

Understanding the Causes and Manifestations of Conflicts in the Management of Football in Cameroon

Thomas, Nongoh Chenui

Department of Physical Education and Animation,
Faculty of Education, The University of Bamenda, Cameroon

Patrick Kongnyuy Wanyu

Department of Educational Leadership, Faculty of Education,
The University of Bamenda, Cameroon

Emmanuel Shu Ngwa

Department of Educational Leadership, Faculty of Education,
The University of Bamenda, Cameroon

Abstract: This research examined the causes and manifestations of conflicts in the management of football in Cameroon from the perspectives of stakeholders. The study was guided by two objectives and two hypotheses. A mixed sequential nested research design was employed in this study, utilising both quantitative questionnaires and qualitative document analyses to collect opinions from football stakeholders. The stakeholders were selected using the purposive sampling technique. The sample of this study comprises 50 officials of the Cameroon Football Federation (FECAFOOT), 50 club presidents, 200 coaches and players, and 315 fans/media officials, both male and female, from different regions of Cameroon, totalling 615 stakeholders. The questionnaire was pilot tested on 25 stakeholders and a reliability coefficient of 0.735 established. Ethical consideration was ensured through ethical clearance, research authorisation and informed consent. Data was analysed using descriptive (frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations) and inferential (kruskal-wallis H test, pairwise post hoc test and one sample t-test) statistics. The qualitative data was analysed using the thematic narration. The findings revealed 76% approval as against 24% on the possible causes of conflict in football management. In terms of the hypothesis, there was a statistically significant difference in the views of stakeholders ($H = 46.98, P < 0.001$) with regards to the causes of conflict in football management thereby rejecting the null hypothesis. The findings for objective two revealed that 80% of stakeholders supported the listed manifestations of conflicts in football management as against 20%. The null hypothesis was also rejected as there was a statistically significant difference ($H = 21.52, P < 0.001$) in the views of stakeholders with regards to the manifestations of conflict in football management in Cameroon. These quantitative findings were corroborated by the qualitative views from the stakeholders. The researcher therefore recommended the need for FECAFOOT to prioritise the establishment of transparent financial management practices and

robust governance structures to address the primary drivers of conflict identified by stakeholders.

Keywords: Conflicts, football management, causes, manifestations, Cameroon.



This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license

Introduction

Conflicts have existed for a very long time, for example, the Jewish-Roman conflict of 66 BC, which is said to be the oldest conflict in the world. To a greater extent, it is normal for conflict to be part of every organisation. A well-coordinated interaction among different actors involved in managing football is essential for achieving a positive performance. To facilitate such a process, the football managing body needs mechanisms to enhance collaboration, and harmonise seemingly incompatible interests. A substantial body of literature on conflict in organisations has been published over the last five decades (Pondy, 1967; Etzioni, 1969; Duetsch 1973; Perrow, 1986; Amason, 1996; Henkin, et al. 2000; DiPaola and Hoy, 2001) showing that conflict is inevitable and that, depending on how it is managed, conflict can have both positive and negative consequences on football performance. Katz and Kahm (1978), and John (1993) cited in Obasan (2004) identified five types of conflict and these include: conflict within the individual which arises from uncertainty about organisation expectation or the situation where work conflicts with other demands are personal to the individual (intra personal), conflict between individuals which is usually caused by personality difference, for example, conflict between the manager and the subordinates (inter personal), conflict between individuals and group which arises from the methods adopted by an individual to conform to the group norms (Intra group conflict), conflict between groups in the same organisation, this arises from series of factors such as role conflict, power struggle etc. for example, management and line staff conflict, labor management conflict etc. (inter group conflict) and conflict between organisations, this is usually caused by economic factors such as innovation, price war, market share conflict etc. (Inter organisational conflict). Ositoye, Adebayo, Alade and Omolade (2012) classified the types of conflict into; intra-personal conflicts, which occurs within an individual, inter-personal conflict which arises between individuals in the same organisation, meaning that as individuals relate and interact in the same organisation in achieving set objectives, because of the differences that exist in them as individuals and in the organisation, there is bound to be such conflict situation and lastly inter-group conflict, which occurs between groups consequent upon their contact and interaction.

Hartwick and Barki (2002) cited Gray and Stark who suggested several sources of interpersonal conflicts. These include limited resources, interdependent work activities, differentiation of activities, communication problems, differences in perceptions, and the organisational environment. They suggest that individual differences, unclear authority, difference in attitude, task symmetries, and differences in time horizons are contributing factors to interpersonal conflicts. Deutsch and Colman (as cited in Barki and Hartwick, 2002) identified control over resources, preferences, and nuisances, as well as values, beliefs, and the nature of relationships between parties, as sources of interpersonal conflicts.

The history of conflict in football management dates back to the sport's early days. Here are some key events and issues that have contributed to conflicts in football management: Player-owner conflicts (1880s): Disputes over player wages, contracts, and working conditions, Formation of player unions (1890s): Players organised to negotiate better pay, benefits, and working conditions. League formation and expansion (1888-1930s): Conflicts over team membership, promotion, and relegation. Financial disputes (1920s-1930s): Debates over revenue distribution, gate receipts, and player transfer fees. World War II and post-war reconstruction (1939-1950s): Conflicts over

player availability, travel restrictions, and competition scheduling. European competitions and UEFA formation (1950s-1960s): Disputes over tournament formats, qualification, and revenue distribution. Player strikes and boycotts (1960s-1970s): Protests over player rights, wages, and working conditions. FIFA and UEFA power struggles (1970s-1990s): Conflicts over governance, regulations, and tournament control. Bosman ruling and player transfer market (1995): Changes to player contracts, transfer fees, and free agency. Modern issues (2000s-present): Conflicts over financial fair play, owner ownership, fan engagement, and technology adoption. These historical conflicts have shaped the complex landscape of football management, leading to ongoing debates and challenges in areas such as player rights and welfare, financial sustainability and distribution, governance and regulation, technology and innovation, and fan engagement and participation.

The origin of conflict in football management can be traced back to the early days of the sport, with several factors contributing to the emergence of conflicts such as power struggles. There are disputes over control and decision-making authority between owners, managers, players, and governing bodies. Financial interest is another primary source of conflict. Conflicts over revenue distribution, player wages, transfer fees, and sponsorship deals have been a serious problem in football management for time immemorial (Freeman 1999). Competing interests arise when stakeholders have different priorities and goals, such as winning, financial sustainability, player development, and fan satisfaction. Personalities and egos: Clashes between strong-willed individuals, including owners, managers, players, and officials. Cultural and ideological differences which are conflicts arising from varying values, beliefs, and approaches to the game. Information asymmetry refers to the imbalance in access to information, leading to mistrust and conflicts. External pressures such as media scrutiny, fan expectations, and sponsorship demands, contribute to stress and conflict. Regulatory and governance issues such as disputes over rules, regulations, and governance structures. Globalisation and commercialisation have brought conflicts related to the increasing commercialisation and globalization of football. Lastly, we look at historical rivalries and traditions. Long-standing rivalries and conflicting traditions contributing to tensions and conflicts.

Glaring examples postulated by Friedman and Miles (2002) of the origin of conflicts in the management of football can be seen in Manchester United and the Glazer family: Conflict over ownership and debt. Liverpool FC and Hicks/Gillett: Dispute over ownership and financial management. Chelsea FC and Ibramovich: Conflict over ownership and control. Barcelona and Neymar: Dispute over player transfer and contract. Real Madrid and Ronaldo: Conflict over player contract and transfer. FIFA and corruption scandal: Conflict over governance and ethics. UEFA and Champions League reform: Dispute over competition format and revenue distribution. Premier League and TV rights: Conflict over broadcasting and revenue distribution. Football Association and England team performance: Conflict over governance and accountability. Club and player conflicts (e.g., Rooney and Manchester United): Disputes over contracts, transfers, and player rights. These case studies illustrate various conflicts in football management, including: Ownership and control disputes, financial and resource allocation conflicts, player transfer and contract disputes, governance and ethical conflicts, competition format and revenue distribution disputes, and lastly, performance and accountability conflicts

Conflicts in the management of football in Africa are common and has stemmed from various factors such as: Poor governance and leadership, political interference, financial mismanagement, corruption, disputes over resources and facilities, ethnic and nationalistic tensions, conflict between traditional and modern approaches to football management, Some case studies of conflicts in African football management include: CAF (Confederation of African Football) and FIFA (Fédération Internationale de Football Association) disputes over governance and representation, Nigerian Football Federation (NFF) and Super Eagles players' dispute over bonuses and pay, South African Football Association (SAFA) and Kaizer Chiefs' dispute over league structure and promotion, Egyptian Football Association (EFA) and Al Ahly's dispute over

club licensing and regulations, Ghana Football Association (GFA) and Black Stars' dispute over player selection and bonuses, Kenyan Football Federation (KFF) and Gor Mahia's dispute over league structure and sponsorship, Zambian Football Galtung's (1998). Association (ZFA) and Chipolopolo's dispute over player selection and bonuses. These conflicts often result in: Disruptions to league and tournament schedules, financial losses for clubs and associations, damage to the reputation of African football, loss of sponsorship and investment opportunities and finally, negative impact on player development and performance.

The word conflict brings to mind images such as antagonism, struggles between parties, opposition processes and threats to cooperation. But not all conflicts come in these forms especially in an organisation. They come in form of needs to be met or desires to be satisfied, disagreements to be settled and ideas to be shared that eventually lead to change of attitudes, feelings and perceptions. Schramm-Nielsen (2002) defines conflict as a state of serious disagreement and argument about something perceived to be important by at least one of the parties involved. In his opinion, Aguba (2009) refers to conflict as a struggle or contest, when workers and management have incompatible, conflicting or irreconcilable views on issues that could lead to conflict.

Many people view conflict as an activity that is almost totally negative and has no redeeming qualities, while other schools of thought accept it as dysfunctional, destructive, but at the same time, as a catalyst for change, creativity and production (Posisha & Ogbuwua, 2009). When differences come to force, collisions, strives, controversies, discords, friction and disagreements cannot be avoided. These are evidences of conflicts. This phenomenon informed the submission of Akomolafe (2002), that conflict is unavoidable in any organisation. Ajayi and Ayodele (2002) believe that conflict is inevitable, while Gilhin (2004) submits that conflict is a normal part of man's social relations. No human organisation is thus immune to conflict. Conflict can also brake out when one party attempt to hinder the goal achievement of the other one. Alabi (2010) sees conflict to be in opposition to another or each other or as disagreement. Kesterner and Ray (2002) believe conflict involves two parties (individuals, groups or states), each striving for goals which can only be reached by one party, and, or wanting to employ incompatible means to achieve certain goals. It thus implies struggle over values or claims to status, power and scarce resources in which the aims of the groups or individuals involved are not only to obtain the desired values but also to neutralise, injure or eliminate rivals.

However, Pondy (1966) opines that it is probable that the causes for conflicts are not highly correlated with goal and objective achievements in organisations of routine behavior where procedures are well-defined and working environment is stable. In these circumstances, conflict variables are probably more related to personality, autonomy reasons, functional interdependence and status. Best (2006:19) defines conflict as the pursuit of incompatible interests and goals by different groups. It is therefore possible to argue that conflict is endemic in nature of human relationships and societies. It is the result of interaction among people, an unavoidable concomitant of choices and decisions and an expression of the basic fact of human interdependence (Adejuwon & Okewale, 2009). Conflict entails discord in actions, lack of concordance in opinion in order to achieve one's goal. It connotes disagreement, distortions, inconsistencies, and antagonisms existing in a particular system.

Conflict is a common social phenomenon which occurs in human society of which the school is a part of. In a secondary school system, the principal is the head of the institution. Principal and other managers while performing their duties may find themselves stepping into the shoes of their subjects which lead to conflict. Kenan (2013) conflicts are normal in any organisation, because people have different opinions, while some individuals cannot accept other people's different opinion which leads to conflict.

Onwurah & Oboegbulem (2011) sees conflict as common occurrences in life. They are inevitable in all organizations, educational institutions inclusive. They involve human beings with varied interests, goal and aspirations. Conflict is therefore a social problem. Ughamadu (2008) defined conflict as a “disagreement over an issue, sometimes such disagreement may be, positive or negative whichever way. Whether in the family, Industrial, national or international setting, it is normal occurrence in human relations, because the society or mankind needs to disagree in order to agree”. Based on the fore going definitions, that conflict is a normal occurrence in human relations, it could breed positive or negative change and as such management of conflict comes in to play a role. Management is a process by which human and non-human resources are coordinated to accomplish a given set of objectives (Nwachukwu, 1998). Conflict management is defined as the different ways or alternatives of the actors that they themselves can manage conflict (Lewicki et al., 2003). Van de Vliert (1997) defines conflict management as what people intend to do as well as what they actually do when they experience conflict.

Conflict in football management, according to Albert (2010), refers to the coordinated and timely application of political, economic, military and or security measures taken in response to a situation threatening peace, intending to defuse the tensed situation, prevent escalation or achieving a peaceful settlement of a dispute. Knippen and Green (1999), cited in Henry (2009), argue that the best way to handle conflicts objectively is to follow six processes that involve describing the conflict situation to the other person, asking the other person how he sees the conflict situation, responding the way the other person sees the situation, jointly deciding how to resolve the conflict, making commitment to resolve the conflicts, and promising to be committed in future to continue resolving conflicts, which might arise.

Contextual underpinning

The concept of conflicts in the management of football in Cameroon refers to the disputes, disagreements, and contradictions that arise within the Cameroonian football sector. These conflicts may involve various stakeholders, including Football authorities (e.g., FECAFOOT, MINSEP), clubs and teams, players and coaches, sponsors and partners, government and political entities, the media, and fans. Conflicts may arise from governance and leadership issues, financial management and resource allocation, political interference and influence, cultural and traditional factors, personal interests and agendas, communication breakdowns and misunderstandings, lack of transparency and accountability, disputes over resources and facilities, conflicting values and interests, external pressures and influences. These conflicts can manifest in various ways, such as: power struggles and leadership disputes, financial mismanagement and corruption, political interference in football decisions, cultural and traditional practices conflicting with modern football management, personal interests prioritised over collective goals, poor communication and misunderstandings leading to conflicts, lack of transparency and accountability fueling mistrust, disputes over resources and facilities hindering development, conflicting values and interests causing tensions, external pressures and influences compromising football decisions. It is paramount that understanding the concept of conflicts in Cameroonian football management is crucial for identifying and addressing the root causes of these conflicts, and developing effective strategies for conflict resolution and management.

Interpersonal conflict, defined as a disagreement between two individuals, often arises from the inherent differences in personalities, leading to incompatible choices and opinions (Hocker and Wilmot, 2018). While such conflicts are a natural part of human interactions and can facilitate personal growth and the strengthening of relationships, it is crucial to manage them effectively (Deutsch, 2017). Adjustments and open communication are essential strategies for resolving these conflicts; however, when interpersonal disputes become excessively destructive, involving a mediator can be beneficial in reaching a resolution (Boullé, 2018). Thus, understanding the

dynamics of interpersonal conflict is vital for fostering healthier relationships and promoting personal development.

Intrapersonal conflict refers to the internal struggles an individual face, often stemming from frustration with personal goals, targets, or accomplishments, as well as competing values and moral dilemmas (Kahn and Byosiere, 1992). This type of conflict can manifest in several ways, including motivational conflicts, where an individual struggle to make decisions; moral conflicts, which involve a struggle between competing ethical beliefs; and conflicts arising from the disparity between one's current reality and aspirations, often characterised by unrealised desires or imbalanced self-appraisal (Kahn et al., 2001). Understanding these dimensions of intrapersonal conflict is essential for personal growth and effective decision-making.

Intrapersonal conflicts can be categorised into three main types: approach-approach conflict, avoidance-avoidance conflict, and approach-avoidance conflict. Approach-approach conflict occurs when an individual must choose between two positive and equally attractive alternatives, such as deciding between two job offers or choosing between love marriage and arranged marriage when one has feelings for both parties (Gerrard et al., 2019). Avoidance-avoidance conflict arises when a person is faced with two negative and equally unattractive options, such as choosing between accepting a job transfer to another town or facing termination of employment (Cohen and Janicki, 2020). Finally, approach-avoidance conflict involves a choice between an option that has both positive and negative consequences, such as accepting a job with a high salary but in an insecure and hostile environment (Kahneman, 2011). Understanding these types of intrapersonal conflicts is crucial for effective decision-making and personal development.

Intragroup conflict occurs among individuals within a team, often stemming from interpersonal disagreements and misunderstandings, such as differing personalities that can create tension (Jehn, 2019). Conversely, intergroup conflict arises between different teams or departments within an organisation, often due to miscommunications and the pursuit of divergent goals and interests, as seen when the sales department clashes with customer support (Tjosvold, 2020). Additionally, competition among groups can exacerbate these conflicts, leading to further misunderstandings and friction (Robinson and Judge, 2019). Understanding these dynamics is essential for fostering Collaboration and Mitigating Conflict in Organizational Settings.

The resultant climate of corruption and poor governance practices has eroded trust among stakeholders, while unequal resource distribution and regional disparities have further fuelled resentment and conflict within the football community (Maguire, 2018). Grassroots actors such as players and fans exhibit a stronger consensus on the identified issues compared to institutional actors like club owners (Nguimkeu, 2021). This discrepancy underscores a disconnect between those directly affected by the conflicts and those in positions of authority who may be reluctant to acknowledge systemic failures (Tchouawou, 2020). political interference and corruption, have created a complex web of challenges that hinder effective football management (Adeleke and Adebayo, 2019). Limited infrastructure and financial mismanagement exacerbate these issues, while ethnic and regional exclusiveness intensify infighting, particularly between the Francophone majority and Anglophone communities (Morrow, 2019).

Theoretical underpinning

Two theories were used to explain the relationship among the two variables under investigation which are conflict in the management and stakeholder's perspectives and the relevance of these theories to the study equally highlighted. These theories were selected based on the different phases of conflict in the management of football. Firstly, the Human Relations Movement Theory (behavioral approach) of Elton Mayo (1951) which emphasises on the leader's role to diagnose and provide solutions to worker's grievances and complaints rather than going into confrontations with them. In this study, this theory can be applied in several ways such as building players

relationship. Strong relationships between players, coaches, and staff to create a positive team culture. It also related in football management in that it motivates the actors of football as a whole. Understanding what motivates players, such as personal growth, achievement, or recognition, to optimise performance. It also encouraging open communication to prevent misunderstandings, resolve conflicts, and foster collaboration. This theory is also very important when looking at the team dynamics. That is recognising the impact of social interactions on team cohesion, morale, and overall performance. By recognising the social and human aspects of football management, managers can create a more productive, successful, and sustainable team environment.

Stakeholder theory is a business ethics and organisational management theory that considers the needs of all stakeholders impacted by a business, not just shareholders. The theory suggest that businesses should balance the needs of all stakeholders, including employees, suppliers, customers, and the community, in order to serve the greater good. This theory focuses on sustainability, employee satisfaction, customer relationships, and community engagement. Stakeholders are groups or individuals “who can affect or, are affected by the achievement of the firm’s objectives” (Freeman, 1984) Yet, as popular and richly descriptive as this term may seem, there is still no agreement on what Freeman (1994) calls “The Principle of Who or What Really Counts” (Mitchell, Agle, & Wood, 1997). Since Freeman (1984) introduced stakeholder theory into the management lexicon, a diverse stakeholder literature has developed. This theory is applicable in football management in that it considers the interest and needs of all stakeholders for building a successful and sustainable organisation. By applying the stakeholder’s theory, football managers can create a positive and productive environment that’s benefits everyone involved.

GENERAL OBJECTIVE

This study generally examined stakeholder’s perspectives on the causes and manifestations of conflicts in the management of football in Cameroon. It specifically examined

- Stakeholders’ perspectives on the causes of conflicts in football management in Cameroon.
- Stakeholders’ perspectives on the manifestation of conflicts in football management in Cameroon.

RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

The study tested the following null hypotheses (Ho)

- There is no significant difference in the views of club presidents and football fans with regards to the causes of conflicts in football management in Cameroon.
- There is no significant difference in the views of players, coaches and football media with regards to the manifestation of conflicts in football management in Cameroon.

RESEARCH METHOD

The research was both a quantitative and qualitative study that anchored the Mixed Sequential Nested Research Design was used. This design was used since the study was aimed at determining the relationship that exists between FECAFOOT and other football stakeholders. By gathering and analysing data from football stakeholders and FECAFOOT officials in Cameroon who are considered to be representatives of the entire population and findings from this study was generalised to all the football teams in Cameroon. The approach used was a dual approach consisting of both quantitative and qualitative methods. Amin (2005) says qualitative research promotes greater understanding of not just the way things are, but also why they are the way they are. Thus, the research employed qualitative methods such as review of documents (journals, articles, government decrees, reports from the regional delegation of FECAFOOT and books), so as to get useful information for the study. The quantitative data was gotten through the use of questionnaires. The questionnaire was pilot tested on 25 stakeholders and a reliability coefficient of 0.74 established using the internal consistency reliability.

Data obtained from the field were first cleaned, coded, and entered into Microsoft Excel and subsequently exported to the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, Version XX) and

R for analysis. The analysis proceeded in several stages, reflecting both descriptive and inferential techniques.

The questionnaire was structured predominantly around a four-point Likert scale with response categories of *Strongly Agree (SA)*, *Agree (A)*, *Disagree (D)*, and *Strongly Disagree (SD)*. In the first stage of analysis, these Likert responses were stretched by assigning numerical values in ascending order (e.g., $SD = 1$, $D = 2$, $A = 3$, $SA = 4$) to facilitate the computation of mean scores and other statistical summaries. This stretching allowed the responses to be treated as ordinal-level data and enabled the use of non-parametric inferential statistics to test differences across stakeholder groups.

In the second stage, the items were collapsed into two broader categories agreement (*SA* and *A*) versus disagreement (*D* and *SD*) in order to highlight overall response trends and simplify interpretation. Collapsed data were presented in frequency distribution tables, with both raw counts and percentages reported, to show the proportion of respondents who endorsed or rejected each item. The “decision” column in these tables was determined based on whether the majority of responses fell into the agreement or disagreement categories.

Descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations) were used to summarise respondents’ demographic characteristics and general patterns of perception across the two thematic sections of the study: causes of conflict and conflict manifestation.

Inferential analysis was then conducted to test the research hypotheses. The Kruskal-Wallis H test was applied to determine whether there were significant differences in perceptions among the various stakeholder groups. The Kruskal-Wallis test indicated statistical significance; pairwise post hoc tests using the Mann-Whitney U test with Holm correction were conducted to establish where the differences lay and to compute effect sizes. For comparisons involving only two groups, the Mann-Whitney U test was directly employed. One-sample t-tests (and in some cases, non-parametric Wilcoxon signed-rank tests) were used to determine whether the mean scores of individual stakeholder groups significantly differed from the neutral midpoint of the scale. Effect sizes were reported alongside all inferential tests to provide a measure of the magnitude of the observed differences.

The results of these analyses are presented using a combination of tables and detailed narrative descriptions, with each table referenced and interpreted to demonstrate the key findings of the study.

The qualitative data from document analyses streamlined the analytical process, making it easier to draw comparisons and extract meaningful insights while remaining open to emergent themes that could not fit into the framework. Overall, thematic narration analysis ensured flexibility, aiding in the systematic exploration of complex qualitative data.

FINDINGS

Out of the total sample, the majority were male (323; 81.6%), while females accounted for only 18.4% ($n = 73$). This imbalance reflects the gendered participation trends in football management and engagement in Cameroon, where men continue to dominate. With respect to stakeholder distribution, football fans constituted nearly half of the respondents ($n = 194$; 49%), underscoring their critical role in shaping and perceiving conflicts in the game. Football players represented 20.5% ($n = 81$), followed by coaches at 18.9% ($n = 75$). FECAFOOT workers accounted for 5.3% ($n = 21$), while football media/press personnel and football club owners were the least represented groups, contributing 3.3% ($n = 13$) and 3% ($n = 12$) respectively.

Table 1: Distribution of respondents by sex and stakeholders

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Sex	Male	323	81.6
	Female	73	18.4
Stakeholder	Football Fans	194	49
	Football Players	81	20.5
	Coaches	75	18.9
	FECAFOOT Workers	21	5.3
	Football Media/Press	13	3.3
	Football Club Owner	12	3
TOTAL		396	100

Taken together, the distribution indicates that while the sample was diverse and captured perspectives across the key categories of football stakeholders, it was strongly weighted towards fans, players, and coaches, who together formed close to 90% of the respondents.

Objective 1: Stakeholders' perspectives on the causes of conflicts in football management in Cameroon

Table 2: Respondents' perception on the causes of conflict in the management of football in Cameroon

Item	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Collapsed		Decision
					A/SA	D/SD	
The fight over FECAFOOT financial resources is the cause of conflicts in the management of football in Cameroon.	241 (61.0%)	103 (26.0%)	50 (12.5%)	2 (0.5%)	344 (87%)	52 (13%)	Agree
Political interference by political stakeholders is a cause of conflict in the management of football in Cameroon	212 (54.0%)	142 (36.0%)	42 (11.0%)	0 (0.0%)	354 (89%)	42 (11%)	Agree
Poor management of football finances are a cause of conflict in the management of football in Cameroon	217 (55.0%)	142 (36.0%)	37 (9.0%)	0 (0.0%)	359 (91%)	37 (9%)	Agree
Self-interest amongst members of the football management body is the cause of conflict in the management of football in Cameroon	201 (51.0%)	152 (38.0%)	43 (11.0%)	0 (0.0%)	353 (89%)	43 (11%)	Agree
Disrespect of football hierarchy by licensed players is the cause of conflicts in the management of football in Cameroon	53 (13.0%)	95 (24.0%)	200 (50.5%)	48 (12.1%)	148 (37%)	248 (63%)	Disagree
The disrespect for the laws of football managers is the cause of conflicts in the management of football in Cameroon	79 (20.0%)	179 (45.0%)	138 (35.0%)	0 (0.0%)	258 (65%)	138 (35%)	Agree
Jealousy amongst football	118	159	119	0	277	119	Agree

stakeholders is the cause of conflicts in the management of football in Cameroon	(30.0%)	(40.0%)	(30.0%)	(0.0%)	(70%)	(30%)	
Disbursement of subventions to football clubs is the cause of conflict in the management of football in Cameroon	182 (46.0%)	132 (33.0%)	82 (21.0%)	0 (0.0%)	314 (79%)	82 (21%)	Agree
Favoritism/discrimination in the management of players is responsible for conflict in the management of football in Cameroon	163 (41.0%)	144 (36.0%)	80 (20.0%)	9 (2.0%)	307 (78%)	89 (22%)	Agree
Regional/ Ethnic sentiments within the football management body is responsible for conflicts in the management of football in Cameroon	141 (36.0%)	153 (39.0%)	90 (23.0%)	12 (3.0%)	294 (74%)	102 (26%)	Agree
Multiple response set	1607 (41%)	1401 (35%)	952 (22.2%)	71 (1.8%)	3008 (76%)	952 (24%)	Agree

The findings from the table above indicate that the majority of respondents agreed that most of the listed factors are significant contributors to conflicts in football management. For example, 87% either agreed or strongly agreed that the fight over FECAFOOT financial resources is a cause of conflicts, while only 13% disagreed. Similarly, 89% of the respondents attributed conflicts to political interference by political stakeholders, and 91% associated them with poor financial management, both of which were overwhelmingly endorsed as important drivers of conflict. Self-interest among members of the football management body was also strongly supported as a cause of conflict, with 89% agreement.

However, disagreement was more pronounced in the case of disrespect of football hierarchy by licensed players, where 63% of respondents disagreed compared to 37% who agreed, suggesting that this factor was not widely perceived as a major source of conflict. By contrast, other governance-related issues such as disrespect for the laws of football managers (65% agreement), jealousy among stakeholders (70%), and disbursement of subventions to football clubs (79%) were regarded as significant contributors to conflict. Favoritism and discrimination in player management were similarly recognised by 78% of respondents, while regional and ethnic sentiments were endorsed by 74%.

Taken together, the multiple response set shows that 76% of all responses across items indicated agreement, with only 24% reflecting disagreement. This pattern reinforces the conclusion that stakeholders generally perceive structural, political, and financial mismanagement issues as the primary sources of conflict in the management of football in Cameroon, as summarised in Table 2

Testing of hypothesis 1: Ho1: There is no significant difference in the views of stakeholders with regards the causes of conflict in the management of football in Cameroon

Table 3: Pairwise comparisons of stakeholders' mean approval ratings of the causes of conflict in the management of football in Cameroon

Group1	Group2	Mean1	Mean2	U	P-value	Effect size r	Decision
Football Fans	Football Media/Press	2.78	2.83	1249.5	1	0.004	Not Significant
Football Fans	Coaches	2.78	2.52	8713.5	0.0767	0.153	Not Significant
Football Fans	Football Players	2.78	3.15	5863.5	0.0071	0.2	Significant; Football Players > Football Fans
Football Fans	Football Club Owner	2.78	1.55	2029.5	0.0002	0.301	Significant; Football Fans > Football Club Owner
Football Fans	FECAFOOT Workers	2.78	2.65	2268	1	0.058	Not Significant
Football Media/Press	Coaches	2.83	2.52	570	1	0.103	Not Significant
Football Media/Press	Football Players	2.83	3.15	369	0.453	0.178	Not Significant
Football Media/Press	Football Club Owner	2.83	1.55	142.5	0.0045	0.702	Significant; Football Media/Press > Football Club Owner
Football Media/Press	FECAFOOT Workers	2.83	2.65	145.5	1	0.055	Not Significant
Coaches	Football Players	2.52	3.15	1642.5	0	0.396	Significant; Football Players > Coaches
Coaches	Football Club Owner	2.52	1.55	724.5	0.0071	0.362	Significant; Coaches > Football Club Owner
Coaches	FECAFOOT Workers	2.52	2.65	715.5	1	0.065	Not Significant
Football Players	Football Club Owner	3.15	1.55	945	0	0.545	Significant; Football Players > Football Club Owner
Football Players	FECAFOOT Workers	3.15	2.65	1197	0.0235	0.284	Significant; Football Players > FECAFOOT Workers
Football Club Owner	FECAFOOT Workers	1.55	2.65	36	0.0071	0.586	Significant; FECAFOOT Workers > Football Club Owner
Kruskal Wallis Test: H statistic = 46.98, P-value < 0.001							

To understand Research Objective One, the results of pairwise comparisons of stakeholders' mean approval ratings regarding the causes of conflict in football management in Cameroon are presented in Table 3 above. The Kruskal-Wallis test revealed significant overall differences among groups, $H = 46.98$, $p < 0.001$, thereby justifying post hoc exploration. The results show that football players reported significantly higher approval ratings than football fans ($M = 3.15$ vs 2.78 , $p = 0.007$, $r = 0.20$) and coaches ($M = 3.15$ vs 2.52 , $p < 0.001$, $r = 0.40$). Football fans, on the other hand, scored significantly higher than club owners ($M = 2.78$ vs 1.55 , $p < 0.001$, $r = 0.30$). Similarly, football media/press respondents recorded significantly higher ratings than club owners ($M = 2.83$ vs 1.55 , $p = 0.005$, $r = 0.70$), while coaches were also significantly more approving than club owners ($M = 2.52$ vs 1.55 , $p = 0.007$, $r = 0.36$). Comparisons between football players and FECAFOOT workers further indicated that players had higher approval

ratings ($M = 3.15$ vs 2.65 , $p = 0.023$, $r = 0.28$). Interestingly, FECAFOOT workers themselves scored significantly higher than club owners ($M = 2.65$ vs 1.55 , $p = 0.007$, $r = 0.59$).

Taken together, these results suggest that football players consistently expressed stronger approval of the identified causes of conflict compared to other groups, whereas club owners were repeatedly rated the lowest across several comparisons. These findings highlight a clear divide in perceptions between grassroots stakeholders such as players and fans, and institutional actors like club owners.

Objective 2: Stakeholders' perspectives on the manifestation of conflicts in football management in Cameroon.

Table 4: Respondents' perception on conflict manifestation in the management of football in Cameroon

Item	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Collapsed		Decision
					A/SA	D/SD	
Conflict in football management is manifested through bitter exchanges by football stakeholders	147 (37.0%)	192 (48.0%)	57 (14.0%)	0 (0.0%)	339 (86%)	57 (14%)	Agree
Conflict in football management is manifested through boycott of meetings by stakeholders	92 (23.0%)	210 (53.0%)	90 (22.7%)	4 (1.0%)	302 (76%)	94 (24%)	Agree
Conflict in football management is manifested through the withholding of football resources for players and other stakeholders	123 (31.0%)	187 (47.0%)	86 (22.0%)	0 (0.0%)	310 (78%)	86 (22%)	Agree
Conflict in football management is manifested through the issuing of counter instructions by football stakeholders	120 (30.0%)	175 (44.0%)	95 (23.9%)	6 (1.5%)	295 (74%)	101 (26%)	Agree
Conflict in football management in Cameroon is manifested through open fight among stakeholders	109 (28.0%)	179 (45.0%)	100 (25.3%)	8 (2.0%)	288 (73%)	108 (27%)	Agree
Conflict in football management in Cameroon is manifested through verbal abuses	115 (29.0%)	214 (54.0%)	67 (17.0%)	0 (0.0%)	329 (83%)	67 (17%)	Agree
Conflict in the management of football in Cameroon is manifested through violent clashes between fans, players and officials during matches	157 (40.0%)	149 (38.0%)	90 (23.0%)	0 (0.0%)	306 (77%)	90 (23%)	Agree
Conflict in the management of football in Cameroon is manifested through bribery, and embezzlement by officials	225 (57.0%)	114 (29.0%)	57 (14.0%)	0 (0.0%)	339 (86%)	57 (14%)	Agree
Conflict in the management of	178	185	33	0	363	33	Agree

football in Cameroon is manifested through power tussle among football officials	(45.0%)	(47.0%)	(8.0%)	(0.0%)	(92%)	(8%)	
Conflict in the management of football in Cameroon is manifested through collusion between players, officials and external parties to manipulate match outcomes	147 (37.0%)	165 (42.0%)	80 (20.2%)	4 (1.0%)	312 (79%)	84 (21%)	Agree
Multiple response set	1413 (36%)	1770 (45%)	755 (19%)	22 (0.1%)	3183 (80%)	777 (20%)	Agree

Table 4 presents respondents' perceptions of how conflicts manifest in the management of football in Cameroon. The majority of participants reported that conflict is commonly expressed through verbal exchanges and hostile interactions among stakeholders. For instance, 86% of the respondents agreed that bitter exchanges are a key form of manifestation, while 76% endorsed boycotts of meetings by stakeholders as a frequent occurrence. Similarly, 78% of participants agreed that withholding of football resources is a manifestation of conflict, whereas 74% acknowledged the issuing of counter instructions as another expression of disagreement.

Other prominent indicators of conflict include open fights (73%) and verbal abuses (83%), both of which were highly endorsed by respondents as typical conflict behaviours. Additionally, violent clashes during matches were perceived as significant by 77% of participants, while bribery and embezzlement by officials attracted 86% agreement, suggesting that corruption-related practices are widely recognised as conflict manifestations. Moreover, power tussles among football officials received the highest endorsement, with 92% of respondents affirming this as a dominant form of conflict, and collusion among players, officials, and external parties to manipulate match outcomes was supported by 79% of the sample.

Overall, the multiple response set shows that 80% of responses indicated agreement with the listed manifestations, while only 20% reflected disagreement. These findings point to a strong consensus among stakeholders that both interpersonal tensions and systemic malpractices constitute major ways in which conflict is expressed in football management in Cameroon.

Testing of hypothesis 2: Ho2: There is no significant difference in the views of stakeholders with regards to the manifestation of conflicts in football management in Cameroon

Table 5: Pairwise comparisons of stakeholders' mean approval ratings of the manifestation of conflicts in football management in Cameroon

Group1	Group2	Mean 1	Mean 2	U	Adj. p	Effect size r	Decision
Football Fans	Football Media/Press	3.26	3.35	1270.5	1	0.003	Not Significant
Football Fans	Coaches	3.26	2.96	8434.5	0.4232	0.124	Not Significant
Football Fans	Football Players	3.26	3.48	6685.5	0.4454	0.118	Not Significant
Football Fans	Football Club Owner	3.26	2.7	1665	0.1277	0.174	Not Significant
Football Fans	FECAFOOT Workers	3.26	2.91	2556	0.4454	0.131	Not Significant
Football Media/Press	Coaches	3.35	2.96	564	1	0.096	Not Significant

Football Media/Press	Football Players	3.35	3.48	435	1	0.103	Not Significant
Football Media/Press	Football Club Owner	3.35	2.7	114	0.4454	0.392	Not Significant
Football Media/Press	FECAFOOT Workers	3.35	2.91	181.5	0.754	0.273	Not Significant
Coaches	Football Players	2.96	3.48	2137.5	0.0156	0.256	Significant; Football Players > Coaches
Coaches	Football Club Owner	2.96	2.7	562.5	0.9706	0.148	Not Significant
Coaches	FECAFOOT Workers	2.96	2.91	828	1	0.037	Not Significant
Football Players	Football Club Owner	3.48	2.7	760.5	0.0156	0.326	Significant; Football Players > Football Club Owner
Football Players	FECAFOOT Workers	3.48	2.91	1197	0.0357	0.284	Significant; Football Players > FECAFOOT Workers
Football Club Owner	FECAFOOT Workers	2.7	2.91	108	1	0.117	Not Significant

Table 5 presents the pairwise comparisons of stakeholders' mean approval ratings regarding the manifestation of conflicts in football management in Cameroon. The Kruskal–Wallis test confirmed significant overall differences among stakeholder groups, $H = 21.52$, $p < 0.001$. Post hoc analyses revealed that football players consistently recorded higher mean scores compared to several other groups. Specifically, players scored significantly higher than coaches ($M = 3.48$ vs 2.96 , $p = 0.016$, $r = 0.26$), football club owners ($M = 3.48$ vs 2.70 , $p = 0.016$, $r = 0.33$), and FECAFOOT workers ($M = 3.48$ vs 2.91 , $p = 0.036$, $r = 0.28$). These findings suggest that players perceive manifestations of conflict, such as verbal abuses, violent clashes, or corruption-related behaviors, more strongly than these other stakeholder groups.

No statistically significant differences were observed between football fans, media/press representatives, coaches, or FECAFOOT workers in most pairwise comparisons, as their mean ratings were relatively close and did not reach the threshold for significance after adjustment. Notably, football club owners consistently registered lower mean approval ratings across comparisons, which placed them in sharp contrast with players, who repeatedly scored the highest.

In summary, while all groups recognised conflict manifestations to varying degrees, the results underscore a clear divergence between players who reported the strongest endorsement of these conflict behaviours and institutional stakeholders such as club owners and coaches, whose ratings were markedly lower.

DISCUSSION

From the findings, a striking 87% of respondents acknowledged that the struggle for FECAFOOT's financial resources is a primary driver of conflict, which aligns with existing literature that emphasizes financial disputes as a common source of conflict in football management (Katz et al., 2020; Smith, 2019). Also, the overwhelming agreement (89%) on the impact of political interference underscores the pervasive influence of external stakeholders in shaping the dynamics of football management. This is consistent with studies that illustrate how political interests can complicate governance structures and lead to conflict within sports

organisations (Maguire, 2018; O’Leary, 2021). Furthermore, the high level of agreement (91%) regarding poor financial management as a conflict driver reflects a broader trend seen in sports management research, where mismanagement of funds often results in organisational strife (Hums and MacLean, 2017).

Conversely, the relatively high level of disagreement regarding the role of disrespect by licensed players towards football hierarchy suggests a nuanced understanding of interpersonal dynamics within the sport. With 63% of respondents rejecting this notion, it suggests that stakeholders may perceive conflicts as stemming more from systemic issues rather than individual behaviours (FIFA, 2022). The strong agreement on football management related issues such as jealousy among stakeholders (70%) and favoritism in player management (78%) further illustrates that interpersonal relationships and perceived inequities are critical factors in conflict dynamics. The endorsement of regional and ethnic sentiments (74%) also highlights the intersection of social identity and conflict, which has been documented in various studies on sports management and community relations (Bairner, 2017; Morrow, 2019). From the findings, it is evident that while individual behaviors play a role in conflicts, structural and systemic issues are viewed as the more significant contributors to discord in football management in Cameroon.

The findings from the Kruskal Wallis test indicate a significant divergence in the perceptions of various stakeholders regarding the causes of conflict in the management of football in Cameroon. Football players exhibited notably higher approval ratings for the identified conflict causes compared to other groups, including fans and coaches. This aligns with previous research suggesting that players are often more attuned to the nuances of conflict within their environment, as they are directly impacted by management decisions (Smith et al., 2019; Hums and MacLean, 2017). The harsh contrast between the ratings of club owners and those of grassroots stakeholders like players and fans underscores a potential disconnect between the experiences and perspectives of those actively engaged in football versus those in positions of authority. This observation resonates with findings by Maguire (2018), who noted that institutional actors may overlook the grassroots realities that significantly shape conflict dynamics in sports organisations. Furthermore, the lower ratings from club owners may reflect their focus on financial aspects and organisational stability rather than the interpersonal and operational conflicts experienced by players and fans (Katz et al., 2020).

From the findings, the limited infrastructure available for football in Cameroon poses significant hurdles that further entrench these systemic issues. Financial mismanagement has been a recurring theme in stakeholder interviews, highlighting how inadequate funding and resources can stifle the growth and professionalisation of the sport (Adeleke and Adebayo, 2019). The absence of proper facilities not only affects player training and development but also diminishes the overall appeal of football in the country, leading to a vicious cycle of underperformance and discontent among stakeholders (Maguire, 2018). Such infrastructural deficiencies are indicative of a broader neglect of sports development, where investment in essential resources is overshadowed by internal conflicts and power struggles within governing bodies (Tchouawou, 2020). Consequently, these findings illustrate that resolving conflicts in Cameroonian football management requires a comprehensive approach that addresses both governance and infrastructural challenges to foster a more sustainable and equitable football environment (Morrow, 2019; Nguimkeu, 2021).

From the findings, the study highlights significant divergences in perceptions regarding the causes of conflict among various stakeholders, revealing that grassroots actors such as players and fans exhibit a stronger consensus on the identified issues compared to institutional actors like club owners (Nguimkeu, 2021). This discrepancy underscores a disconnect between those directly affected by the conflicts and those in positions of authority who may be reluctant to acknowledge systemic failures (Tchouawou, 2020). The qualitative analysis further reinforces these findings, illustrating how power struggles between FECAFOOT and MINSEP, alongside external

influences such as political interference and corruption, have created a complex web of challenges that hinder effective football management (Adeleke and Adebayo, 2019). Additionally, the impacts of limited infrastructure and financial mismanagement exacerbate these issues, while ethnic and regional exclusiveness intensify infighting, particularly between the Francophone majority and Anglophone communities (Morrow, 2019). Collectively, these elements contribute to an environment that is not only rife with conflict but also resistant to meaningful reform, perpetuating inequity within the Cameroonian football landscape.

The findings regarding conflicts in the management of football in Cameroon underscore the critical role of power dynamics and communication styles. The prevailing authoritarian communication style, characterised by government dominance and interference, creates an environment ripe for conflict, particularly between the Cameroon Football Federation (FECAFOOT) and the Ministry of Sports and Physical Education (MINSEP). This struggle for control is exacerbated by misunderstandings arising from varying communication styles among stakeholders, ranging from direct assertiveness to more diplomatic approaches (Ngwa, 2022; Tchouatcha, 2021). Cultural factors also play a significant role, as they influence how individuals interpret and respond to conflicts, further complicating interactions (Fongang, 2023). Moreover, external influences from governing bodies like FIFA and CAF can be perceived as intrusive, intensifying existing tensions and contributing to a climate of distrust among stakeholders (Mouelle, 2020). Such an environment not only hampers effective management but also undermines the integrity of the football itself, as competing interests often overshadow collaborative efforts (Njeuma, 2023).

The study reveals notable disparities in perceptions of conflict manifestation among different stakeholder groups, with players consistently reporting higher levels of agreement regarding the existence and impact of conflicts compared to club owners, who recorded the lowest ratings (Biyong, 2022). This quantitative divergence aligns with qualitative findings that illustrate how conflicting parties utilise media campaigns and public accusations to amplify their grievances and sway public opinion (Ngong, 2021). The strategic use of media reflects a broader trend where power dynamics rooted in authoritarian communication styles and government interference fuel these conflicts (Fongang, 2023). However, the research also highlights the potential for collaborative leadership practices to serve as a remedy. By fostering trust, addressing power imbalances, and enhancing communication channels among stakeholders, such practices could mitigate conflicts and promote a more inclusive governance model in Cameroonian football (Mouelle, 2020; Tchouatcha, 2021). Ultimately, embracing collaboration may pave the way for a more harmonious football environment that prioritises the interests of all parties involved.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The analysis of current conflicts within Cameroonian football reveals a multifaceted landscape characterised by strategic protests, aggressive behaviour, perceptions of corruption, and the influential role of the media in shaping narratives. The high endorsement of tactics such as boycotts and withholding resources signals that stakeholders are increasingly willing to assert their collective power against perceived injustices in the sport. This reflects a growing trend in sports management where voices are amplified to challenge governance structures, as stakeholders seek to drive change.

The prevalence of more aggressive forms of conflict, evidenced by high rates of open fights and verbal abuse, raises alarm about escalating tensions that threaten the integrity of the sport. These conflicts often extend beyond typical administrative disagreements, suggesting deeper systemic issues at play. The near-consensus among stakeholders regarding the prevalence of corruption, specifically bribery and embezzlement further underscores the urgent need to address ethical concerns that erode trust within football management in Cameroon.

Power struggles among officials also emerge as a critical factor that complicates leadership and decision-making, implying that internal dynamics within organisations can obstruct necessary reforms. The inclination of players and officials to collude for competitive advantage brings to light serious ethical dilemmas and raises questions about the integrity of match outcomes.

Moreover, the role of media in conflict management cannot be understated. Stakeholders utilising media to highlight grievances serves both to amplify their individual complaints and shape public perceptions of institutional failures. This strategic engagement with media not only portrays complainants as victims but also pressures governing bodies to address systemic issues, illustrating how public narratives can influence the resolution of conflicts.

To navigate these challenges and foster the growth of football in Cameroon, it is critical to recognise the interplay between financial, infrastructural, and governance issues. The differing perceptions among stakeholders about the severity of these challenges indicate a significant disconnect that must be addressed through more inclusive engagement.

Implementing a comprehensive strategy focused on transparency, accountability, and equitable resource distribution is essential. Prioritising infrastructural development and grassroots involvement will create a sustainable framework supporting talent and enhancing competitiveness in Cameroonian football. Such investments are vital not just for current stakeholders but for nurturing a thriving environment that benefits future generations, ensuring the sport's integrity and growth.

From the findings, recommendations were put forth on how to better the management of football in Cameroon through the exploitation of the perspectives of football stakeholders. The recommendations are presented in line with the research objectives.

One of the most critical measures that need to be taken by the government, is to implement comprehensive reforms aimed at enhancing transparency and accountability within FECAFOOT and the broader football management framework. This includes establishing independent oversight mechanisms to monitor financial management and resource allocation, thereby reducing conflicts stemming from financial disputes and political interference. Additionally, fostering inclusive dialogue platforms that engage all stakeholders; players, fans, coaches, and club owners will help bridge the disconnect between grassroots experiences and institutional decision-making. By prioritising stakeholder engagement and addressing systemic issues such as favoritism and regional sentiments, the government can create a more equitable and sustainable environment for football management that not only mitigates conflicts but also promotes the overall growth of the sport in Cameroon.

The government should prioritise fostering a culture of collaboration and transparency within Cameroonian football by implementing inclusive governance practices that encourage open communication among all stakeholders. This can be achieved by establishing regular dialogue forums where players, club owners, and officials can voice their concerns and work together to address conflicts. Additionally, the government should reduce its interference in football administration, allowing for greater autonomy within the FECAFOOT. By promoting trust and understanding among stakeholders, the government can help mitigate existing tensions and create a more harmonious environment that supports the integrity and growth of the sport.

The government is advised to implement a comprehensive strategy focused on infrastructural development and grassroots engagement in football. This should include establishing independent financial oversight and fostering public-private partnerships to create an equitable distribution of resources, addressing regional disparities in football infrastructure. By prioritising these foundational elements, the government can ensure sustainable growth in the sport, nurturing talent and enhancing competitiveness across the nation, ultimately benefiting both current players and

future generations. Investing in these initiatives will be crucial for cultivating a successful and enduring football environment in Cameroon.

Consequently, if there must be successful football management in Cameroon without conflict, FECAFOOT must prioritise the establishment of transparent financial management practices and robust governance structures to address the primary drivers of conflict identified by stakeholders. This includes implementing independent audits and oversight mechanisms to ensure equitable resource allocation, thereby mitigating financial disputes. Additionally, FECAFOOT should actively engage with all stakeholder groups particularly players, fans, and coaches to foster open communication and collaboration, ensuring that the voices and experiences of grassroots participants are integrated into decision-making processes. By addressing systemic issues such as favouritism and regional sentiments through inclusive policies and initiatives, FECAFOOT can cultivate a more harmonious football environment that reduces conflicts and enhances the overall integrity of the sport in Cameroon.

The study cannot be said to be perfect, as it had some limitations that may have influenced the outcome in one way or another. The closed-ended items on the causes of conflicts in the football management questionnaire were inexhaustive due to the need to make the instrument concise and engaging for stakeholders. Consequently, other important aspects or indicators related to the CV and IGRS were not considered thereby constituting a limitation. Some institutions and government offices visited for data collection during the study were reluctant to release specific data that could have numerically substantiated some of the sweeping statements made within the study. Additionally, most stakeholders from FECAFOOT found it difficult to take a position on the variable of conflict in the management of football in Cameroon. Consequently, most of their responses were undecided. The researcher observed this as a sign of insincerity in their responses even after committing themselves to it out of freewill.

REFERENCE

1. Adeleke, A. A., and Adebayo, A. (2019). Governance Challenges in African Sports: The Case of Nigeria and Cameroon. *African Journal of Sport Management*.
2. Alimova, Y. O., & Golovina, N. M. (2019). Moot Court Competitions and their Role in Practice Oriented Training of Law Students. *Kutafin Law Review*, 6(2), 237-271.
3. ANAGNOSTOPOULOS, C. Stakeholder management in Greek professional football: identification and salience. *Soccer & Society*, v. 12, n. 2, p. 249-264, 2011.
4. Anderson, J. (2021). Governance in Sports Organizations: A Framework for Accountability. *Sports Management Review*.
5. Bairner, A. (2017). Sport, Nationalism and Globalization: European and North American Perspectives. Routledge.
6. Biyong, A. (2022). Corruption and accountability in Cameroonian football. *Journal of Sports Management*, 15(3), 45-60.
7. Boulle, L. (2018). Mediation: Skills and Techniques. Routledge.
8. Brown, L. (2021). Stakeholder Engagement in Sports: Building Trust through Active Listening. *Journal of Sports Administration*.
9. Burnette, J. L., Taylor, K. W., Worthington, E. L., & Forsyth, D. R. (2007). Attachment and trait forgiveness: The mediating role of angry rumination. *Personality and individual differences*, 42(8), 1585-1596.
10. Clark, R. (2022). Training Leaders: Capacity Building in Sports Management. *International Journal of Sports Development*.

11. Clarkson, M. E. (1995). A stakeholder framework for analyzing and evaluating corporate social performance. *Academy of management review*, 20(1), 92-117.
12. Cohen, J., and Janicki, D. (2020). *Decision Making in Psychology: Theories and Applications*. Academic Press.
13. Coser, L. A. (1956). *The functions of social conflict* (Vol. 9). Routledge.
14. Dalilawati, Z. (2013). *Ownership structure, board of directors, regulation and corporate social responsibility reporting (CSRR) in Malaysia/Dalilawati Zainal* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Malaya).
15. Deutsch, M. (2017). *The Resolution of Conflict: Constructive and Destructive Processes*. Yale University Press.
16. Donaldson, T., & Preston, L. E. (1995). The stakeholder theory of the corporation: Concepts, evidence, and implications. *Academy of management Review*, 20(1), 65-91.
17. Epée, E., Mandeng, N., Libwea, J. N., Mouangué, C., Belinga, S., Fokam, J., ... & Mballa, G. A. E. (2022). Two years of Cameroon's resilient response to the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of the Cameroon Academy of Sciences*, 18, 493-500.
18. FIFA. (2022). *Football Governance: Best Practices and Recommendations*. FIFA Publications.
19. FIFA. (2023). *Laws of the Game*. Retrieved from FIFA official website (<https://www.fifa.com/laws-of-the-game>).
20. Fisher, R., Ury, W., & Patton, B. (2011). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in*. New York: Penguin.
21. Fongang, L. (2023). Public sentiment and football governance: The role of media. *African Journal of Sport Studies*, 12(1), 23-37.
22. Forsyth, P. (2006). *How to motivate people* (Vol. 105). Kogan Page Publishers.
23. Fouda, A., and Tchouassi, G. (2021). Education as a Tool for Conflict Resolution in Football: The Case of Cameroon. *African Journal of Sport Management*.
24. FREEMAN, R. E. *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*, Cambridge University Press 2010.
25. Freeman, R. E., & Phillips, R. A. (2002). Stakeholder theory: A libertarian defense. *Business ethics quarterly*, 12(3), 331-349.
26. FROOMAN, J. Stakeholder influence strategies. *Academy of management review*, v. 24, n. 2, p. 191-205, 1999.
27. Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, and peace research. *Journal of peace research*, 6(3), 167-191.
28. Gerrard, M., Gibbons, F. X., and Lane, D. J. (2019). *Health Psychology: A Biopsychosocial Approach*. Routledge.
29. Gillin, J. (1948). Magical fright. *Psychiatry*, 11(4), 387-400.
30. Harrison, J. S., & Freeman, R. E. (1999). Stakeholders, social responsibility, and performance: Empirical evidence and theoretical perspectives. *Academy of management Journal*, 42(5), 479-485.
31. Hocker, J. L., and Wilmot, W. W. (2018). *Interpersonal Conflict*. McGraw-Hill Education.

32. Hums, M. A. and MacLean, J. C. (2017). *Governance and Policy in Sport Organizations*. Routledge.
33. IFAB. (2023). *Laws of the Game*. Retrieved from IFAB official website (<https://www.theifab.com/laws>).
34. Jawahar, I. M., & McLaughlin, G. L. (2018). Toward a descriptive stakeholder theory: An organizational life cycle approach. In *Business Ethics and Strategy, Volumes I and II* (pp. 381-398). Routledge.
35. Jehn, K. A. (2019). Conflict in Organizations: A Review of the Literature and a Proposed Research Agenda. In *The Handbook of Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice* (pp. 43-66). Wiley.
36. Mitchell, R. K., Agle, B. R., & Wood, D. J. (1997). Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: Defining the principle of who and what really counts. *Academy of management review*, 22(4), 853-886.
37. Mokogwu, A., and Mbah, S. (2022). Building Resilience in Sports Management: Strategies for Conflict Mitigation in Cameroon. *Journal of Sports Governance*.
38. Morrow, S. (2019). The Role of Community Identity in Sports Conflict: A Case Study Approach. *International Journal of Sports Policy and Politics*.
39. Mouelle, J. (2020). Media influence on conflict resolution in sports. *International Review of Sports Studies*, 8(2), 100-115.
40. Naniwadekar, M., & Varottil, U. (2016). The stakeholder approach towards directors' duties under Indian Company Law: a comparative analysis. *Mahendra Pal Singh, The Indian Yearbook of Comparative Law*, 95-120.
41. Ngong, E. (2021). Transparency and accountability in sports governance: Lessons from Cameroon. *Journal of Governance and Policy Analysis*, 5(2), 67-84.
42. Nguéfack, A. (2021). Legitimacy and Stakeholder Engagement in Cameroonian Football. *International Journal of Sports Policy*.
43. Jones, P., and Taylor, S. (2019). The Role of Infrastructure in Conflict Resolution in Sports. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*.
44. Kahn, R. L., and Byosiére, P. (1992). Stress in organizations. In M. D. Dunnette L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 3, pp. 571-650). Consulting Psychologists Press.
45. Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D., and Rosenthal, R. A. (2001). *Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity*. Wiley.
46. Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
47. Katz, R., Smith, J. and O'Leary, T. (2020). *Financial Management in Sports Organizations*. Sports Management Review.
48. Kivits, R., Sawang, S., Kivits, R., & Sawang, S. (2021). Stakeholder theory. *The dynamism of stakeholder engagement: A case study of the aviation industry*, 1-8.
49. Laplume, A. O., Sonpar, K., & Litz, R. A. (2008). Stakeholder theory: Reviewing a theory that moves us. *Journal of management*, 34(6), 1152-1189.
50. Li, Y. (2014). The impact of corporate governance on the corporate social responsibility of small corporation in australia: a structural equation modeling approach. In *WEI International Academic Conference Proceeding, New Orleans, USA*.

51. Li, Y., Armstrong, A., & Clarke, A. (2014). The relationship between corporate governance and financial performance of small corporations in Australia. *Journal of Law and Governance*, 9(2), 25-40.
52. Madison College Assembly Bylaws [Pamphlet]. 2014. Madison, WI: Madison College.
53. Magness, V. (2008). Who are the stakeholders now? An empirical examination of the Mitchell, Agle, and Wood theory of stakeholder salience. *Journal of business ethics*, 83, 177-192.
54. Maguire, J. (2018). Sport and Politics: The Role of Political Interference in Sports Governance. *Journal of Sport Management*.
55. Tchouassi, G. (2020). Communication Strategies for Effective Football Management in Cameroon. *Journal of Sport Communication*.
56. Tchouatcha, R. (2021). Framing grievances: The media's role in sports conflicts. *Journal of Communication Research*, 9(3), 88-104.
57. Tchouawou, M. (2020). Football Management in Cameroon: Issues and Perspectives. *Journal of Sports Administration and Management*.
58. Tjosvold, D. (2020). Constructive Conflict Management: An Overview. In *The Handbook of Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice* (pp. 367-380). Wiley.
59. Windlinger, R., Warwas, J., & Hostettler, U. (2020). Dual effects of transformational leadership on teacher efficacy in close and distant leadership situations. *School Leadership & Management*, 40(1), 64-87.