategias utilizadas por los administradores escolares con un estilo de liderazgo paternalista, que es uno de los estilos de liderazgo buscados en el enfoque de la educación contemporánea, durante la resolución o gestión de conflictos. En la investigación preparada utilizando el método cualitativo. La muestra de la investigación consistió en 5 maestros (25 maestros) cada uno que trabajó en las escuelas de 5 administradores que trabajan en escuelas primarias públicas y privadas afiliadas al Ministerio de Educación de TRNC en el año académico 2019-2020. La muestra de la investigación está de acuerdo con el enfoque de "muestreo intencional". Durante el análisis de los datos, se utilizó el método de "análisis de contenido". Según los resultados de la investigación, las opiniones de los docentes, se
which the paternalist leaders pursue in the conflicts in the school environment, was “uniting those in common view”. In addition, there have been conclusions that the managers tried to find a solution to the conflict by making one-to-one interviews with the people who caused the conflict after the conflict, and that this was effective in preventing the conflict from recurring.
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**Introduction**

In every situation where people interact, experiencing conflicts is inevitable. The Turkish Language Association (TLA) explains the concept of “conflict” as one’s state of mind in cases of spontaneous wishes and desires, opposite or equally attractive (TDK, 2018). Generally researchers define conflicts as negative cases such as contradiction, incompatibility, going against etc. which cause strain in an organization and hinder development. Hence, this view is supported by “Concept of Classical Methods” and is emphasized that conflicts should be abandoned as soon as possible (Ertürk, 1994). Whereas, in contemporary concepts this case is totally dealt with differently. It is argued that, conflicts add to organizational development and coping with problems. It is even emphasized that, new ideas and problem-solving skills are developed by conflicts, but not by rapport (Karip, 2013; Tjosvold et. al., 2014).

The two different viewpoints developed, raised two questions as current points of consideration, “solving the conflict” or “managing the conflict” (Konak and Erdem, 2015). Rahim argues that these two expressions are crucial and should be considered separately (Adpt. Gümüşeli, 2001). There are three basic points that differentiate these two terms; aim, amount of conflict, and viewpoints. In the process of solving the conflict, the aim is to eradicate conflicts, minimize the causes, and ignore them to prevent from any harm to the organization. Conflict management deals with practicing different strategies to interfere to make it more useful in terms of individual and organizational benefits, keep the amount of conflict at the lowest level required by individual and organizational conditions, and adapt them as beneficial issues for the individuals and organization (Bercovitch, Kremenyuk and Zartman, 2008).

It is in the responsibility of the leaders of organizations either to benefit from conflicts or consider them as unfruitful processes, that is to say solving or managing conflicts. This issue is the indication of the importance of leaders and leadership concept. Arslantaş and Özkan (2012) argue that effective management by the leader turns conflicts into opportunities rather than a threat to the organization.

Schools are institutions where human interaction is intense due to the involvement of different individuals and groups. Therefore, conflicts are naturally experienced because of different human profiles and views. At this point, the crucial issue is how to manage conflicts rather than experiencing them, which is in the responsibility of school managers (Arslantaş and Özkan, 2012). Durkan (2004) points out that if the managers approach conflicts wisely, they can turn them into a beneficial issue without any worries. The school Director, as a leader, needs to specify the reasons for conflicts clearly so as to sustain the existence of the institution (Doğan, 2012), which requires an effective leadership style of the Director.

When the historical process of leadership is considered, until 1950s, leadership was assumed to be an innate ability. In time, different types of leaderships such as individual leadership related to personal characteristics, situational leadership affected by current events and situations, visionary leadership advocating participation and authorizing, and ethical leadership focusing on principles and values emerged (Sezgül, 2010). Parallel to these new styles, the non-western countries started leadership styles reflecting their culture as a result of which Paternalist leadership was adapted in the Eastern countries.
Emerging from the combination of Leadership and Paternalism concepts, Paternalist Leadership, one of the 18 leadership concepts today, was adapted because it did not respond to every culture in the West (Kurt, 2013). In Leadership studies in the non-western countries, it was observed that leadership behavior differed in different societies and their cultures and national culture played a great role in leadership types (Çalışkan and Özköç, 2016). Cheng et al., (2014) stated that, Paternalist Leadership is a concept, suggested by Silin in 1976. Silin studied leadership behavior in Thailand and leadership behavior exercised in the West and argued that it was incompatible with Eastern culture. The issue, then, became a question to be researched in 1990s.

Paternalist leadership is a type of attitude and behavior based on patriarchy. Within the family, it symbolizes “father”, reflecting a protectionist thought, making decisions for the benefit of family members, self-sacrifice, affection and protection (Erkuş et al., 2010). Paternalist leaders are expected to practice strategies to help integration in case of conflicts and making concession in their organizations. In this regard, this study is of crucial importance. With this assumption in mind, this study aimed to specify school Directors”, with Paternalist leadership types required in contemporary education concept, strategies in solving or managing conflicts. The sub-aims responding to the research are as follows;

1. What kind of solution/management strategies do Paternalist school Directors follow in case of conflicts among the school staff?
2. What kind of solution/management strategies do Paternalist school Directors follow in case of conflicts between Director and staff?
3. Do Paternalist school Directors meet the involved individually after conflicts?
4. Do Paternalist school Directors investigate the conditions of the involved responsible for the conflict?
5. What common strategies do Paternalist school Directors exercise in conflict solution /management?

The Concept of Conflict, Causes and Types

Leaders in developing countries prefer close relationship with their staff rather than exercising their authority (Aycan, 2001). Meanwhile, the staff also expect such behavior from their leaders. Cerit et al., (2011) administered a study with class-teachers and found out that teachers with different demographic characteristics expected Paternalist leadership behavior from their Directors. This is why Paternalist Leadership is common in developing countries.

Theoretical framework

Paternalist Leadership and Its Characteristics

The concept of Paternalist Leadership, a result of cultural differences among cultures, was defined by Westwood (1997) as the Leader’s fatherly, sincere, and respectful approach towards juniors. According to Aycan (2006), Paternalist leadership is a relationship in which the juniors see their professional lives directed in a family understanding and are expected to be loyal and obedient. Paternalist leadership symbolizes “father” and the leader undervalues own benefits, helps juniors make decisions for their own good with affection and sacrifice (Erkuş et al., 2010). In short, Paternalist leadership is a combination of the leader’s power and authority, fatherly approaches, and kindness (Köksal, 2011; Özköç and Çalışkan, 2016).

As stated in literature, Aycan (2001); Farh and Cheng (2000) put Paternal Leadership into two categories. Aycan classified Paternal Leadership as self-interested and good-willing. If the classification in self-interest dimension is good-willing Paternalism, the benefit of the employee is the priority. Farh and Cheng (2000) examined Paternal Leadership in three dimensions; authoritative, helpful, and ethical. The authoritative dimension refers to strict control over the employee, Ethical dimension reflects the leader’s honesty, and helpful dimension represents the employee and the prosperity of their family.

Different views and thoughts are likely and an anticipated cases among people. Therefore, the concept of conflict is common and defined differently. Some scientists define conflict as disagreement with some issues among people bound to be together (Folger et al., 2015), misunderstanding between two or more groups for some reasons (Balç, 2010), opposition and efforts to hinder reaching aims between groups (Can, 2005), deliberate efforts between two sides to achieve aims or continue to do so (Robbins and Judge, 2003), and misunderstanding among individuals (Gardiner, 1993).

When conflicts in organizations are considered, it is clear that one of the most crucial reasons for conflicts is communication problems. Insufficient or incorrect flow of views or information among individuals or groups, language differences due to culture or difficulty
in understanding one another are some of the basic reasons of conflict (Kırel, 1997).

Apart from communication problems, another factor triggering conflict is mutual behavior among individuals. Disapproved behavior between two sides leads to conflict, which becomes difficult to cope with (Bozdoğan, 2004).

Different perceptions of events by an individual or individuals is another factor of conflict. An individual’s psychological situation or the social environment he was brought up create different perceptions of conflict and opposite views. Insistence on opposing views is a cause for conflict (Kandemir, 2006).

Agarual (1983), points to individual differences as one of the crucial causes of conflict. People in his category; try to achieve their aims as well as the aims of the organization. Individual aims emerge from individual differences. However, this is not the same for everyone (Adapt. Kırel, 1996). Can (2005) came to the same conclusion in a study saying that individuals with different aims are bound to experience conflicts.

Besides the causes of conflict mentioned above, functional loyalty, common decision making, limited sources, new expertise, way of supervision (Ipek, 2000), being unclear about organizational duties and responsibilities (Eren, 2004), tough attitude by groups (Karip, 2013), compulsory common decision making (Kocabaş and Karakoş, 2005), the size of the organization (Süküt, 2008; Buysal and Tekarşlan, 1996), authority (Can, 2005), rewarding and rivalry (Efeoğlu and Özgen, 2006), different Managers (Şendur, 2006), and uncertainty in management (Genç, 2004) are also causes of conflict in organizations.

As it can be noted, there are various reasons for conflicts pointed at by different researchers. Kırlıç (2006) classified below types of conflict caused by these reasons.

Table 1. Types of Conflict.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Types of Conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supportes</td>
<td>1. Individual conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Conflict among Individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>1. Functional conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Non-functional conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergence</td>
<td>1. Potential conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Perceived conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position in</td>
<td>1. Horizontal conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Vertical conflict</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conflict Management and Strategies in Organizations

Managing conflicts in organizations is the leader’s responsibility. The Leader’s skills and applications shape with the strategies, which may be an advantage for the organization or may harm it.

Bumin (1990) defines conflict management as to find solutions to conflicts in every stage before they reach to a harmful level. Another definition by Karip, (2013) is to observe conflicts for the benefit of the organization and the counter-action by the other partners involved to put an end to the problem.

Rahim (2002) argues that in conflict management more focus should be on eradicating all negative factors and replace them with positive ones rather than trying to minimize or to do away with the results. In order to achieve organizational effectiveness in conflict management, the existence of conflict should be well-defined and solutions in different situations with effective strategies should be found (Karip,
2013). Demirkaya, (2012), emphasizes that for conflict management a leader has an action plan to follow; 1-Controlling anger, 2- Thinking well before approaching the opponent, 3- Creating a positive atmosphere, 4- Watching the basic rules, 5- Defining the problem, 6- Brain-storming for possible solutions, 7- Evaluating probable solutions and come up with sound decisions.

There are different strategies to follow in conflict management and application stages developed by researchers mentioned in literature and frequently referred to for their studies. Blake and Mount (1964) classified conflict solution strategies as “forcing”, “withdrawing”, “smoothing”, “sharing”, and “problem solving” (Adapt. Niederauer, 2006). Unlike Blake, Mount and Thomas (1976) classified conflict solving strategies as “accommodating”, “avoiding”, “collaborating”, “competing”, and “compromising” (Adapt. Niederauer, 2006). Rahim (1992) classified conflict solving strategies as “integration”, “accommodating”, “domination”, “avoiding”, and “compromising”. The aim of “integration” strategy is to deeply overview causes and eradicate them (Öztaş, 2005). At this point, needs and demands of both sides are regarded (Süküt, 2008). In “making concession” strategy, the individual is expected to put aside own demands, but respect to the principles specified by others without any interpretation (Şişeri & Gürbüz, 2014). In one of the most common strategies “domination”, the authorized person is the supervisor, does not care about other needs, does not trust anyone in emergency situations, and believes that he can provide the best solution (Stroh et al., 2002). In cases when sides underestimate importance, put the responsibility on others and stay away, the “avoiding” strategy is practiced (Kılıç, 2006). Finally, in the last strategy, the involved make concessions in their demands and agree on a common point (Karip, 2013). This is assumed to be the best conflict solution strategy. Although the involved are not fully satisfied with what they get, at least they end in a common agreement (Akın, 2008).

Methodology

Research Method

A qualitative method was conducted in this study. As Yıldırım and Şimşek (2018) express, it is applicable in natural environments, the researcher has a participatory role, it is a holistic and inductive approach and flexible in research designing and effective in specifying perceptions. Yıldırım and Şimşek (2013) define Qualitative research as a process in which qualitative data collection methods such as “observation”, “interviews” and “document analysis” are used, and perceptions and events are examined in a natural environment.

Mostly a face-to-face interview technique was conducted in this study because it is quite an effective way in specifying participants’ views, experiences, and feelings (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2013). A semi-structured interview technique, one of the three types of interview techniques, used with questions prepared in advance, was conducted in this research (Karasar, 2011).

The Participants

The participants were composed of Directors and teachers working in Private and State schools of the Ministry of National Education, TRNC (Turkish Republic of North Cyprus) in 2019-2020 academic years. A total of twenty Directors were picked for the study. Later, 25 teachers, five from five schools each directed by Directors with “Paternalist Director traits” were picked through purposeful sampling method. Yıldırım and Şimşek (2018) define this method as a process to investigate situations in depth to obtain ample data.

Data Collection Tools

The “semi-structured interview” technique was conducted in this study. In this technique, the researchers design the interview form with questions written in advance, but during the interview, they can come up with sub-questions so that the interviewee expands the answers for more details (Türnüklü, 2000). In order to specify Directors with “Paternalist Leadership Traits”, firstly, Cheng’s “Paternalist Leadership Scale”, developed in 2004 and a short-version of which was designed in 2014, was used. This Scale consists of three sub-dimensions; “helpfulness, ethical, and authoritarian” with 15 questions, 5 for each dimension. With this Scale Directors with paternalist Traits were specified. In the following stage, teachers were asked open-ended questions to find about “Directors’ conflict-solution strategies”.

Three experts, two in Educational Management and one in Turkish language, were referred to confirm the internal validity of the interview questions written by the researchers. The
questions, as presented below, were subjected to a pilot study with four primary school teachers:

- Q.1. How does your Director interfere to settle conflicts among teachers (reconciliation, imposing ideas, leaving the conflict area, supporting the one(s) on his side etc)? Add. Q: Are the suggestions effective in settling the conflict?
- Q.2. What strategy does your Director follow in case of conflicts between teachers and directors (reconciliation, imposing ideas, leaving the area, supporting the one(s) on his side etc)? Add. Q: Are the suggestions effective in settling the conflict?
- Q.3. Does your Director has face-to-face talks with the ones causing the conflict? Add. Q: What is the topic during face-to-face talks? Add. Q: Are these talks effective in settling the conflict?
- Q.4. Does your Director investigate to find out the one(s) causing the conflict and their situation? Add. Q: Do you think the same conflicts are likely to be prevented from happening again?
- Q.5. Which of the following strategies does your Director exercise in settling conflicts?
  a. Integration: Considers both groups’ needs and ends the conflict in agreement
  b. Accommodation: Makes groups agree with each other’s views
  c. Domination: Makes one group accept the other’s demands
  d. Compromising: Makes groups mutually agree on a decision

Add. Q: Which of the above strategies does your Director most frequently exercise?

Data Analysis

A “content analysis” technique was conducted in analyzing the data. A content analysis is a systematic coded analysis of written and verbal materials (Balcı, 2005). According to Miles and Huberman (1994), content analysis is done in four stages: coding the data, specifying themes, arranging the codes and themes, and defining and interpreting the findings.

- Coding the Data: The analysed data were numbered, coded and documented. The coding list was overviewed by the researchers for agreement. Every stage of the research was confirmed together and the discrepancies were minimized.
- Specifying the Themes: All the codes were put under categories to find common aspects. Categories and themes were specified in five interview questions.
- Arranging Codes and Themes: Every teacher and their views were represented with a number starting from 1. (e.g: Teacher 1 (T 1)).
- Defining and Interpreting the Findings: The findings were presented in detail with quotations to confirm the validity of the research.

Results

The first section of this research dealt with Paternalist leaders’ strategies and their effectiveness in settling conflicts among teachers. 30 teachers were asked for their views about the subject question. Table 2 reveals views under rates and themes.
Table 2. Conflict solution strategies and their effectiveness among teachers.

As it is revealed in Table 2, 77.1% of the participants stated that their Directors managed to settle conflicts. A big majority of them expressed that their Directors were successful in combining common problems, followed by “common decision-making”, “exchanging views”, “imposing self-ideas”, “providing constructive solutions to the problem”, “exhibiting unbiased approaches” etc.

T 6 stated, “The Director talks to teachers and ends in a common agreement”.
“Without being biased, our Director tries common agreement strategies and is effective in settling conflicts” expressed T 29.

%8.97 of the participants argued that the strategies followed were effective when there were no private problems among individuals. T 21 explained saying, “Conflicts are settled most of the time. However, a solution can not be achieved in private problems among the involved”.

A very low number of the participants (%2.57) expressed views saying that their Directors were not always successful in settling conflicts. They added that there were seldom solutions. T 22 said, “The suggestions by the Directors are not very effective in settling conflicts”.

“The Director’s strategies are not very effective, but they just hide the conflict” expressed T 11.

The second section of this research examined the strategies of Paternalist leaders in finding solutions to conflicts between teachers and Directors and the effectiveness of these strategies. The subject question was asked to 30 teachers for their views, as shown in Table 3 under rates and themes.

Table 3.
Directors’ strategies in settling conflicts between teachers and directors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ways for solutions</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combining common views</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imposing self-thoughts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sticking to self-interests</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trying mutual understanding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking for solutions from the teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to the involved</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face meetings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing respect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignoring position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showing goodwill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following rules</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calming the atmosphere</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick solution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommending</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expecting views from teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting self-suggestions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trying to persuade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting the right</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trying to correct</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affecting positively</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being fair to all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding running down</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to the involved</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ineffective ways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have no idea</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have no idea</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ways sometimes effective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of the problem</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>58</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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As shown in Table 3, 82.76% of the participants admitted that their Directors managed to settle conflicts between teachers and Directors by combining common views.

T 13 explained, “Our Director would prefer combining common views in settling conflicts between teachers and the Director”.

“Our Director tries to solve the problem within the school by a common agreement” said T 17. 5.17% of the participants argued that their Directors were unable in their strategies to settle conflicts.

T 1 expressed views saying, “Our Director prefers leaving the scene”.

Only one participant (1.72%) admitted that their Director’s strategy in settling conflicts was rarely effective, saying, “Our Director tries to impose self-ideas, which is seldom effective” T 10.

The third section dealt with Paternalist Directors’ approach towards meeting the involved after conflicts and the effectiveness of such attempts. 30 teachers were asked for views about the subject question. Their views are as in Table 4 under rates and themes.

The third section of the study examined the topics during face-to-face meetings between the Director and the involved in the conflict and the effectiveness of this process in solving the problem. 30 teachers were asked to raise their opinions about the subject question. The participants’ views are as shown in Table 4 under rates and themes.

**Table 4.**
Teachers’ views about the topics in face-to-face meetings and their effectiveness in settling conflicts.
As it can be observed in Table 4, %62.12 of the participants stated that the Directors had face-to-face discussions of the topic with individuals. Most of these respondents expressed the aim of discussions as to find a way to solve the problem. Views such as, “Efforts to seek common agreement”, “seeking a solution with all the involved”, “listening to the involved to put an end to the problem”, and “listening to the involved to detect the reason for the problem” were the other statements.

T 9 stated “Our Director holds meetings to put an end to the causes and finds solutions”.

“The Director meets individuals in his office to discuss the problem for a solution” expressed T6. %22.73 of the participants agreed that discussions were effective in settling conflicts.

T 17 said, “Our Director is skillful in settling conflicts through communicating with the involved”.

%13.63 of the participants argued that the discussions were effective on condition that the involved were willing to solve the problem.

T 25 stated, “Conflicts are generally settled, but it depends on the type of problem and the character of the individual”.

Only one participant, T 12 (%1.52) opposed saying, “If the involved have experienced any problems or conflicts before, the discussions do not help. It may seem to be settled, but reoccurs after a short time”.

In section four of this research, Paternalist Directors’ strategies in specifying the causes and ways to prevent reoccurrence of conflicts were dealt with. 30 teachers were asked for their opinions about the subject question. Their views are as shown in Table 5 under rates and themes.

Table 5.
Teachers’ views about Directors strategies in specifying causes and ways to prevent reoccurrence of conflicts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Way of study</td>
<td>Investigates to control the solution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Studies problem to control</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Studies the problem in advance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Studies for early interference</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usually studies the problem</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not study</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPINIONS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevents reoccurrence</td>
<td>Prevents reoccurrence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes measures in advance</td>
<td>Takes measures in advance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggests and recommends leaders</td>
<td>Suggests and recommends leaders</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes guidance</td>
<td>Makes guidance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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As it is revealed in Table 5, % 58.18 of the participants agreed that their Directors study the problem through face-to-face discussions. This strategy is followed by “individual discussions”, respecting to rights”, “studies to collect information”, “studies to control the solution”, “carries out pre-studies”, “studies to find ways for solutions”, “studies to interfere” etc.

T 1 explained, “It is important that the Director has face-to-face communication respecting individuals”.

T 6 said, “Talks to the involved to specify the reasons for the problem”.

%34.56 of the participants stressed that post-study of the problem helped stop reoccurrence.

T 26 stated saying, “The Director follows the settled conflicts and this helps prevent reoccurrence”.

%5.46 of the participants agreed that post-studies in conflicts generally prevented reoccurrence. Meanwhile, a small group of participants (%1.8) opposed to this and expressed that post-studies did not help much in preventing reoccurrence.

T 23 expressed views saying, “The employees’ characters are as important as the efforts by the Director, who is generally successful in his tries”.

The participants were asked to raise views about the most frequently used strategies; “Unifying”, “Accommodating”, “Dominating”, “Avoiding”, and “Compromising” by the Directors in settling conflicts. Their views are as presented in Table 6.

Table 6.
Teachers’ views about their Directors’ strategies in settling conflicts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>Unifying</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>settling/management</td>
<td>Compromising</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategies</td>
<td>Dominating</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accomodating</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoiding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 6 reveals, %46.29 of the participants admitted that their Directors practiced “Unifying”, %40.74 “Compromising”, %5.56 “Dominating”, %5.56 “Accomodating”, and %1.85 “Avoiding” to settle or manage conflicts. The teachers who advocated “Unifying” stated that their Directors listened to the interests and need of the involved and tried to reach a common and fair solution.

The teachers who raised views about “Domination” stressed that their Directors tried to impose self-thoughts or someone else’s thoughts on his side.

As for “Accommodation”, the teachers agreeing with this strategy agued that their Directors supported the idea by someone he picked to be adapted.

Some teacher raised views about “Avoiding” and expressed that their Directors ignored the problem and preferred to leave the scene.

The teachers agreeing in “Compromising” explained that their Directors asked the involved to make concessions and meet at a common point.
Conclusion, Discussion and Suggestions

When leadership styles and conflict solution strategies are considered, there are studies pointing to the connection between these two variables. Doğan (2012) found out a positive meaningful connection between these two strategies. Şirin (2008) investigated the effectiveness among styles and found out a connection between transformist and interactive leadership styles and conflict management strategies. Özkam (2014) referred to the same issues and found a connection between transformist and interactive leadership styles and the effectiveness of Directors at schools. Konak and Erdem (2015) found a connection between leaders’ effectiveness and Directors’ strategies in settling conflicts. However, it is strange, but true that, there does not exist a research explaining the connection between Paternalist Leadership Styles and conflict settling strategies. This is why this research aimed to find out the connection between these two variables.

As the first stage, teachers’ views were asked to specify the most frequently used conflict solution strategies by the Directors with Paternalist Leadership Styles. The findings revealed that the Paternalist Leaders mostly refer to making the involved agree on a common point, which indicates that they manage to settle conflicts among teachers and between the Directors and teachers. “Common decision-making”, “asking for everybody’s views”, “imposing views when necessary”, “producing solutions” are the secondary strategies Directors referred to. Similarly, in literature it is observed that studies done showed “Unifying” as the most frequently practiced strategy. Tiirtek et al., (2015); Arslanat and Özkam (2014); Kircan and Bostanci (2012); Şirin (2008); Şahan (2006); Uğurlu (2001); Kılıç (2006); Şentürk (2006) and Ural (1997) found out that “Accommodating” was the most frequently used strategy. In a study by Kaya (2008), the same strategy was raised by teachers. Özmen and Aküzüm (2010) argued that conflicts in schools were disapproved and the Directors usually preferred “Unifying” and “Compromising” strategies the most. Contrary to Özmen et al., (2011) stressed that conflicts in schools are usually assumed as positive events and “unifying” and “compromising” strategies were referred to the most.

As for the ineffective solution methods, the teachers pointed to “leaders’ leaving the scene, “delaying the discussion of the conflict” or “hiding” strategies. Kâçıksüleymanoğlu and Bingöl (2014) argued that “avoiding” and “hiding” strategies were the least exhibited. Balay (2006), on the other hand, emphasized that Directors mostly preferred “avoiding”, “competing”, and “compromising” strategies. Contrary to this, Gunes (2008) stressed that Directors used “domination” strategy effectively. Similarly, Frat (2010) too, agreed that “domination” was the most frequently used strategy.

When literature is overviewed, a strong connection between conflict solution and communication is observed (Laposi, Dan and Filip, 2015; Nwogbagia, Nwankwo and Onwa, 2015; Egeci and Gencoz, 2011; Karahan, 2009; Cain and Jolliff, 1998; Mores and Ivey, 1996). A big majority of the teachers admitted that Directors tried to settle conflicts through face-to-face meetings. They also added that Directors met the involved to reach a common agreement, seek solutions with the involved, and specify the problem and the cause(s) of conflict. Face-to-face meetings after conflicts, as teachers stated, proved to be effective. This finding is similar to Demirkaya’s (2012) study in conflict settling strategies and communication. Zornoza, Ripoli and Peiro (2002) found out that the two methods, face-to-face and one-to-one communication in the media were effective in conflict settlement.

The participant teachers stated that Directors tried “face-to-face communication” to specify the causes of conflicts. Added to this, they also expressed that Directors often investigated individuals and topics during communication processes with respect to individual rights to collect information about the case, which seems to be an effective way in preventing further conflicts. In their research, Koza and Dant (2007) stated that in organizations where there is mutual respect and positive communication among individuals, the Director is effective in conflict management and performance. In organizational climate, individuals’ culture and beliefs are actually important factors in the sustainability of organizations. In a study Kausal and Kwantes (2006) investigated the effect of Directors’ culture and personalities in settling conflicts and found out that there was a connection between culture and personality and adapting strategies. Wang et. al. (2007) studied the effect of work stress and personal characteristics in settling conflicts and came to a conclusion that the individuals who reflect their personal characters were effective in solving the problem.

In the light of the findings in this study, in order to develop Directors’ Paternalist Leadership traits to establish a sound conflict management, the following are suggested:
a) They should try to meet at a common agreement.
b) Once a conflict is over, they should try face-to-face discussions so as to prevent recurrence of the problem.
c) During or soon after the a conflict, steps should be taken to prevent recurrence.
d) During or after a conflict, unifying or compromising methods should be practiced for the approval of the solution.

School Directors should be well informed in conflict settling methods through in-service training programs.
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