



Conflict Management Styles and Organizational Behavior of Public School Heads in The New Normal

Mark Stephen T. Tagarda^{1*}

¹Laguna College of Business and Arts, Philippines

Received: November 22, 2023

Revised: January 3, 2024

Accepted: February 13, 2024

Online: March 31, 2024

Abstract

This study evaluated the organizational behavior and conflict resolution approaches used by public school heads in Calamba City's Cluster 9 Division. The study was conducted from April to May of 2023. Survey questionnaires were used in the study's descriptive correlational design and stratified random sampling to determine organizational behavior and conflict management approaches. The participants in the study were the school heads and teaching personnel in Cluster 9. There were 140 target respondents in all, and the cluster consisted of 6 public elementary and 2 secondary institutions. The researcher-made questionnaire underwent reliability testing using Cronbach's Alpha and pilot testing before data collection, with five experts validating it. The four-point Likert scale, mean, and Pearson r were used to assess the degree of organizational behavior and conflict management styles' application. An expert statistician who used the SPSS software received the collected data. The findings showed that school heads are proactive and skilled communicators with their staff. They use cooperative and accommodating resolution strategies, which is consistent with a supportive and less autocratic workplace. To improve the practices and utilization of conflict management techniques, a proposed enhancement program named Project CARP (Conflict Activity Resolution Program for School Heads in Cluster 9 Division of Calamba) was developed.

Keywords: *Conflict management styles; organizational behavior; public school heads; resolution techniques; behavioral approaches; communicative competence*

INTRODUCTION

Workplace conflicts often arise from divergent understandings, interests, and perspectives between parties, because of the varied range of individuals in the workplace. When there are disputes, conflicts occur (Johnson, 2019). A company's head oversees staff and puts regulations into effect in the workplace. Every mind approach conflict resolution differently. Within the educational context, a school is led by a school head that is responsible for the staff behavior and putting DepEd's policies into practice. There are norms and procedures that are applied differently in each school, which frequently leads to misunderstandings and conflicts between the staff and school heads. The main causes of conflict in the workplace are often poor performance and insufficient resources, along with differences in personality, attitudes, and interests. Conflicts can be advantageous or detrimental (Sasikala et al., 2021).

It is normal for schools to face challenges, and conflicts. The way these concerns are handled and resolved depends on the school head's behavioral approach and conflict resolution strategies. (Kayanda, Tangi, 2022) A strong school leader involves everyone in the school's performance, which empowers teachers and influences leadership (Lathan, 2023).

The school's work environment has changed because of the pandemic since work instructions are mostly distributed using online social media. Virtual meetings remotely bridged the gap of communication gap between school head and teachers. These changes allowed school heads to contact teachers at any time. Other school heads find these new platforms complicated,



and occasionally misconstrue messages. (Santiago Jr. et al., 2021) The school head plays a role in setting the work atmosphere, handling conflicts, and interacting with the teachers. As former educators, school administrators have direct knowledge of the concerns that their staff members may face. A positive work atmosphere is primarily achieved through the active leadership of the school and the cooperation of staff members. (Tingley, 2023) The study aims to identify the conflict management approaches utilized by school heads in resolving issues and determine their relation to the organizational behavior of schools in Cluster 9 of Calamba City. This study can contribute to improving conflict management styles and organizational behavior by identifying good practices of school heads in the school.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Conflict Management Styles

Resolving conflicts and disagreements between two or more parties is the aim of conflict management. Its goals were to reduce adverse effects and promote consensus among those engaged. Every conflict resolution approach has benefits and drawbacks, but each was meant to address a particular set of circumstances, thus, it was up to the individual to decide which to employ. (Amaresan, 2022) The diversity of employees in the workplace is the root cause of conflicts.

There are five approaches in dealing with conflict which were competition, accommodation, avoidance, compromise, and collaboration. The competitive approach was described as assertive and uncooperative. Accommodating was being unassertive and cooperative, Avoiding was unassertive but uncooperative, compromising falls under both qualities, and collaborating was being assertive and cooperative. (CLIMB Professional Development and Training, 2020). Managers who are emotionally flexible can better deal with conflicts and performance reviews (Iqbal, M.Z, Shakoor, A.,2023) The behavioral approach of the school head influences how conflicts are resolved in the workplace. During deadlines, school heads need to be straightforward. They are often mistaken as authoritative when they are assertive.

Communication is essential in resolving issues. Body language and gestures are important in conveying messages. The intonation of voice matters when the school head is communicating with the personnel in the school. There are virtual communication skills that need to be developed in the new normal which is important in online communication. Be considerate when a mistake was made virtually, a message may be composed with an all-caps format and the others might mistake you for being angry. (Harvey, 2020) The pandemic has changed the means of communication in the workplace. Social media applications are often used to distribute work tasks, and communication using this platform has its own etiquette that need to be observed.

There are five main approaches to handling conflicts: collaborating, competing, avoiding, accommodating, and compromising When both parties were pleased with the results, collaboration was taking place. Competition had little room for cooperation, and being assertive highlights one's stance. Avoidance is just avoiding a problem and happens when there is a difference in opinion. A type of negotiation known as accommodation is one in which one party relents and makes concessions to others to reach a consensus. The compromise style was an assertive way of coming to an agreement with the other party to establish common ground and working together to find a solution. (Benoliel, 2022) Each behavioral approach has its own advantages and disadvantages. A competitive approach can deliver results however, it has a negative impact on the work relationship between the school head and teachers. A collaborative approach is important to ensure cooperation.

Organizational Behavior

An organization has 4 framework models in which an organization may behave. These models were Autocratic, Custodial, Supportive, and Collegial. (Performance Juxtaposition site,

2020). Organizational behavior can be gauged by the leaders to improve the performance of the workplace and resolve anticipated issues that may be encountered such as task-related conflicts, lack of training and development, and misunderstanding and lack of communication among departments (Kopp, 2022).

The way a problem is resolved depends on one's Negotiation ability. The ability of a leader to foster cooperation through political influence is crucial for finding a solution. (Tasa, K., Bahmani, M.,2023) A climate that is both competitive and self-centered at work leads to significant disputes. High performance norms in the workplace sometimes lead to stress among employees. (Harms et al. ,2023) Collaboration at work fosters a greater understanding among coworkers. Workers value a supervisor who is cooperative and responsive to their concerns, even when some managers choose to take an authoritarian or autocratic stance (Egerova, D., Rotenbornova, L. ,2021).

Organizational behavior is the indicator of whether an organization is healthy or not. The school head's conflict management style can influence how they deal with issues and concerns in the school. A collaborative environment fosters good working relationships between the school head and personnel, which is an indicator of a healthy organization.

RESEARCH METHOD

The study used a quantitative descriptive correlational research design which aimed to describe conflict management styles and their relationship to organizational behavior. The research design allows the researcher to describe variables and investigate its relationship. The researcher used the survey questionnaire as an instrument to determine the conflict management styles used by school heads. School heads and teaching personnel were the respondents in identifying the level of organizational behavior of the school. This study used stratified random sampling to systematically select the respondents and make them adequately represent them. This assures that the sample was not biased towards the total population. The questionnaire is composed of 42 questions for school heads and 58 questions for teaching personnel The questionnaire was based on contemporary theories of conflict management, which described the conflict management styles of school heads and organizational behavior of public schools in the Cluster.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Conflict and Resolution Techniques

Table 1. Level of Implementation of the School Head's Conflict Management as Assessed by the School Heads and Teaching Personnel in terms of Resolution Techniques for Collaborating

Indicators	School Heads		Teachers		Composite	
	X	VI	X	VI	X	VI
1.I recognize the need of a group discussion to identify problems and find solutions.	3.67	FI	3.79	FI	3.73	FI
2. I make sure that everyone can express their concerns and issues.	3.78	FI	3.72	FI	3.75	FI
3. I consider other's feelings and try not to offend it.	3.89	FI	3.68	FI	3.79	FI
Overall Mean	3.78	FI	3.73	FI	3.76	FI

Legend: 3.25-4.00 Fully Implemented (FI) 2.50-3.24 Implemented (I)
1.75-2.49 Partially Implemented (PI) 1.00-1.74 Not Implemented (NI)

Table 1 shows that the level of implementation of the school head's conflict management as assessed by the school head and teaching personnel in terms of collaboration had an overall

mean of 3.76 fully implemented. The third indicator “I consider other’s feelings and try not to offend it” had the highest computed mean of 3.76 which was fully implemented while the first indicator “I recognize the need of a group discussion in identifying problems and finding solutions” had the lowest computed mean of 3.73 which was fully implemented. This implies that school heads in Cluster 9 foster a collaborative environment, and value of feelings and beliefs of teachers. The presence of group discussion when resolving a conflict is observed. Respect between school heads and teachers is prioritized, and the sensitivity in the feelings of their colleagues are observed.

People in workplace are not just workers. Valuing feelings of workers provides purpose and job satisfaction to accomplish their tasks. Employee engagement is important in an organization to support employees in their concerns and make them feel valuable (Turner, 2023).

Table 2. Level of Implementation of the School Head's Conflict Management as assessed by the School Heads and Teaching Personnel in terms of Resolution Techniques for Competing

Indicators	School Heads		Teachers		Composite	
	\bar{X}	VI	\bar{X}	VI	\bar{X}	VI
1. I see it that everyone knows my position as leader	3.56	FI	3.76	FI	3.66	FI
2. I am strict in meeting targets of the school.	3.56	FI	3.77	FI	3.67	FI
3. I make sure that my stand and directives are implemented.	3.67	FI	3.72	FI	3.70	FI
Overall Mean	3.59	FI	3.75	FI	3.67	FI

Legend: 3.25-4.00 Fully Implemented (FI) 2.50-3.24 Implemented (I)
1.75-2.49 Partially Implemented (PI) 1.00-1.74 Not Implemented (NI)

Table 2 shows that the level of implementation of the school head's conflict management as assessed by the school head and teaching personnel in terms of Competing had an overall mean of 3.67, which was fully implemented. The third indicator had the highest computed mean of 3.70 which was fully implemented while the first indicator was fully implemented with a mean of 3.66. The school heads in Cluster 9 are competitive. They are firm in implementing work directives. They prefer to be recognized as leaders. Directives in the workplace provide a structured approach and consistency in work performance of personnel which is effective in reaching goals (Tai, 2020).

Table 3. Level of Implementation of the School Head's Conflict Management as assessed by the School Heads and Teaching Personnel in terms of Resolution Techniques as to avoid

Indicators	School Heads		Teachers		Composite	
	\bar{X}	VI	\bar{X}	VI	\bar{X}	VI
a. I do not bother to know and worry about differences in the school.	3.00	I	3.43	FI	3.22	I
b. I keep my distance to avoid unpleasantness in a conflict situation.	3.33	FI	3.40	FI	3.37	FI
c. I avoid taking sides to avoid controversies.	3.56	FI	3.61	FI	3.59	FI
Overall Mean	3.30	FI	3.48	FI	3.39	FI

Legend: 3.25-4.00 Fully Implemented (FI) 2.50-3.24 Implemented (I)
1.75-2.49 Partially Implemented (PI) 1.00-1.74 Not Implemented (NI)

Table 3 shows that the level of implementation of the school head's conflict management as assessed by the school head and teaching personnel in terms of Avoiding had an overall mean of 3.39 fully implemented. The third indicator “I avoid taking sides from both parties involved to avoid

controversies” had the highest mean of 3.59 which was fully implemented while the first indicator “I don’t bother to know and worry about differences in the school” had the lowest computed mean of 3.22 which was implemented. School heads in Cluster 9 are unbiased towards parties involved in conflicts. It shows that school heads do understand the differences in each personnel and do not worry about the diversity of the teachers. Taking sides in a workplace issue is a lose-lose situation, because leaders can empathize without agreeing with Taking sides may affect work relationships and workplace performance in the workplace (Jengkings, 2020).

Table 4. Level of Implementation of the School Head's Conflict Management as assessed by the School Heads and Teaching Personnel in terms of Resolution Techniques as to accommodate

Indicators	School Heads		Teachers		Composite	
	X	VI	X	VI	X	VI
1. I listen proactively to concerns of the other party.	3.89	FI	3.76	FI	3.83	FI
2. I prioritize to find a common ground of understanding.	3.78	FI	3.71	FI	3.75	FI
3. I acknowledge concerns of workers and discuss a balanced resolve.	3.89	FI	3.66	FI	3.78	FI
Overall Mean	3.85	FI	3.71	FI	3.78	FI

Legend: 3.25-4.00 Fully Implemented (FI) 2.50-3.24 Implemented (I)
1.75-2.49 Partially Implemented (PI) 1.00-1.74 Not Implemented (NI)

Table 4 shows that the level of implementation of the school head's conflict management as assessed by the school head and teaching personnel in terms of accommodating had an overall mean of 3.78 which was fully implemented. Furthermore, the first indicator “I listen proactively to the concern of the other party” had the highest computed mean of 3.83 which was fully implemented while the second indicator “I prioritize to find a common ground of understanding” had the lowest computed mean of 3.75, which was fully implemented. School heads proactively listen to concerns raised during meetings. Data also show that school heads prioritize a win-win situation when resolving conflicts. Finding common ground preserves harmony. It promotes mutual respect in the workplace between the leader and his colleagues (Kordestani, 2022).

Table 5. Level of Implementation of the School Head's Conflict Management as assessed by the School Head and Teaching Personnel in terms of Resolution Techniques as to Compromise.

Indicators	School Heads		Teachers		Composite	
	X	VI	X	VI	X	VI
1. I make sure that there is a balance of loses and gains for both sides.	3.89	FI	3.69	FI	3.79	FI
2. I negotiate my terms and discuss the proposed resolution to keep the peace.	3.67	FI	3.74	FI	3.71	FI
3. I value the point of others to preserve relationships.	3.78	FI	3.73	FI	3.76	FI
Overall Mean	3.78	FI	3.72	FI	3.75	FI

Legend: 3.25-4.00 Fully Implemented (FI) 2.50-3.24 Implemented (I)
1.75-2.49 Partially Implemented (PI) 1.00-1.74 Not Implemented (NI)

Table 5 shows that the level of implementation of the school head's conflict management as assessed by the school head and teaching personnel in terms of Compromising had an overall mean of 3.75 which was fully implemented. Furthermore, the first indicator “I make sure that there is a balance of loses and gains for both sides” had the highest computed mean of 3.79 which was

fully implemented while the third indicator “I value the point of others to preserve the relationship” had the lowest mean of 3.71 which was fully implemented. The school heads emphasize preserving good work relationships while addressing and providing resolution. Schools in Cluster 9 have a small number of teachers. A misunderstanding in the workplace is noticeable. Finding losses and gains means giving up something as a compromise for a mutual agreement ([University of Washington, 2023](#)).

Behavioral Approaches

Table 6. Level of Implementation of the School Head's Conflict Management Style as assessed by the School Head and Teaching Personnel in terms of Behavioral Approach as to Passive

Indicators	School Heads		Teachers		Composite	
	X	VI	X	VI	X	VI
1. I believe that conflicts will be resolved naturally.	3.00	I	3.16	I	3.08	I
2. I do not need to prove my point	2.67	I	2.68	I	2.68	I
3. I put less effort in explaining myself to convince others.	2.56	I	2.60	I	2.58	I
4. I did not see a point in choosing sides.	2.50	I	2.75	I	2.63	I
5. I accept issues in the workplace as it is.	3.33	FI	3.29	FI	3.31	FI
Overall Mean	2.82	I	2.90	I	2.86	I

Legend: 3.25-4.00 Fully Implemented (FI) 2.50-3.24 Implemented (I)
1.75-2.49 Partially Implemented (PI) 1.00-1.74 Not Implemented (NI)

Table 6 shows that the level of implementation of the school head's behavioral approach as assessed by the school head and teaching personnel in terms of Passive had an overall mean of 2.86 as implemented. The fifth indicator “I accept issues in the workplace as it is” had the highest computed mean of 3.31, which was fully implemented while the third indicator “I put less effort in explaining myself to convince others” had the lowest computed mean of 2.58, interpreted as implemented. School heads understand that each has its own issues. School heads are proactive and ensure that everyone is involved. Workplace issues are normal however if not address, they can lead to serious issues among teachers. The workplace is a diverse environment with people of different perspectives. Accepting workplace issues means accountability for your own actions ([Oren, 2023](#)).

Table 7. Level of Implementation of the School Head's Conflict Management Style as assessed by the School Head and Teaching Personnel in terms of Behavioral Approach as to Aggressive

Indicators	School Heads		Teachers		Composite	
	X	VI	X	VI	X	VI
1. I use my authority to prove my point.	2.44	PI	2.71	I	2.58	I
2. I take over a situation by expressing my views in a firm way.	3.00	I	2.90	I	2.95	I
3. I present facts in a firm and straightforward manner.	3.22	I	3.03	I	3.13	I
4. I insist that my inputs and opinions are considered.	2.56	I	2.61	I	2.59	I
5. I make sure that I have advantage to win in a conflict.	1.78	PI	1.75	PI	1.77	PI
Overall Mean	2.60	I	2.59	I	2.60	I

Legend: 3.25-4.00 Fully Implemented (FI) 2.50-3.24 Implemented (I)

1.75-2.49 Partially Implemented (PI)

1.00-1.74 Not Implemented (NI)

Table 7 shows that the level of implementation of the school head's behavioral approach as assessed by the school head and teaching personnel in terms of aggressive had an overall mean of 2.60 implemented. Furthermore, the third indicator "I present facts in a firm and straight forward manner" had the highest computed mean of 3.13 implemented while the fifth indicator "I make sure that I have an advantage to win in a conflict" had the lowest computed mean of 1.77 partially Implemented. School heads in Cluster 9 are not aggressive. The data showed that school heads are not biased in addressing conflict. School heads are sensitive and cautious when addressing a conflict. Direct communication is a provocation for another conflict. It is not rational to confront when emotions are high, and it can result in offensive and harsh behavior toward another (Jacobson, 2023).

Table 8. Level of Implementation of the School Head's Conflict Management Style as assessed by the School Head and Teaching Personnel in terms of Behavioral Approach as Assertive

Indicators	School Heads		Teachers		Composite	
	X	VI	X	VI	X	VI
1. I initially validate the background of the conflict.	3.67	FI	3.43	FI	3.55	FI
2. I show empathy to the other party.	3.44	FI	3.44	FI	3.44	FI
3. I do root cause analysis in order to understand the problem.	3.67	FI	3.55	FI	3.61	FI
4. I explain the consequences of his/her actions.	3.78	FI	3.59	FI	3.69	FI
5. I am transparent about my stand in an issue.	3.67	FI	3.63	FI	3.65	FI
Overall Mean	3.64	FI	3.53	FI	3.59	FI

Legend: 3.25-4.00 Fully Implemented (FI) 2.50-3.24 Implemented (I)
1.75-2.49 Partially Implemented (PI) 1.00-1.74 Not Implemented (NI)

Table 8 shows that the level of implementation of the school head's behavioral approach as assessed by the school head and teaching personnel in terms of Assertive had an overall mean of 3.59 fully implemented. Furthermore, the fourth indicator "I explain the consequences of his/her actions" had the highest computed mean of 3.69 fully implemented, whereas the second indicator "I show empathy to the other party" has the lowest computed mean of 3.44 fully implemented. School heads assure that the teachers are well informed regarding the consequences of their actions. School heads show empathy towards teachers. School heads are considerate during emergencies. The consequences of one's action in the workplace should be aligned with existing disciplinary action policies. The leader who implements should clearly explain the consequences to their employees. It provides a framework to be more responsible for their actions (Kuligowski, 2023).

Communicative Competence

Table 9. Level of Implementation of the School Head's Conflict Management as Assessed by the School Head and Teaching Personnel in terms of Communicative Competence as to Verbal

Indicators	School Heads		Teachers		Composite	
	X	VI	X	VI	X	VI
1. I appropriately choose words when communicating in person.	3.78	FI	3.67	FI	3.73	FI
2. I articulate and pronounce words properly.	3.22	I	3.63	FI	3.43	FI

3. I positively deliver feedback and criticism.	3.89	FI	3.62	FI	3.76	FI
4. I use humor when responding to people.	3.33	FI	3.53	FI	3.43	FI
Overall Mean	3.56	FI	3.61	FI	3.59	FI
Legend: 3.25-4.00 Fully Implemented (FI) 2.50-3.24 Implemented (I) 1.75-2.49 Partially Implemented (PI) 1.00-1.74 Not Implemented (NI)						

Table 9 shows that the level of implementation of the school head's conflict management as assessed by the school head and teaching personnel in terms of Communicative Competence as to Verbal had an overall mean of 3.59 fully implemented. The third indicator "I positively deliver feedback and criticisms" had the highest computed mean of 3.76 fully implemented whereas the second indicator "I articulate and pronounce words properly" and fourth indicator "I use humor when responding with people" had the lowest computed mean of 3.43 fully implemented. This implies that the school heads can provide positive feedback. Positive feedback boosts confidence and value. It aids leaders to understand the skills of each individual and motivates them to improve (Marsh, 2019).

Table 10. Level of Implementation of the School Head's Conflict Management as Assessed by the School Head and Teaching Personnel in terms of Communicative Competence as to Non-Verbal

Indicators	School Heads		Teachers		Composite	
	X	VI	X	VI	X	VI
1. I use body gestures and understand body language.	3.56	FI	3.55	FI	3.56	FI
2. I listen actively to people.	3.89	FI	3.60	FI	3.75	FI
3. I persuade and convince people and others to gain trust and cooperation.	3.78	FI	3.57	FI	3.68	FI
4. I organize and analyze ideas.	3.67	FI	3.64	FI	3.66	FI
Overall Mean	3.72	FI	3.59	FI	3.66	FI
Legend: 3.25-4.00 Fully Implemented (FI) 2.50-3.24 Implemented (I) 1.75-2.49 Partially Implemented (PI) 1.00-1.74 Not Implemented (NI)						

Table 10 shows that the level of implementation of the school head's conflict management as assessed by the school head and teaching personnel in terms of Communicative Competence as to Non-Verbal had an overall mean of 3.66 which was interpreted as fully implemented. The second indicator "I listen actively to people" had the highest computed mean of 3.75, which was interpreted as fully implemented while the first indicator "I use body gestures and understand body language" has lowest computed mean of 3.56, which was interpreted as fully implemented. School heads are active listeners and understand the body language of their teachers. They know because school heads were once teachers and have previous experience about issues which is why they know the approach. Active listening is important because it values personnel in the workplace. This results in minimized distractions, usage of correct body language, and appropriate gestures when discussing important things in the workplace. It promotes a positive work environment in the organization (Indeed Editorial Team, 2023).

Table 11. Level of Implementation of the School Head's Conflict Management as Assessed by the School Head and Teaching Personnel in terms of the communicative Competence Questionnaire as to Virtual

Indicators	School Heads	Teachers	Composite
------------	--------------	----------	-----------

	X	VI	X	VI	X	VI
1. I choose the content of words appropriately when communicating virtually through social media, messaging, and meeting platforms.	3.67	FI	3.70	FI	3.69	FI
2. I deliver my instructions clearly during online meetings.	3.67	FI	3.64	FI	3.66	FI
3. I am knowledgeable about using internet-based messaging and meeting tools.	3.56	FI	3.57	FI	3.57	FI
4. I am courteous and polite when responding online.	3.89	FI	3.67	FI	3.78	FI
Overall Mean	3.69	FI	3.65	FI	3.67	FI

Legend: 3.25-4.00 Fully Implemented (FI) 2.50-3.24 Implemented (I)
 1.75-2.49 Partially Implemented (PI) 1.00-1.74 Not Implemented (NI)

Table 11 shows that the level of implementation of the school head's conflict management as assessed by the school head and teaching personnel in terms of Communicative Competence as to Virtual had an overall mean of 3.67 verbally interpreted as Fully Implemented. Furthermore, the fourth indicator "I am courteous and polite when responding online" had the highest computed mean of 3.78, interpreted as fully implemented while the third indicator "I am knowledgeable in using internet-based messaging and meeting tools" has the lowest computed mean of 3.57, interpreted as fully implemented. School heads are courteous and punctual when responding to online queries. They have adapted to using internet-based applications. They were able to use social media in cascading work instructions. Virtual etiquette dictates the professionalism of a person and makes impacts on the effectiveness of directives delivered using the internet. Each must still recognize boundaries and courtesy to promote harmony in the workplace (Schad, 2020).

Table 12. Test of Significant Difference in the Assessment of the School Heads and Teachers on the Level of Implementation of Conflict Management Styles

Variables	t test Computed	Probability Value	Remarks	Decision
Collaborating	.362	.718	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Competing	-1.220	.225	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Avoiding	-.894	.373	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Accommodating	.938	.350	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Compromising	.359	.720	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Passive	-.249	.804	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Aggressive	.027	.979	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Assertive	.624	.533	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Verbal	-.306	.760	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Nonverbal	.704	.482	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Virtual	.287	.775	Not Significant	Accept Ho

Table 12 shows that there was no significant difference in the assessment of the school heads and teachers on the level of implementation of conflict management styles. The respondents had the same assessment on the level of implementation of management practices of school heads. As shown in the probability values of 0.718, 0.225, 0.373, 0.350, 0.72, 0.804, 0.979, 0.533, 0.760, 0.482, and 0.775, respectively, were all greater than the level of significance at .05, thus the null hypothesis was accepted. This implies that the assessment of the school heads and teaching personnel have the same perception of the level of implementation of conflict management styles.

Table 13. Level of Organizational Behavior in the Schools as observed by Teaching Personnel in terms of Autocratic

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. Only the school head is allowed to make decisions in the school	2.19	SO

2. The school has a strict rules and heavy sanctions for mistakes made by Teachers	2.27	SO
3. There is less opportunity for discussions among 4. Teachers to voice their suggestions.	1.90	SO
5. Teachers obey the directives, but they have less work relationship with their school head.	2.07	SO
Composite	2.11	SO
Legend: 3.25-4.00 Highly Observed (HO) 2.50-3.24 Observed (O) 1.75-2.49 Slightly Observed (SO) 1.00-1.74 Not Observed (NO)		

Table 13 shows that the level of organizational behavior of the school as observed by teaching personnel in terms of Autocratic had an overall mean of 2.11 which was interpreted as slightly observed. The second indicator “The school has a strict rules and heavy sanctions for mistakes done by Teachers” had the highest computed mean of 2.27 verbally interpreted Slightly Observed while the fourth indicator “Teachers to air their suggestions” had the lowest computed mean of 1.90 interpreted as Slightly Observed. It implies that the organizational behavior of the schools in Cluster 9 isn’t autocratic. School heads are strict but considerate in handling mistakes. They provide opportunities to express concerns and suggestions. The autocratic approach can be effective during deadlines, but not always. Leaders with autocratic approach have less connection with personnel. Employees should be able to express their concerns. Some employees do not prefer others controlling them (Lamarco, 2019).

Table 14. Level of Organizational Behavior in the Schools as Observed by Teaching Personnel in terms of Custodial

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. Teachers have a long tenure in the organization because it provides professional stability.	3.62	HO
2. Teachers receive good benefits and compensation from the organization.	3.63	HO
3. The organization provides more career development and opportunities.	3.69	HO
4. The organization prioritizes leave benefits for emergency purposes and manage stress levels of teachers.	3.64	HO
Composite	3.65	HO
Legend: 3.25-4.00 Highly Observed (HO) 2.50-3.24 Observed (O) 1.75-2.49 Slightly Observed (SO) 1.00-1.74 Not Observed (NO)		

Table 14 shows that the level of organizational behavior of the school as observed by teaching personnel in terms of custodial behavior had an overall mean of 3.65 which was interpreted as highly observed. The third indicator “The organization provides more career development and opportunities” had the highest computed mean of 3.69, interpreted as highly observed while the first indicator “Teachers have a long tenure in the organization because it provides professional stability” has the lowest computed mean of 3.62, interpreted as Highly Observed. The organizational behavior in Cluster 9 results in teachers having longer tenure in Deped because of professional development and promotions. Custodial behavior in an organization is characterized by the compensation of personnel economically and professionally. It provides employees with opportunities to make them stay longer (Smirti, 2021).

Table 15. Level of Organizational Behavior in the Schools as Observed by Teaching Personnel in terms of Supportive

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
------------	------	----------------

1. The school head displays good leadership traits and is respected by the subordinates.	3.62	HO
2. The teachers feel they are part of the organization.	3.63	HO
3. When things go wrong, the main concern is to fix the problems and concerns.	3.69	HO
4. The Teachers feel valued and are recognized for their work.	3.64	HO
Composite	3.65	HO
Legend: 3.25-4.00 Highly Observed (HO) 2.50-3.24 Observed (O) 1.75-2.49 Slightly Observed (SO) 1.00-1.74 Not Observed (NO)		

Table 15 shows that the level of organizational behavior of the school as observed by teaching personnel in terms of Supportive had an overall mean of 3.65 interpreted as highly observed. The third indicator “When things go wrong, the main concern is to fix the problems and concerns” had the highest computed mean of 3.69 verbally interpreted as Highly Observed while the first indicator “The school head displays good leadership traits and is respected by subordinates” has the lowest computed mean of 3.62 interpreted as highly observed. The organizational behavior in Cluster 9 promotes a no blame culture. The school heads are well respected by the teachers. A no blame culture removes competition in a working environment. It encourages creativity and loyalty. Staff are empowered and promote an understanding of one’s shortcomings.

Table 16. Level of Organizational Behavior of Schools as observed by Teaching Personnel in terms of Collegial

Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1. There is a collaborative effort between School heads and teachers in the school.	3.69	HO
2. There is a better work relationship between school head and teachers.	3.69	HO
3. Enthusiasm is present among the teachers which results in better job.	3.69	HO
4. The Teachers have high esteem and feels valuable to the organization.	3.65	HO
Composite	3.68	HO
Legend: 3.25-4.00 Highly Observed (HO) 2.50-3.24 Observed (O) 1.75-2.49 Slightly Observed (SO) 1.00-1.74 Not Observed (NO)		

Table 16 shows that the level of organizational behavior of the school as observed by in terms of Collegial had an overall mean of 3.68 interpreted as Highly Observed. The first indicator “There is a collaborative effort between school heads and teachers in the school”, second “There is a better work relationship between school head and teachers” and third indicator “Enthusiasm is present among the teachers results to a better job performance” have the highest computed mean of 3.69 interpreted as Highly Observed while the fourth indicator “The teachers have high esteem and feel valuable to the organization” has the lowest computed mean of 3.65, interpreted as Highly Observed. The organizational behavior in Cluster 9 promotes collaboration. Teachers feel enthusiastic about performing their tasks. The Collegial style shares a goal in working as a unit. A leader who shares power and authority equally with all creates an atmosphere of high morale (Wright, 2022).

Table 17. Test of the significant Relationship between the Conflict Management Style of School Heads as to Resolution Techniques and Organizational Behavior of Schools

Conflict Management Style	Organizational behavior	r value	p value	Remarks	Decision
Collaborating	Autocratic	-0.102	0.225	Not Significant	Accept Ho
	Custodial	.463**	0.000	Significant	Reject Ho
	Supportive	.615**	0.000	Significant	Reject Ho
	Collegial	.607**	0.000	Significant	Reject Ho
Competing	Autocratic	-0.061	0.467	Not Significant	Accept Ho
	Custodial	.279**	0.001	Significant	Reject Ho
	Supportive	.404**	0.000	Significant	Reject Ho
	Collegial	.355**	0.000	Significant	Reject Ho
Avoiding	Autocratic	.188*	0.025	Significant	Reject Ho
	Custodial	.399**	0.000	Significant	Reject Ho
	Supportive	.360**	0.000	Significant	Reject Ho
	Collegial	.355**	0.000	Significant	Reject Ho
Accommodating	Autocratic	-0.144	0.087	Not Significant	Accept Ho
	Custodial	.515**	0.000	Significant	Reject Ho
	Supportive	.670**	0.000	Significant	Reject Ho
	Collegial	.610**	0.000	Significant	Reject Ho
Compromise	Autocratic	-0.160	0.057	Not Significant	Accept Ho
	Custodial	.395**	0.000	Significant	Reject Ho
	Supportive	.638**	0.000	Significant	Reject Ho
	Collegial	.571**	0.000	Significant	Reject Ho

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

There was a significant relationship between the conflict management styles of the school head as to resolution techniques and the organizational behavior of the school. The probability was less than the level of significance at .05, thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. Healthy organizational behavior has less tendency toward autocratic behavior because it can compromise the harmony and connection between employees.

Proposed Enhancement Program

The enhancement program was proposed to address identified areas that need improvement in conflict management and improve organizational behavior of the school.

Table 5. Project CARP: Conflict Activity Resolution Program for School Heads in the cluster 9 Division of Calamba City

Area of Concern	Objectives	Strategies/ Activities	Time Frame	Person's Involved	Source of Fund	Success Indicator
Conflict resolution techniques	To ensure that school heads can maintain the good conflict resolution practices and avoid authoritative traits. School heads will commit to participate in workshop on applying strategies and activities to improve	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Root cause analysis activities for Solving complex problems. 2. Speaking and active listening exercises. 3. Workshop on gestures, interpreting body language. 4. How to accept criticism and admitting fault. 	July 2023 to August 2023	School Heads, Head Teachers, Officer in Charge, Key Teachers	Cluster 9 Development Budget	95% percent of the participants have utilized developed strategies and activities

Conflict Resolution.

Behavioral Approach Techniques	Develop effective behavioral approach among school heads when dealing with different attitudes of personnel. School heads will commit to participate on workshop in applying strategies and activities to improve Behavioral approaches.	1. Identifying aggressive and passive behaviors in the workplace. 2. Strategies in dealing passive-aggressive behavior and developing skills in positive reinforcement.	July 2023 to August 2023	School Heads, Head Teachers, Officer in Charge, Key Teachers	Cluster 9 Development Budget	95% percent of the participants have utilized developed strategies and activities
Communicative Competence	To develop communication skills of school leaders in dealing with concerns and issues. School heads will commit to participate in workshop to apply strategies and activities to improve Communicative competence.	1. How to identify fake news. 2. How to improve vocabularies when communicating. Establishing understanding when engaging with personnel.	July 2023 to August 2023	School Heads, Head Teachers, Officer in Charge, Key Teachers	Cluster 9 Development Budget	95% percent of the participants have utilized developed strategies and activities.

CONCLUSIONS

The school heads in terms of the conflict management approach are collaborative, considerate regarding their teaching personnel because they also started as Teachers before being promoted. They are straightforward in carrying out instructions to comply with Deped’s directives. In terms of behavioral approaches, they have an assertive approach. School heads prioritize the importance of explaining the consequences of the actions taken and their impact. They acknowledge the presence of issues and diversity. In terms of Communicative competence, the school heads have been balanced in being passive, aggressive, and assertive. They explain their point to gain the trust of their teaching personnel during meetings. The data showed that school heads have active listening skills and are respectful when communicating online. School heads have adapted well to cascading directives online. The organizational behavior in Cluster 9 is unlikely to be autocratic because of being considerate. Career opportunities are evident in the cluster with continuous promotion of employees. The cluster manifests a no blame culture. The proposed enhancement program is essential to maintain and develop conflict resolution and organizational behavior.

LIMITATION & FURTHER RESEARCH

This study focused on determining the conflict management styles and their implementation among the elementary and secondary public-school heads using quantitative descriptive correlational design. This study determined the relationship between conflict management styles and organizational behavior. The respondents were the school heads and teaching personnel of the public elementary and secondary schools in Cluster 9 Division of Calamba City. There have been limited studies published on conflict management in the working environment of schools in the Philippines and the researcher hopes that the study can be a step ladder in conducting future research to further understand and improve conflict management and organizational behavior among elementary and secondary schools.

REFERENCES

- Amarasan, S. (2022). Expert tips for conflict management for every personality type. HubSpot. <https://blog.hubspot.com/service/conflict-management-styles#:~:text=The%205%20Conflict%20Management%20Styles,compromising%2C%20collaborating%2C%20and%20competing.>
- Benoliel, B. (2022). What's your Conflict Management Style. Walden University. <https://www.waldenu.edu/news-and-events/walden-news/2022/0530-whats-your-conflict-management-style>
- Big Dog and Little Dog's Performance Juxtaposition site. (2022). Leadership and organizational behavior. Big Dog and Little Dog's Performance Juxtaposition. <http://www.nwlink.com/~donclark/leader/leadob.html>
- Kopp, Carol. (2022). What is organizational behavior? Why is it important. Investopedia. <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/o/organizational-behavior.asp>
- CLIMB Professional Development and Training. (2020). What Are the Five Conflict Resolution Strategies. Portland Community College. <https://climb.pcc.edu/blog/what-are-the-five-conflict-resolution-strategies>
- Egerova, D., Rotenbornova, L. (2021). Towards Understanding of workplace conflict: An Examination into causes and conflict management strategies. Problems of Management in the 21st Century. <https://www.scientiasocialis.lt/pmc/?q=node/195>
- Harvey. (2020). 5 virtual communication skills. Medium. <https://medium.com/@danaharveycommunications/5-virtual-communication-skills-95a3d5ad4b7c>
- Harms, P. D., Bao, Y., Guohong, H., Cheng, S. (2023) Narcissism and tradition: how competing needs result in more conflict, greater exhaustion, and lower performance. International Journal on Conflict Management Vol. 34 No. 2, pp. 273-298. <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/IJCMA-05-2022-0091/full/html>
- Indeed Editorial Team. (2023). How to effectively use active listening in the workplace. Indeed. <https://www.indeed.com/career-advice/career-development/listening-in-the-workplace#:~:text=Active%20listening%20in%20the%20workplace%20is%20important%20because%20it's%20a,to%20add%20to%20the%20conversation.>
- Iqbal, M. Z., Shakoor, A. (2023). Exhibiting emotional flexibility to alleviate employee hateful emotions and elevate their justice perceptions. International Journal on Conflict Management Vol. 34 No. 4, pp. 746-772. <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/IJCMA-11-2022-0196/full/html>
- Johnson, R. (2019). What Causes Employee Conflict in the Workplace. Small Business Chronicles. <https://smallbusiness.chron.com/causes-employee-conflict-workplace-21264.html>
- Jacobson, M. (2023). 5 Common workplace communication problems. Bloom Fire. <https://bloomfire.com/blog/workplace-communication-problems/>

- Jengkings, E. (2020). Taking sides: a lose – lose scenario. LinkedIn.
<https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/taking-sides-lose-lose-scenario-emma-jenkings>
- Kayanda, Tangi. (2022). Journal of Humanities and Education Development. Methods used by School Heads in Managing Conflict in Improving Teacher’s Morale in Public Secondary Schools in Tanzania. Journal of Humanities and Education Development.
<https://issuu.com/monika.infogain/docs/1khadija-manuscript-methods>
- Keller. (2021). Navigating Conflict in the Workplace: Ongoing Challenges in 2021. Pathways.
<https://www.pathways.com/pathways-at-work/blog/navigating-conflict-in-the-workplace-ongoing-challenges-in-2021#:~:text=What%20Are%20the%20Three%20Main,to%20multiple%20instances%20of%20conflict.>
- Kordestani, M. (2022). The importance of finding common ground. Milan Kordestani.
<https://www.milankordestani.com/blog/finding-common-ground#:~:text=The%20Importance%20of%20Finding%20Common,solution%20to%20re solve%20the%20conflict.>
- Kuligowski, K. (2023). How to develop a disciplinary action policy. Business News Daily.
<https://www.businessnewsdaily.com/15896-disciplinary-action-policy-how-to.html>
- Lamarco, N. (2019). The effect of Autocratic Leadership. Small Business Chronicles
<https://smallbusiness.chron.com/effect-autocratic-leadership-2974.html>
- Lathan, J. (2023) 10 Traits of Successful School Leaders. University of San Diego.
<https://onlinedegrees.sandiego.edu/effective-educational-leadership/>
- Marsh, E. (2019). Why do we need more positive feedback. T-Three. <https://www.t-three.com/thinking-space/blog/why-we-need-to-give-more-positive-feedback#:~:text=expected%20of%20them>
- Oren, C. Z. (2023). Common workplace issues. Good Therapy Organization.
<https://www.goodtherapy.org/learn-about-therapy/issues/workplace-issues#:~:text=Discrimination,Poor%20job%20fit.>
https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3905418
- Santiago Jr., Ulanday, Centeno, Bayla, Callanta. (2021). Flexible Learning Adaptabilities in the New Normal: E-Learning Resources, Digital Meeting Platforms, Online Learning Systems and Learning Engagement. Asian Journal of Distance Education.
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1332615.pdf>
- Sasikala, P., Santhiya, C. Swetha, K. (2021). Conflict Management in Workplace. Palarch’s Journal Of Archaeology Of Egypt/Egyptology 18(8).
- Schad, E. (2020). Virtual office etiquette: 10 common sense tips. Virtual Vocations.
<https://www.virtualvocations.com/blog/telecommuting-survival/virtual-office-etiquette-common-sense-tips/>
- Skillsyouneed.com. (2023). Dealing with no assertiveness. Skills You Need.
<https://www.skillsyouneed.com/ps/assertiveness3.html>
- Smirti. (2021). Reference notes for management. Management Note.
<https://www.managementnote.com/custodial-model/>
- Tasa, K., Bahmani, M. (2023). Who is cooperative in negotiations? The impact of political skill on cooperation, reputation, and outcomes. International Journal on Conflict Management. Vol. 34 No. 4, pp. 801-817. <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/IJCM-11-2022-0197/full/html>
- Tai. (2020). The pros and cons of directive leadership. MatterApp Inc.
<https://matterapp.com/blog/the-pros-and-cons-of-directive-leadership>
- Tingley. (2023). Beyond the Classroom – Conflict Resolution, Principals, Teacher Advise Dealing

with Conflicts in School: Advice from a Former Principal. Western Governor's University.
<https://www.wgu.edu/heyteach/article/dealing-teacher-conflicts-school-advice-former-principal1710.html>

Turner, J. (2023). Employees seek personal value and purpose at work. Be prepared to deliver. Gartner Inc. <https://www.gartner.com/en/articles/employees-seek-personal-value-and-purpose-at-work-be-prepared-to-deliver>

University of Washington. (2023) Healthy ways to handle conflict. Husky Experience Toolkit.
<https://sas.uaahusky.uw.edu/-experience/know-yourself/healthy-ways-to-handle-conflict/>

Wright B. E., Moynihan D. P., & Pandey S. K. (2012). Pulling the levers: transformational leadership, public service motivation, and mission valence. *Public Administrat. Rev.* 72 206–215.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2011.02496.x>