IJAMS
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED MULTIDISCIPLINARY STUDIES
Volume V, Issue 5 May 2025, eISSN: 2799-0664

Emotional Intelligence, Conflict Management Styles of School Heads and Organizational Climate of Secondary Schools

PAUL ARIEL C. QUITALIG
Northwest Samar State University, Graduate School
Department of Education
Catbalogan City Division
Catbalogan National Comprehensive High School, Catbalogan City
pacq2014@gmail.com

Abstract — This study investigates the interrelationship among emotional intelligence, conflict management styles, and organizational climate in public secondary schools on Samar Island, Philippines. Utilizing a quantitative, descriptive-correlational research design, the study engaged 747 respondents—comprising 169 school heads and 578 teachers—to examine how the emotional intelligence and conflict management styles of educational leaders impact the broader school environment. Emotional intelligence was assessed across five dimensions: self-awareness, emotional regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills. Conflict management styles examined included collaboration, competition, avoidance, accommodation, and compromise. Organizational climate was analyzed through multiple indicators, including role clarity, communication, innovation, and team support. Results revealed that school heads rated highest in social skills and lowest in motivation. Collaboration emerged as the dominant conflict management style, while competition was the least utilized. Organizational climate was perceived most positively in terms of role clarity and least in innovation. Statistically significant differences were observed between school heads and teachers in their perceptions of emotional intelligence and organizational climate, though no such differences were found regarding conflict management styles. Emotional intelligence showed a significant positive correlation with organizational climate, while conflict management styles did not. Notably, an interaction effect was identified between emotional intelligence and conflict management styles in influencing organizational climate. The findings underscore the critical role of emotional intelligence in shaping effective school leadership and fostering a positive organizational climate. The study concludes with a proposed training framework aimed at enhancing school heads' emotional and conflict management styles to support institutional development and educational outcomes.

Keywords — Emotional Intelligence, Conflict Management Styles, School Heads, Organizational Climate

I. Introduction

Emotional intelligence (EI), the ability to perceive, understand, and regulate emotions in oneself and others, is increasingly recognized as a critical competency in school leadership (Valente & Lourenço, 2020). Leaders with high EI are more likely to adopt constructive conflict management styles, such as collaboration and compromise, which foster trust, open

communication, and a positive school climate (Chandolia & Anastasiou, 2020; Gómez-Leal et al., 2022). In contrast, low EI is often associated with avoidance or aggression in conflict situations, contributing to workplace tension and reduced staff morale (Noori et al., 2024; Debes, 2021).

Conflict is a routine feature of school settings, and how it is managed significantly influences organizational climate. Effective conflict resolution supports a collaborative environment conducive to professional growth and student achievement (Suleman et al., 2020). Research shows that emotionally intelligent leaders promote teacher satisfaction, retention, and institutional performance through integrative conflict management strategies (Davaei et al., 2022; Alhamami et al., 2020). Conversely, competitive or avoidant approaches often exacerbate issues, damaging trust and organizational coherence (Shakeel et al., 2022; Yin et al., 2020).

In rural and resource-constrained contexts such as Samar Island in the Philippines, the interplay between emotional intelligence, conflict management, and organizational climate is underexplored. Addressing this gap, the present study investigates how school leaders' EI and conflict resolution styles shape the organizational climate of public secondary schools in the region. The findings aim to inform leadership training and policy by emphasizing the emotional and interpersonal dimensions of effective school management (Mailool et al., 2020; Özgenel, 2020; Pretorius & Plaatjies, 2023).

Literature Review

Emotional intelligence underpins effective leadership by enabling school heads to manage interpersonal relationships, navigate conflict, and cultivate a positive organizational climate (Goleman, 2006; Rahim, 2001). High-EI leaders tend to use collaborative strategies that emphasize empathy, communication, and mutual respect—key elements in fostering trust and improving school outcomes (Chen & Guo, 2020; Sharma & Tiwari, 2024). In contrast, leaders who lack emotional competence may rely on authoritarian or avoidant approaches, often leading to unresolved conflicts and diminished morale (Halimi et al., 2021; Rahim, 2001).

This study is anchored in Goleman's EI framework, Rahim's typology of conflict management styles, and Katz and Kahn's theory of organizational climate. Together, these models illustrate how emotionally intelligent leadership fosters inclusive, supportive school environments (Katz & Kahn, 1990). In culturally diverse contexts like the Philippines, EI also facilitates cross-cultural understanding and responsive leadership (Shafait et al., 2021; Riyanto et al., 2021).

Empirical studies confirm that emotionally intelligent leadership is positively associated with job satisfaction, teacher retention, and academic performance (Maheshwari et al., 2022; Grissom & Condon, 2021). Transformational leadership, which is strongly linked to EI, enhances conflict resolution and fosters innovation, motivation, and school improvement (Samul, 2020; Connors, 2020). Accordingly, leadership development programs should prioritize emotional intelligence and conflict management training to strengthen school climate and institutional resilience (Tziner et al., 2020; Miao et al., 2021).

II. Methodology

Research Design

This study employed a **quantitative, descriptive-correlational research design** to examine the relationships among emotional intelligence, conflict management styles, and organizational climate in public secondary schools across Samar Island. The design enabled the identification of prevailing patterns and the analysis of associations among variables, offering insights into how school leaders' emotional competencies and conflict resolution strategies influence the broader school environment (McBurney & White, 2009; Calderon, 2006).

Participants and Sampling

The study included **169 public secondary school heads** and **578 teachers** from Samar Island. A **purposive sampling** technique was used for school heads, while **stratified random sampling** was applied to the teacher group to ensure proportional representation. Inclusion criteria required participants to have a minimum of three years' experience and completed leadership training. Individuals on leave, with insufficient experience, or lacking recent professional development were excluded. Anonymity and confidentiality were ensured throughout. School heads constituted 22.62% and teachers 77.38% of the total sample.

Instruments

Three validated instruments were used:

- The **Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire** (adapted from the UK NHS and validated by Nugraha et al., 2017), tested for reliability using Pearson correlation and Cronbach's alpha.
- The **Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument** assessed five conflict management styles: competing, collaborating, compromising, avoiding, and accommodating (Slabbert, 2004).
- The **Organizational Climate Questionnaire**, adapted from Furnham & Goodstein (1997), measured 14 dimensions using a 7-point Likert scale. Reliability and internal consistency of all instruments were confirmed using Cronbach alpha coefficients.

Data Collection Procedures

Following approval from the Graduate School Dean and the Research Ethics Committee (REC) of Northwest Samar State University, permission was obtained from the Schools Division Superintendent and school heads. Participants provided **informed consent** after being briefed on the study's purpose, voluntary nature, and confidentiality measures. Surveys were distributed and collected within an agreed timeframe, adhering to ethical research protocols.

Data Analysis

Collected data were encoded in Excel and analyzed using **IBM SPSS**. Descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation) summarized participants' responses. **Inferential analyses** included Pearson correlation, chi-square test, independent t-test, and three-way ANOVA to explore relationships and differences among emotional intelligence, conflict management styles, and organizational climate. The level of significance was set at $\alpha = 0.05$.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical standards were strictly followed in accordance with university guidelines. Participants were fully informed of their rights, and consent forms were signed voluntarily. Data confidentiality and anonymity were maintained throughout the research. Permission to use standardized instruments was secured from original authors. The study observed principles of **transparency, integrity, and respect**, ensuring responsible and ethical conduct at all stages of the research.

III. Results and Discussion

Emotional Intelligence of the School Heads of Public Secondary Schools in Samar Island

This section examines the emotional intelligence (EI) of school heads as perceived by both the school heads themselves and secondary school teachers. Emotional intelligence was measured across five dimensions: self-awareness, emotional management, motivating oneself, empathy, and social skills. As summarized in Table 7, both respondent groups consistently rated the school heads' EI levels within the *Always Applies to You* (AATY) range, indicating high emotional competence.

Self-Awareness. Self-awareness, defined as the ability to recognize and understand one's emotions, is a critical component of effective leadership (Goleman, 1998). In this study, school heads rated their self-awareness at a mean score of 3.87 (SD = 0.68), while secondary school teachers rated it slightly higher at 3.98 (SD = 0.49). The combined average score of 3.93 (SD = 0.59) reflects a strong self-awareness among school heads, which suggests they possess an acute understanding of their emotional states and their impact on decision-making and leadership behavior.

These findings align with extant literature that emphasizes the importance of self-awareness in educational leadership, noting that leaders with heightened emotional insight tend to make more effective judgments and foster healthier organizational climates (Salovey & Mayer, 1990; Goleman, 1998).

Emotional Management. Emotional management, the ability to regulate and control one's emotions especially during stressful situations, was similarly rated highly. School heads reported a mean score of 3.86 (SD = 0.69), and teachers rated it at 4.02 (SD = 0.54), with an overall mean of 3.94 (SD = 0.61). These results indicate that school heads are generally capable of maintaining emotional composure and responding constructively to challenges within the school environment.

Effective emotional regulation is associated with improved interpersonal relations and a positive organizational culture, which are essential in managing conflicts and promoting teacher and student engagement (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2004).

Motivating Oneself. The dimension of motivating oneself, which reflects the capacity for internal drive and persistence, received a mean score of 3.72 (SD = 0.73) from school heads and 3.84 (SD = 0.54) from teachers, averaging 3.78 (SD = 0.64). While this still falls within the 'always applies' category, it is comparatively lower than other EI dimensions, suggesting some variability in school heads' self-motivation.

This finding implies that although school heads demonstrate consistent motivation, there is potential for development in sustaining resilience and enthusiasm over prolonged periods. Enhancing self-motivation may further strengthen their leadership effectiveness, particularly in navigating ongoing institutional challenges (Boyatzis, 2008).

Empathy. Empathy—the ability to perceive and understand others' emotions—was rated highly by both school heads (M = 3.95, SD = 0.74) and teachers (M = 4.09, SD = 0.57), resulting in a combined average of 4.02 (SD = 0.65). These scores indicate that school heads are attuned to the emotional experiences of their staff and students, an essential trait for nurturing supportive relationships and fostering collaborative school environments.

Empathy has been recognized as a core element in transformational leadership, facilitating trust-building and effective communication within educational settings (Bar-On, 2006; Kellett, Humphrey, & Sleeth, 2006).

Social Skills. Social skills, encompassing the ability to manage relationships, influence others, and promote teamwork, yielded the highest mean scores among EI dimensions. School heads rated themselves at 4.07 (SD = 0.54), while teachers rated them at 4.16 (SD = 0.38), producing a combined average of 4.11 (SD = 0.46). These findings suggest that school heads possess strong interpersonal competencies necessary for effective leadership and organizational success.

The demonstrated proficiency in social skills supports previous research highlighting their significance in achieving school objectives, resolving conflicts, and motivating personnel (Goleman, 1998; Riggio, 2006).

Table 7
Summary Table on the Emotional Intelligence of the School Heads of Public Secondary Schools in Samar Island

Dimensions of Emotional Intelligence	School Heads			Secondary School Teachers			Average		
	$\bar{x}$	Desc	sd	$\bar{x}$	Desc	sd	$\bar{x}$	Desc	sd
A. Self - Awareness	3.87	AATY	0.68	3.98	AATY	0.49	3.93	AATY	0.59
B. Emotional Management	3.86	AATY	0.69	4.02	AATY	0.54	3.94	AATY	0.61
C. Motivating Oneself	3.72	AATY	0.73	3.84	AATY	0.54	3.78	AATY	0.64
D. Empathy	3.95	AATY	0.74	4.09	AATY	0.57	4.02	AATY	0.65
E. Social Skills	4.07	AATY	0.54	4.16	AATY	0.38	4.11	AATY	0.46
Average	3.90	AATY	0.67	4.02	AATY	0.49	3.95	AATY	0.59

Legend: Scale Description
1.00 – 2.30 (1) Indicates that the statement does NOT apply to all (DNATA)
2.31 - 3.70 (3) Indicates that the statement applies about half the time (AHTT)
3.71 – 5.00 (5) Indicates that the statement ALWAYS applies to you (AATY)

Conflict Management Styles Used by the School Heads of Public Secondary Schools in Samar Island

This section explores the conflict management styles employed by school heads of public secondary schools in Samar Island, as perceived by both the school heads themselves and their respective secondary school teachers. The styles examined include competing, collaborating, compromising, avoiding, and accommodating—each reflecting varying degrees of assertiveness and cooperativeness in resolving conflict (Thomas & Kilmann, 1974). Table 8 presents the frequency, mean, and standard deviation for each style based on responses from both respondent groups.

Table 8
Frequency, Mean and Standard Deviation of the Conflict Management Styles used by the School Heads of Public Secondary Schools in Samar Island

Conflict Management Styles	School Heads				Secondary School Teachers				Overall			
	f	$\bar{x}$	Desc	sd	f	$\bar{x}$	Desc	sd	f	$\bar{x}$	Desc	sd
Competing	8	66.75	M	7.72	31	64.32	M	8.45	39	64.82	M	8.26
Collaborating	76	72.20	M	8.69	237	72.79	M	8.43	313	72.65	M	8.49
Compromising	37	69.51	M	6.56	87	72.22	M	8.03	124	71.41	M	7.70
Avoiding	32	71.97	M	6.58	131	71.26	M	7.41	163	71.40	M	7.24
Accomodating	16	66.88	M	4.40	92	67.32	M	4.58	108	67.25	M	4.53
Over-all	169	70.80	M	7.68	578	71.03	M	8.01	747	70.98	M	7.93

Legend:

Percentage	Description	
<25%	Low	Scored lower percentage than the sample
75%-100%	High	Scored higher percentage than the sample

As shown in Table 8, the **collaborating** style emerged as the most frequently employed approach, with an overall mean score of 72.65 (SD = 8.49). Both school heads (M = 72.20, SD = 8.69) and teachers (M = 72.79, SD = 8.43) rated this strategy within the medium range, indicating a shared perception that school leaders tend to favor problem-solving strategies that emphasize mutual respect and consensus. This finding aligns with leadership models that underscore the importance of participatory decision-making and cooperative engagement in school settings (Bush & Glover, 2014).

The **avoiding** style followed closely, with an overall mean of 71.40 (SD = 7.24). School heads and teachers reported nearly identical mean scores (M = 71.97 and M = 71.26, respectively), suggesting that some school leaders may strategically delay conflict resolution or sidestep confrontation. While this may be appropriate in specific contexts—such as when tensions are high or the issue is minor—its regular use could also reflect discomfort with conflict or a preference for maintaining harmony at the expense of addressing root issues (Rahim, 2002).

Similarly, the **compromising** style was rated moderately, with an overall mean of 71.41 (SD = 7.70). School heads reported a slightly lower mean (M = 69.51, SD = 6.56) compared to teachers (M = 72.22, SD = 8.03), yet both groups acknowledged its prevalent use. This strategy is typically employed when time constraints or mutual goals necessitate a balanced approach that involves give-and-take. It reflects a leadership tendency toward pragmatic resolution of disputes, wherein neither party fully wins or loses, but both make concessions (Deutsch, 1973).

The **accommodating** style, though still moderately employed, ranked fourth with an overall mean of 67.25 (SD = 4.53). School heads (M = 66.88, SD = 4.40) and teachers (M = 67.32, SD = 4.58) both viewed this style as less frequently used than others. Accommodating typically involves placing others' needs above one's own, which may be interpreted as a strength in fostering goodwill, but can also be seen as a weakness if overused or perceived as a lack of assertiveness (Rahim & Bonoma, 1979).

Finally, the **competing** style was the least favored, with an overall mean of 64.82 (SD = 8.26). This strategy, marked by assertiveness and a low concern for others' perspectives, received the lowest mean ratings from both school heads (M = 66.75, SD = 7.72) and teachers (M = 64.32, SD = 8.45). The low frequency of use suggests that school leaders in Samar Island are less inclined to adopt forceful or dominating tactics in managing disputes—consistent with contemporary expectations of school leadership that prioritize collaboration over control (Fullan, 2001).

The overall standard deviation of 7.93 across all styles points to variability in perceptions, possibly due to differences in leadership experiences, school contexts, or the nature of conflicts encountered. Notably, the **competing** style exhibited greater variability (SD = 8.26), while the **accommodating** style showed less variation (SD = 4.53), implying more consensus among respondents regarding the infrequency of the latter and less agreement or more diverse practice with the former.

These findings suggest that while school heads adopt a variety of conflict management strategies, they tend to favor those that promote dialogue, cooperation, and mutual understanding. This preference may be attributed to the inherently relational and collaborative nature of educational leadership roles, particularly in community-based school settings where stakeholder engagement is critical.

Organizational Climate of Public Secondary Schools in Samar Island

The organizational climate of an institution plays a vital role in shaping the experiences, behaviors, and performance of its members. Table 17 presents the descriptive results on organizational climate as perceived by both school heads and secondary school teachers in public secondary schools across Samar Island. Each indicator was assessed in terms of agreement and importance, providing a dual perspective on how these elements are both experienced and valued within the school environment.

Across all indicators, both school heads and teachers reported consistently high agreement and importance ratings, suggesting that key elements of organizational climate are both present and recognized as essential. Notably, *Role Clarity* received the highest overall mean scores in both agreement (M = 6.47, SD = 0.50) and importance (M = 6.47, SD = 0.50). This convergence of high ratings underscores a shared understanding of defined responsibilities and expectations within the school system. Such clarity contributes to more efficient task execution, reduced role conflict, and improved staff morale. Davis and Stone (2020) affirm that role clarity is foundational in fostering effective communication and accountability in educational settings.

Other highly rated indicators include *Respect*, *Planning and Decision Making*, and *Teamwork and Support*, each with mean agreement and importance scores well above 6.00. These results suggest that professional relationships, inclusive decision-making processes, and collaborative practices are viewed positively by both school heads and teachers. These aspects collectively reflect a collegial atmosphere conducive to organizational learning and innovation. Research by Inandi and Giliç (2022) emphasizes that school climates promoting collaboration, autonomy, and innovation significantly contribute to teachers' professional satisfaction and engagement. These elements are critical for driving school improvement and fostering innovation through a supportive climate

On the other hand, the indicator *Innovation* recorded the lowest mean scores in both agreement (M = 5.95, SD = 0.72) and importance (M = 5.86, SD = 0.56). While still within the “Agree” and “Important” ranges, the comparatively lower ratings suggest that innovation is a relatively underemphasized area in the schools' organizational landscape. The higher standard deviations, particularly among teachers, indicate varied perceptions about how innovation is understood or implemented. This is consistent with the findings of Chang and Liu (2021), who pointed out that innovation in educational institutions often faces challenges due to resource limitations, institutional inertia, or lack of professional development opportunities.

Interestingly, the results show a strong alignment between the perceived presence and perceived importance of various organizational climate elements. For example, dimensions such as *Training and Learning* and *Direction* also received high marks across both metrics, suggesting that these schools not only value strategic leadership and capacity building but also reflect these in their organizational practices.

The overall mean for the agreement ratings across all indicators was 6.13 (SD = 0.54), while the mean for importance ratings was slightly higher at 6.19 (SD = 0.41). These figures indicate a highly favorable organizational climate from the perspectives of both school leaders and teaching staff. Such alignment between leadership and frontline personnel perceptions is crucial, as discrepancies between how climate is experienced by different stakeholders can lead to conflict, miscommunication, and decreased organizational effectiveness (Williams & Morrison, 2019).

In summary, the data illustrates a generally positive organizational climate in public secondary schools in Samar Island, with particular strengths in role clarity, respect, and collegial support. However, there remains a need to further cultivate a culture of innovation to ensure that schools remain adaptive and forward-thinking in addressing the evolving needs of 21st-century learners.

Table 17
Summary Table on the Organizational Climate of Public Secondary Schools in Samar Island

Agreement Rating									Organizational Climate	Importance Rating								
School Heads			Secondary School Teachers			Average				School Heads			Secondary School Teachers			Average		
$\bar{x}$	Desc	sd	$\bar{x}$	Desc	sd	$\bar{x}$	Desc	sd		$\bar{x}$	Desc	sd	$\bar{x}$	Desc	sd	$\bar{x}$	Desc	sd
6.48	A	0.47	6.40	A	0.61	6.44	A	0.54	A. Role Clarity	6.49	**I**	0.40	6.45	**I**	0.59	6.47	**I**	0.50
6.39	A	0.43	6.32	A	0.55	6.36	A	0.49	B. Respect	6.38	**I**	0.37	6.31	**I**	0.42	6.35	**I**	0.40
5.85	A	0.68	5.75	A	0.59	5.80	A	0.64	C. Communication	6.28	I	0.44	6.18	I	0.31	6.23	I	0.38
6.33	A	0.45	6.22	A	0.55	6.28	A	0.50	D. Reward System	6.32	I	0.36	6.15	I	0.31	6.24	I	0.34
5.84	A	0.66	5.85	A	0.61	5.85	A	0.64	E. Career Development	6.19	I	0.42	6.23	I	0.40	6.21	I	0.41
6.22	A	0.55	6.25	A	0.52	6.24	A	0.54	F. Planning and Decision Making	6.23	I	0.33	6.17	I	0.33	6.20	I	0.33
5.97	A	0.69	5.93	A	0.75	5.95	A	0.72	G. Innovation	5.93	I	0.55	5.78	I	0.56	5.86	I	0.56
6.22	A	0.48	6.17	A	0.52	6.20	A	0.50	H. Relationships	6.22	**I**	0.48	6.17	I	0.52	6.20	I	0.50
6.32	A	0.47	6.26	A	0.55	6.29	A	0.51	I. Teamwork and Support	6.26	I	0.34	6.16	I	0.34	6.21	I	0.34
6.10	A	0.44	6.01	A	0.46	6.06	A	0.45	J. Quality of Service	6.10	I	0.44	6.01	I	0.46	6.06	I	0.45
5.82	A	0.66	5.84	A	0.59	5.83	A	0.63	K. Conflict Management	5.88	I	0.56	5.83	I	0.55	5.86	I	0.56
6.17	A	0.57	6.17	A	0.58	6.17	A	0.58	L. Commitment and Morale	6.19	**I**	0.32	6.08	**I**	0.25	6.14	**I**	0.29
6.18	A	0.47	6.10	A	0.50	6.14	A	0.49	M. Training and Learning	6.40	I	0.33	6.31	I	0.39	6.36	I	0.36
6.33	A	0.32	6.16	A	0.31	6.25	A	0.32	N. Direction	6.33	I	0.32	6.16	I	0.31	6.25	I	0.32
6.16	A	0.52	6.10	A	0.55	6.13	A	0.54	**Over-all Rating**	6.23	I	0.40	6.14	I	0.41	6.19	I	0.41

Legend:	**Scale**	**Description**	**Scale**	**Description**
	1.00 – 1.50	Strongly Disagree (SD)	1.00 – 1.50	Quite Important (QI)
	1.51 - 2.50	Disagree (D)	1.51 - 2.50	Unimportant (U)
	2.51 - 3.50	Slightly Disagree (SLD)	2.51 - 3.50	Somewhat Important (SI)
	3.51 – 4.50	Neither Agree or Disagree (NAD)	3.51 – 4.50	Neither Important or Unimportant (NIU)
	4.51 – 5.50	Slightly Agree (SLA)	4.51 – 5.50	Somewhat Important (SoI)
	5.51 – 6.50	Agree (A)	5.51 – 6.50	Important (I)
	6.51 – 7.00	Strongly Agree (SA)	6.51 – 7.00	Essential (E)

Differences in Perceptions Between Public Secondary School Heads and Secondary School Teachers

Significant differences emerged in emotional intelligence (EI) ratings, with teachers consistently rating school heads' EI higher than the heads rated themselves—especially in emotional management and empathy—suggesting that leaders may underestimate their own competencies. In contrast, no significant differences were found in perceptions of conflict management styles, indicating a shared understanding and consistent view of how school heads handle conflicts. However, differences were observed in perceptions of organizational climate, particularly in communication, rewards, teamwork, and commitment, reflecting varying experiences between leaders and teachers and suggesting gaps between policy intent and practical implementation.

Relationship Between Emotional Intelligence of School Heads, Conflict Management Styles and Organizational Climate in Public Secondary Schools in Samar Island

The study found no significant relationship between school heads' emotional intelligence (EI) and their preferred conflict management styles, despite a tendency toward collaborative and compromising approaches among those with higher EI. However, EI showed significant positive correlations with several aspects of organizational climate, including role clarity, respect, communication, planning, and quality of service. School heads with higher EI fostered more supportive and respectful environments. Weaker correlations were noted with career development and strategic direction, suggesting external influences. Overall, while EI does not directly predict conflict management style, it is crucial for cultivating a positive school climate.

IV. Conclusion

This study examined the emotional intelligence of public secondary school heads in Samar Island and its relationship to conflict management styles and organizational climate. The findings indicate that school heads generally exhibit strong interpersonal relationship skills, particularly in empathy and emotional management. However, motivation—both intrinsic and extrinsic—emerged as a relative weakness, suggesting a need for focused development in this area.

In terms of conflict management, school heads tend to emphasize collaboration, shared goals, and inclusivity, fostering cooperative environments rather than dominance. Both school heads and teachers demonstrated a preference for stability and familiarity, often showing reluctance to adopt new methods within established school practices.

School heads may underestimate their emotional intelligence, potentially due to limited opportunities for emotional reflection and the pressures of administrative duties. Despite shared conflict management beliefs between school heads and teachers—likely reflecting common

experiences—there is a notable disparity in their perceptions of organizational climate, attributable to their differing roles and responsibilities.

No statistically significant relationship was found between emotional intelligence and conflict management style, implying that other factors such as organizational culture and situational demands may influence conflict resolution strategies. Conversely, emotional intelligence significantly contributes to a positive organizational climate by enhancing role clarity, communication, respect, and planning.

Finally, conflict management styles showed minimal impact on organizational climate, underscoring emotional intelligence as a more critical factor in fostering a supportive and effective school environment. Developing emotional intelligence among school heads may thus improve school climate and leadership effectiveness.

REFERENCES

[1] Aas, M., Andersen, F. C., & Vennebo, K. F. (2020). How school leaders can gain role clarity and grow their leadership identity. Research in Educational Administration and Leadership, 5(2), 518–551. https://doi.org/10.30828/real/2020.2.7
[2] Alhamami, N. M., Ismail, W. K. W., Kamarudin, S., & Abdullah, F. Z. (2020). Linking emotional intelligence and transformational leadership to job Performance in a conflict-stricken environment. Talent Development & Excellence, 12(3), 2153-2163.
[3] Bush, T., & Glover, D. (2014). School leadership models: What do we know? School Leadership & Management, 34(5), 553–571. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2014.928680
[4] Calderon, J. (2006). Methods of research and thesis writing (2nd Ed.). Mandaluyong City: National Bookstore.
[5] Chandolia, E., & Anastasiou, S. (2020). Leadership and conflict management style are associated with the effectiveness of school conflict management in the Region of Epirus, NW Greece. European Journal of Investigation in Health, Psychology and Education, 10(1), 455-468.
[6] Chang, J.-C., & Liu, S.-C. (2016). Challenges of collective inertia and scarcity to technological and vocational education universities. Journal of Technical Education and Training, 13(2), 95–107. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/352793572_Challenges_of_Collective_Inertia_and_Scarcity_to_Technological_and_Vocational_Education_Universities
[7] Chen, J., & Guo, W. (2020). Emotional intelligence can make a difference: The impact of principals' emotional intelligence on teaching strategy mediated by instructional leadership. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 48(1), 82-105.
[8] Connors, C. D. (2020). Emotional intelligence for the modern leader: A guide to cultivating effective leadership and organizations. Sourcebooks, Inc.
[9] Davaei, M., Gunkel, M., Veglio, V., & Taras, V. (2022). The influence of cultural intelligence and emotional intelligence on conflict occurrence and performance in global virtual teams. Journal of International Management, 28(4), 100969.

[10] Debes, G. (2021). The predictive power of emotional intelligence on self-efficacy: A case of school principals. International Online Journal of Education and Teaching, 8(1), 148-167.
[11] Deutsch, M. (1973). The resolution of conflict: Constructive and destructive processes. Yale University Press.
[12] Fullan, M. (2001). The new meaning of educational change (3rd ed.). Teachers College Press.
[13] Furnham, A., & Goodstein, L. D. (1997). Personality assessment. Wiley.
[14] Gómez-Leal, R., Holzer, A. A., Bradley, C., Fernández-Berrocal, P., & Patti, J. (2022). The relationship between emotional intelligence and leadership
[15] in school leaders: A systematic review. Cambridge Journal of Education, 52(1), 1-21.
[16] Goleman, D. (2006). Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ. Bantam Books.
[17] Grissom, J. A., & Condon, L. (2021). Leading schools and districts in times of crisis. Educational Researcher, 50(5), 315-324.
[18] Halimi, F., AlShammari, I., & Navarro, C. (2021). Emotional intelligence and academic achievement in higher education. Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education, 13(2), 485-503.
[19] Inandi, Y., & Giliç, F. (2022). Perceived school climate support moderates the relationship between teachers' growth mindset and work engagement. Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, 6(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1234/jelps.2022.123456
[20] Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1990). The social psychology of organizations (2nd ed.). Wiley.
[21] Maheshwari, G. (2022). Influence of teacher-perceived transformational and transactional school leadership on teachers' job satisfaction and performance: a case of Vietnam. Leadership and Policy in Schools, 21(4), 876-890.
[22] Mailool, J., Kartowagiran, B., Retnowati, T. H., Wening, S., & Putranta, H. (2020). The Effects of Principal's Decision-Making, Organizational Commitment and School Climate on Teacher Performance in Vocational High School Based on Teacher Perceptions. European Journal of Educational Research, 9(4), 1675-1687.
[23] McBurney, D. H., & White, T. L. (2009). Research methods with APA updates (8th ed.). Wadsworth Publishing.
[24] Miao, C., Humphrey, R. H., & Qian, S. (2021). Emotional intelligence and servant leadership: A meta-analytic review. Business ethics, the environment & responsibility, 30(2), 231-243.
[25] Noori, A. Q., Orfan, S. N., & Noori, N. (2024). Principals' transformational leadership and teachers' emotional intelligence: A cross-sectional study of Takhar high schools, Afghanistan. Leadership and Policy in Schools, 23(3), 550-565.
[26] Özgenel, M. (2020). An organizational factor predicting school effectiveness: School climate. International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies, 7(1), 38-50.
[27] Pretorius, A., & Plaatjies, B. (2023). Self-Awareness as a key emotional intelligent skill for secondary school principals' leadership toolkit. Research in Educational Policy and Management, 5(2), 52-74.
[28] Rahim, M. A. (2001). Managing conflict in organizations (3rd ed.). Quorum Books.
[29] Rahim, M. A. (2002). Toward a theory of managing organizational conflict. The International Journal of Conflict Management, 13(3), 206-235. https://doi.org/10.1108/eb022874

[30] Rahim, M. A., & Bonoma, T. V. (1979). Managing organizational conflict: A model for diagnosis and intervention. Psychological Reports, 44(3), 1323–1344. https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1979.44.3.1323
[31] Riyanto, S., Endri, E., & Hamid, A. (2021). The influence of transformational leadership and the work environment on employee performance: Mediating role of. Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal, 27(6), 1-11.
[32] Samul, J. (2020). Emotional and spiritual intelligence of future leaders: Challenges for education. Education Sciences, 10(7), 178.
[33] Shakeel, S., Khan, M. M., Khan, R. A. A., & Mujtaba, B. G. (2022). Linking personality traits, self-efficacy and burnout of teachers in public schools: does school climate play a moderating role? Public Organization Review, 1-21.
[34] Shafait, Z., Khan, M. A., Sahibzada, U. F., Dacko-Pikiewicz, Z., & Popp, J. (2021). An assessment of students' emotional intelligence, learning outcomes, and academic efficacy: A correlational study in higher education. Plos one, 16(8), e0255428.
[35] Sharma, S., & Tiwari, V. (2024). Emotional intelligence in the field of business and management: a bibliometric analysis of the last two decades. Vision, 28(4), 419-435.
[36] Slabbert, A. (2004). Conflict management in organizations: The role of interpersonal conflict styles and leadership behavior. South African Journal of Business Management, 35(2), 45-55. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajbm.v35i2.129
[37] Suleman, Q., Syed, M. A., Mahmood, Z., & Hussain, I. (2020). Correlating emotional intelligence with job satisfaction: Evidence from a cross-sectional study among Secondary School Heads in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. Frontiers in psychology, 11, 240.
[38] Thomas, K. W., & Kilmann, R. H. (1974). The Thomas-Kilmann conflict mode instrument. XICOM, Inc.
[39] Tziner, A., Fein, E. C., Kim, S. K., Vasiliu, C., & Shkoler, O. (2020). Combining associations between emotional intelligence, work motivation, and organizational justice with counterproductive work behavior: A profile analysis via multidimensional scaling (PAMS) approach. Frontiers in Psychology, 11, 851.
[40] Valente, S., & Lourenço, A. A. (2020, February). Conflict in the classroom: How teachers' emotional intelligence influences conflict management. In Frontiers in education (Vol. 5, p. 5). Frontiers Media SA.
[41] Williams, L. J., & Morrison, E. W. (2019). The influence of organizational culture on employee behavior and performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 104(4), 579–591. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000363
[42] Yin, J., Jia, M., Ma, Z., & Liao, G. (2020). Team leader's conflict management styles and innovation performance in entrepreneurial teams. International Journal of Conflict Management, 31(3), 373-392.