

TOFEDU: The Future of Education Journal

Volume 3 Number 5 (2024) Page: 1731-1748

E-ISSN 2961-7553 P-ISSN 2963-8135

https://journal.tofedu.or.id/index.php/journal/index

Conflict Management Styles, Workplace Incivility and Organizational Commitment of Teachers in Region XI: an Explanatory Sequential Design

Marevic Jean P. Lutog*1, Grace O. Aoanan2

* mlutog_220000001792@uic.edu.ph

1,2 University of the Immaculate Conception, Davao City, Philippines

ABSTRACT

Organizational commitment of teachers has been a prevalent issue in education which stem from different underlying factors at present. This explanatory sequential mixed-method study aimed to assess and examine the influence of conflict management style and workplace incivility toward organizational commitment of Region XI junior high school teachers. The respondents were from large and implementing schools of different school divisions for the quantitative phase. For the qualitative phase, the participants were purposively selected for the in-depth interview and focus group discussions. A validated and adapted survey questionnaire along with the interview guide were utilized in the gathering of data. For the results, regression analysis and thematic analysis were employed to interpret the data collected. The quantitative findings indicated that conflict management styles were high, workplace incivility is seldom observed, and organizational commitment is oftentimes manifested. Additionally, both conflict management styles and workplace incivility significantly influenced and predicted organizational commitment of junior high school teachers. In the qualitative phase, the results corroborated the quantitative findings, affirming the high ratings of conflict management styles and organizational commitment, and the low rating of workplace incivility. The integration of data revealed confirmation-connection between the two sets of results. The findings of the study are relevant to maintain the organizational commitment of teachers in the department.

Keywords: conflict management styles; education; explanatory sequential design; organizational commitment; workplace incivility

INTRODUCTION

Organizational commitment determines the desire of employees to remain and strive to achieve the goals of an institution (Rachman, 2022). Further, it often plays an important role in productivity, organizational process and retention rate among employees. Moreover, Seid and Negassa (2019) stated that organizational commitment has always been seen as a critical issue in the higher educational setting for the success of its visions and goals since their waning commitment causes their lack of desire to do their best in schools. Additionally, Moodie (2023) revealed that there are teachers who manifested low level of commitment to their organization due to the tedious teaching and administrative duties. Also, Zhu et al. (2022) revealed that primary school substitute teachers have precarious jobs and low organizational commitment to their school.



In Indonesia, it was found out that low organizational commitment of primary school teachers is an annual problem of the regional educational supervisor due to several factors such as poor school facilities and teacher's personality among others (Werang, 2015). Additionally, a study in the United Arab Emirates (UAE) shows that teachers who are young and have lower years of experience exhibit low levels of organizational commitment than their counterparts (Ibrahim & Aljneibi, 2022). In the Philippines, Bading (2023) also found out that teachers in Cagayan have a weak organizational commitment in terms of continuance commitment which affects their decision of staying if given better opportunities. Moreover, Further, Pambuena (2022) reported that Filipino teachers report lower commitment and eagerness to teach which means there is prevalence of uncommitted teachers can resonate with their lack of enthusiasm and hostile behavior toward their students.

Additionally, in a study conducted by Alshehri (2022), it showed that conflict management styles of academic department heads are important factors in determining its relationship with the organizational commitment of faculty members. Also, Zakaria et al. (2023) observed that majority of the conflict management styles have a significant relationship to organizational commitment wherein integrating style has the strongest relationship. Furthermore, Kashif et al. (2024) revealed that factors of conflict management styles are significantly and positively effecting organizational commitment.

Several studies are focused on having bivariate associations especially on conflict management styles and organizational commitment (Akhtar & Syeda, 2021; Rajasekar et al., 2019; Barberan et al., 2023; Agbakwuru et al., 2021) and work incivility and organizational commitment (Zia-ud-Din et al., 2017; Rehman et al., 2022; Mehmood et al., 2021; Mahmood et al., 2023) Nevertheless, an explanatory sequential design concerning conflict management styles, workplace incivility, and organizational commitment in Davao region is limited.

The outcomes of this research will be valuable for school leaders in becoming aware of the current perception of their constituents especially on their attitudes in handling conflict. Moreover, if there are deep-rooted issues that will be found out between leader-employee or employee-employee relationships, it could be addressed through dialogues and interventions to create a more harmonious atmosphere in the work setting. This could lessen the conflict and incivility and enhance the work productivity of the teachers.

This study determined the significant influence of conflict management styles, workplace incivility, and organizational commitment of public junior high school teachers in Region XI in terms of status of each variable, influence, standpoints of the participants on the salient points and explanation of the quantitative results to the qualitative results.

METHOD

This study employed mixed methods research, specifically the explanatory sequential design. According to Creswell and Clark (2017), mixed methods research combines both qualitative and quantitative data gathering and analysis approaches in a single study. The integration of the qualitative and quantitative results aims to achieve a thorough and better understanding to a research question.

In the quantitative phase, the researcher used the descriptive correlation design to obtain information about the situation. While the qualitative phase, the phenomenological approach was utilized. This design was appropriate in analyzing first the descriptive findings of the conflict management styles, workplace incivility and organizational commitment of teachers followed by gathering comprehensive information through interviews of teachers with significant sentiments on these variables. It depicted a clearer picture on the perspective of these respondents.

The study was conducted in the public schools of Region XI or also known as the

Davao Region which is situated at southeastern part of Mindanao, Philippines. It is composed of five provinces, namely: Davao del Norte, Davao del Sur, Davao Oriental, Davao Occidental, and Davao de Oro. The respondents of the quantitative phase were 372 public junior high school teachers with the use of stratified random sampling in selecting the respondents from selected secondary schools in Region XI.

In the qualitative phase, the researcher purposively selected 17 public junior high school teachers. They were drawn from the quantitative strand respondents, 10 for the IDI and seven public junior high school teachers for the FGD. A total of 17 public junior high school teachers will be invited as participants. To gather the quantitative data, three adapted survey questionnaires were utilized based on the variables mentioned.

The mean, standard deviation, Pearson-r, and multiple linear regression analysis were used to analyze the quantitative data of this study. In the qualitative strand, the researcher employed the thematic analysis and interpretation of data to create the rich descriptions that emanate from the data extracts, using the participants' own words to support their interpretations (Creswell, 2013).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Data Description

Status of Conflict Management Styles

The results showed that conflict management styles had an overall mean of 3.61 with a description of high. This entails that conflict management styles are oftentimes practiced by junior high school teachers of Region XI. Further, the overall standard deviation is 0.53 which means that the responses are consistently clustered with the average given that the value is considered small.

The results of the study are consistent with the finding of Morallos (2018) where teachers much practiced conflict management styles since it is vital in sustaining a sound and conducive school environment. Moreover, Guiab and Miguel (2023) confirmed that faculty, staff and student leaders have their own conflict management styles in managing conflicts. Some are inclined to make use of the combination of two of the five different approaches.

Integrating Style. This indicator had a mean of 4.09 denoted as high with means range from 3.94 to 4.19. This is aligned with the study of Rambuyon and Domondon (2020) wherein teachers prefer collaborative conflict management style with supervisors, peers, and students. This approach promotes creative problem-solving, mutual respect and strengthen interpersonal relationships.

Obliging Style. Obliging style got a category mean of 3.87 described as high wherein the means range from 3.70 to 3.96. Further, Yazdanmehr et al. (2020) found that task-oriented teachers tend to adopt an accommodating style when managing conflicts. By minimizing arguments and readily yielding to others' perspectives, these teachers are able to quickly refocus the task at hand which allows them to resume class procedures and focus more on accomplishing tasks.

Dominating Style. Conversely, dominating style acquired a category mean of 2.981 implied as moderate. The means range from 2.79 to 3.18. The result of this study is aligned to the study of Saldanha et al. (2023) wherein teachers least desired conflict management style is competing. This approach focuses on the "I win, you lose" belief which is detrimental to relationships.

Avoiding style. The avoiding style gained a category mean of 3.44 which is denoted as high with means range from 3.27 to 3.63. The result of this study is similar to Yasin and Khalid (2015) wherein avoiding style is commonly manifested by females and lecturers. Since they encounter numerous conflicting situations daily, they cannot respond aggressively

to each one of them. Instead, they choose to avoid conflict and continue with their daily routine.

Compromising Style. The compromising style got a category mean of 3.67 where its means range from 3.49 to 3.81. In connection, Jamail et al. (2019) reported that Millennial teachers tend to prefer compromising style when conflicts arise with principals, as it involves a "give and take" approach where neither party wins or loses. This style, known as "win some - lose some," encourages both parties to benefit and fosters a moderate balance between self-interest and concern for others, ultimately leading to an agreement and resolution of the conflict.

Status of Conflict Management Styles

| Iı | ndicators/Statements | Mean | SD | Descr iption |
|----|---|------|------|-----------------|
| A. | Integrating Style | | | рион |
| 1. | trying to investigate an issue with our supervisor to find a solution acceptable to us. | 3.94 | 0.95 | High |
| 2. | trying to integrate their ideas with those of their supervisor to come up with a decision jointly. | 4.01 | 0.79 | High |
| 3. | trying to work with our supervisor to find solutions to a problem which satisfy our expectations. | 4.12 | 0.77 | High |
| | exchanging accurate information with their supervisor to solve a problem together. | 4.13 | 0.81 | High |
| 5. | trying to bring all our concerns out in the open so that the issues can be resolved in the best possible way. | 4.08 | 0.82 | High |
| 6. | collaborating with our supervisor to come up with decisions acceptable to us. | 4.16 | 0.78 | High |
| 7. | trying to work with their supervisor for a proper understanding of a problem. | 4.19 | 0.78 | High |
| | Category Mean | 4.09 | 0.68 | High |
| В. | Obliging Style | | | |
| | 1. generally trying to satisfy the needs of their supervisor. | 3.96 | 0.87 | High |
| | 2. usually accommodating the wishes of their supervisor. | 3.84 | 0.89 | High |
| | 3. giving in to the wishes of their supervisor. | 3.70 | 0.91 | High |
| | 4. often going along with the suggestions of their supervisor. | 3.91 | 0.91 | High |
| _ | 5. trying to satisfy the expectations of their supervisor. | 3.93 | 0.87 | High |
| | Category Mean | 3.87 | 0.79 | High |
| C. | Dominating Style | | | |
| | 1. using their influence to get their ideas accepted. | 3.02 | 1.11 | Mode rate |

| 2. using their authority to make a decision in their favor. | 2.79 | 1.08 | rate | Mode |
|--|------|------|------|------|
| 3. using their expertise to make a decision in their favor. | 3.12 | 1.09 | rate | Mode |
| 4. being generally firm in pursuing their side of the issue. | 3.18 | 1.04 | rate | Mode |
| 5. sometimes using their power to win a competitive situation. | 2.79 | 1.12 | rate | Mode |
| Category Mean | 2.98 | 0.97 | rate | Mode |
| D. Avoiding Style | | | | |
| 1. attempting to avoid being 'put on the spot' and try to keep their conflict with their supervisor to themselves. | 3.39 | 1.01 | rate | Mode |
| 2. usually avoiding open discussion of their differences with their supervisor. | 3.27 | 1.04 | rate | Mode |
| 3. trying to stay away from disagreement with their supervisor. | 3.53 | 1.04 | | High |
| 4. avoiding an encounter with their supervisor. | 3.35 | 1.13 | rate | Mode |
| 5. trying to keep their disagreement with their supervisor to myself in order to avoid hard feelings. | 3.47 | 1.02 | | High |
| 6. trying to avoid unpleasant exchanges with their supervisor. | 3.63 | 1.05 | | High |
| Category Mean | 3.44 | 0.87 | | High |
| E. Compromising Style | | | | |
| 1. trying to find a middle course to resolve an impasse. | 3.67 | 0.80 | | High |
| 2. usually proposing a middle ground for breaking deadlocks. | 3.49 | 0.84 | | High |
| 3. negotiating with their supervisor so that a compromise can be reached. | 3.73 | 0.86 | | High |
| 4. using 'give and take' so that a compromise can be made. | 3.81 | 0.85 | | High |
| Category Mean | 3.67 | 0.72 | | High |
| Overall Mean | 3.61 | 0.53 | | High |

Status of Workplace Incivility

The status of workplace incivility had an overall mean of 3.79 described as low. This means that the workplace incivility of junior high school teachers of Region XI is seldom observed. Further, the overall standard deviation is 0.86. This indicates homogeneity due to the consistent responses as reflected by a standard deviation that does not surpass 1.00. The findings are aligned to the study of Yirci and Daso (2021) which states that incivility is an occasional phenomenon. It shows that individuals working in the school environment act within the framework of respect and courtesy rules.

Coworker Incivility. The coworker incivility obtained a category mean of 3.61

described as low wherein the means range from 3.77 to 3.22. This aligns with the result of De Cordova et al. (2019) where there is low teacher-directed violence because of the support they received from their colleagues.

Instigated Incivility. This indicator got a mean of 3.94 described as low. The range of means are from 3.90 to 3.60. Further, Holm et al. (2015) revealed that instigated incivility arises when an individual witnessed or experienced the said incivility firsthand. In this case, since the level of incivility is unseen and latent, teachers are less likely to do the said incivility to their colleagues.

Supervisor Incivility. This indicator attained a mean of 3.79 implied as low. The ranges of mean are from 3.90 to 3.60. This aligns with Uslukaya and Demirtas (2024) wherein teachers who are supported by supervisors foster positive emotions toward their work and enhance their performance.

Status of Workplace Incivility

| A. Coworker Incivility 1. paying little attention to other's statement or showing little interest in their opinion. 2. addressing others in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately. 3. ignoring or excluding others from professional camaraderie. 4. doubting other's judgment on a matter over which they have responsibility 5. making unwanted attempts to draw others into a discussion of personal matters. Category Mean 3.61 3.62 3.62 3.63 4.04 5. ignoring or excluding other's statement or showing little interest in their opinion. 2. addressing others in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately. 3. ignoring or excluding others from professional camaraderie. 4. doubting other's judgment on a matter over which they have responsibility 5. making unwanted attempts to draw others into a discussion of personal matters. 4. doubting other's judgment on a matter over which they have responsibility 5. making unwanted attempts to draw others into a discussion of personal matters. Category Mean 3.22 3.68 7 1.0 Low 1.0 Low 2 1.0 Low 2 Low 2 Low 4.04 5 Low 4.05 Low 4.07 Low 4.09 Low 4.09 Low 4.01 Low 4.01 Low 4.01 Low 4.01 Low 4.02 Low 4.03 Low 4.04 Low 4.06 Low 4.07 Low 4.09 Low 4.09 Low 4.00 Low 4.00 Low | I | ndicators/Statements | Mean | | SD | Description |
|---|----|--|-------|----|-----|-------------|
| showing little interest in their opinion. 2. addressing others in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately. 3. ignoring or excluding others from professional camaraderie. 4. doubting other's judgment on a matter over which they have responsibility 5. making unwanted attempts to draw others into a discussion of personal matters. Category Mean B. Instigated Incivility 1. paying little attention to other's statement or showing little interest in their opinion. 2. addressing others in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately. 3. ignoring or excluding others from professional camaraderie. 4. doubting other's judgment on a matter over which they have responsibility 5. making unwanted attempts to draw others into a discussion of personal matters. 4.04 | A. | Coworker Incivility | | | | |
| 2. addressing others in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately. 3. ignoring or excluding others from professional camaraderie. 4. doubting other's judgment on a matter over which they have responsibility 5. making unwanted attempts to draw others into a discussion of personal matters. Category Mean B. Instigated Incivility 1. paying little attention to other's statement or showing little interest in their opinion. 2. addressing others in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately. 3. ignoring or excluding others from professional camaraderie. 4. doubting other's judgment on a matter over which they have responsibility 5. making unwanted attempts to draw others into a discussion of personal matters. Category Mean 3.68 7 1.0 Low Low Low 4.04 7 1.0 Low Low Low 4.09 5 Low 4.09 5 Low Low Analy 1.0 Low Low Low Low Low Low Low Lo | 1. | 1 · · | 3.22 | 0 | 1.0 | |
| 3. ignoring or excluding others from professional camaraderie. 4. doubting other's judgment on a matter over which they have responsibility 5. making unwanted attempts to draw others into a discussion of personal matters. Category Mean 3.61 3.62 2. addressing others in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately. 3. ignoring or excluding others from professional camaraderie. 4. doubting other's judgment on a matter over which they have responsibility 5. making unwanted attempts to draw others into a discussion of personal matters. 3.62 4.04 5. Low 4.04 7. Low Low Low Low Low Low Low Low | 2. | addressing others in unprofessional terms, | 3.68 | 7 | 1.0 | Low |
| 4. doubting other's judgment on a matter over which they have responsibility 5. making unwanted attempts to draw others into a discussion of personal matters. Category Mean 3.67 3.67 3.67 4.09 3.60 B. Instigated Incivility 1. paying little attention to other's statement or showing little interest in their opinion. 2. addressing others in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately. 3. ignoring or excluding others from professional camaraderie. 4. doubting other's judgment on a matter over which they have responsibility 5. making unwanted attempts to draw others into a discussion of personal matters. Category Mean 3.60 4.00 5. Low 1.0 Low | 3. | ignoring or excluding others from | 3.77 | 6 | 1.0 | Low |
| 5. making unwanted attempts to draw others into a discussion of personal matters. Category Mean 3.61 B. Instigated Incivility 1. paying little attention to other's statement or showing little interest in their opinion. 2. addressing others in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately. 3. ignoring or excluding others from professional camaraderie. 4. doubting other's judgment on a matter over which they have responsibility 5. making unwanted attempts to draw others into a discussion of personal matters. Category Mean 3.67 3.67 3.69 4.09 5. Low Low Low Low 1.0 Low Low 1.0 Low 1.0 Low 1.0 Low 1.0 Low 1.0 Low 1.0 Low | 4. | doubting other's judgment on a matter over | 3.70 | | 1.0 | Low |
| Category Mean 3.61 B. Instigated Incivility 1. paying little attention to other's statement or showing little interest in their opinion. 2. addressing others in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately. 3. ignoring or excluding others from professional camaraderie. 4. doubting other's judgment on a matter over which they have responsibility 5. making unwanted attempts to draw others into a discussion of personal matters. 3.62 2. Low 4.04 7. Low Low Low Low 5. Low 6.09 Low 1.0 Low | 5. | making unwanted attempts to draw others | 3.67 | | 1.0 | Low |
| 1. paying little attention to other's statement or showing little interest in their opinion. 2. addressing others in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately. 3. ignoring or excluding others from professional camaraderie. 4. doubting other's judgment on a matter over which they have responsibility 5. making unwanted attempts to draw others into a discussion of personal matters. Cotegory Mean 1.1 Low 1.0 Low | C | • | 3.61 | 3 | 0.9 | Low |
| showing little interest in their opinion. 2. addressing others in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately. 3. ignoring or excluding others from professional camaraderie. 4. doubting other's judgment on a matter over which they have responsibility 5. making unwanted attempts to draw others into a discussion of personal matters. Cotegory Mean 3.02 4.04 7 Low Low Low 4.01 2 Low 4.01 2 Low 4.01 2 Low 4.01 Low 4.01 Low 4.01 Low 4.01 Low 4.01 Low | В. | Instigated Incivility | | | | |
| 2. addressing others in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately. 3. ignoring or excluding others from professional camaraderie. 4. doubting other's judgment on a matter over which they have responsibility 5. making unwanted attempts to draw others into a discussion of personal matters. Cotegory Mean 1.0 Low 1.0 Low 1.0 Low 2. Low 4.01 2. Low 1.0 Low 2. Low 1.0 Low | 1. | - · · | 3.62 | 2 | 1.1 | Low |
| 3. ignoring or excluding others from professional camaraderie. 4. doubting other's judgment on a matter over which they have responsibility 5. making unwanted attempts to draw others into a discussion of personal matters. Cotegory Mean 3.91 1.0 Low Low 2.09 Low 0.9 | 2. | addressing others in unprofessional terms, | 4.04 | 7 | 1.0 | Low |
| 4. doubting other's judgment on a matter over which they have responsibility 5. making unwanted attempts to draw others into a discussion of personal matters. Cotegory Mean 3.92 1.0 Low 2 Low 0.9 | 3. | ignoring or excluding others from | 4.09 | | 1.0 | Low |
| 5. making unwanted attempts to draw others into a discussion of personal matters. 1.0 Low Cotegory Mean 3.94 Low | 4. | doubting other's judgment on a matter over | 3.92 | | 1.0 | Low |
| Category Mean 3.04 0.9 Low | 5. | making unwanted attempts to draw others | 4.01 | | 1.0 | Low |
| 5 | C | Category Mean | 3.94 | 5 | 0.9 | Low |
| C. Supervisor Incivility | C. | Supervisor Incivility | | | | |
| 1. paying little attention to other's statement or showing little interest in their opinion. 3.597 Low | 1. | | 3.597 | 56 | 1.0 | Low |
| 2. addressing others in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately. 1.0 Low | 2. | addressing others in unprofessional terms, | 3.903 | | 1.0 | Low |
| 3. ignoring or excluding others from 3.898 town professional camaraderie. 1.0 Low | 3. | ignoring or excluding others from | 3.898 | | 1.0 | Low |

| 4. doubting other's judgment on a matter ove which they have responsibility | er 3.863 | 15 | 1.0 | Low |
|--|----------|----|-----|-----|
| 5. making unwanted attempts to draw other into a discussion of personal matters. | | 30 | 1.0 | Low |
| Category Mean | 3.825 | 66 | 0.9 | Low |
| Overall Mean | 3.790 | 60 | 0.8 | Low |

Status of Organizational Commitment

The status of organizational commitment had an overall mean of 3.59 denoted as high. This means that the organizational commitment of junior high school teachers of Region XI is oftentimes manifested. Furthermore, the overall standard deviation is 0.60. This indicates similarity due to the consistency of responses as reflected by a standard deviation that does not exceed 1.00. This is aligned with Volkova et al. (2021) who mentioned that organizational commitment of teachers is higher in schools where leaders foster professional development, collaboration and collegial decision making

Affective Commitment. The affective commitment of teachers got a category mean of 3.86 described as high. The range of means are from 3.33 to 4.05. The results of this study align with the findings of Lobrigo et al. (2023), which indicates that teachers demonstrate a strong emotional attachment and dedication to their school organization.

Continuous Commitment. This indicator got a mean of 3.54 denoted as high. The means range from 3.36 to 3.83. The study by Perez et al. (2023) confirmed that university teachers exhibit a high degree of continuance commitment to their organization, indicating that they remain in their roles largely due to practical reasons such as financial stability and a lack of better employment opportunities.

Normative Commitment. This indicator attained a mean of 3.37 conveyed as high. The range of means are from 2.73 to 3.76. The results of this study align with the findings of Rayo et al. (2022), which highlighted a strong presence of normative commitment among teachers, indicating their deep devotion and loyalty to their organization.

Status of Organizational Commitment

| Indicators/Statements | Mean | SD | Description |
|---|------|------|-------------|
| A. Affective Commitment | | | |
| 1. very happy to be spending the rest of their career with this organization. | 3.97 | 0.88 | High |
| 2. really feeling as if this organization's problems are their own. | 3.33 | 1.03 | High |
| 3. really feeling a strong sense of "belonging" to their organization. | 4.05 | 0.79 | High |
| 4. really feeling "emotionally attached" to this organization. | 3.79 | 0.87 | High |
| 5. really feeling like "part of the family" in their organization. | 4.01 | 0.81 | High |
| 6. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for them. | 4.02 | 0.78 | High |
| Category Mean | 3.86 | 0.71 | High |

B. Continuous Commitment

| 1. right now, staying with the organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire. | 3.83 | 0.91 | | High |
|---|------|------|----|--------|
| 2. it would be very hard for them to leave their organization right now, even if they wanted to do that. | 3.74 | 0.97 | | High |
| 3. too much of their life would be disrupted if they decided in wanting to leave my organization now. | 3.47 | 1.02 | | High |
| 4. feeling of having too few options to consider leaving this organization. | 3.36 | 0.99 | te | Modera |
| 5. if they had not already put so much of myself into this organization, they might consider working elsewhere. | 3.47 | 0.97 | | High |
| 6. one of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives. | 3.38 | 1.00 | te | Modera |
| Category Mean | 3.54 | 0.79 | | High |
| C. Normative Commitment | | | | |
| 1. feeling obligated to remain with their current employer. | 3.29 | 1.06 | te | Modera |
| 2. feeling it would be right to leave their organization now even if it were to their disadvantage. | 2.73 | 1.03 | te | Modera |
| 3. would be feeling guilty if I left their organization now. | 3.19 | 1.06 | te | Modera |
| 4. believing that this organization deserves their loyalty. | 3.76 | 0.90 | | High |
| 5. would not be leaving their organization right now because they feel a sense of obligation to the people in it. | 3.53 | 0.96 | | High |
| 6. owing a great deal to my organization. | 3.71 | 0.96 | | High |
| Category Mean | 3.37 | 0.72 | te | Modera |
| Overall Mean | 3.59 | 0.60 | | High |

Significance of the Influence of Conflict Management Styles and Workplace Incivility on Organizational Commitment

For the significant influence of conflict management styles to organizational commitment, it has a beta coefficient of 0.36 and p-value of less than 0.001. This implicates that as conflict management styles increase, the organizational commitment tends to increase as well. This suggests that better conflict management styles improve organizational commitment.

For workplace incivility, it significantly influences organizational commitment with a beta coefficient of -0.124 and p-value of 0.013. Thus, for every unit increase in workplace incivility, there is a corresponding decrease in the organizational commitment by 0.124.

Finally, the combined predictive effect of conflict management styles and workplace incivility in organizational commitment is significant as quantified by the R-squared value of

0.172 with a p-value of less than 0.05. This result indicates that the regression model with conflict management styles and workplace incivility as predictors will be able to explain 17.2 percent of the variance in organizational commitment of teachers that is attributed to these predictors. This would mean that 82.8 percent of the variation can be contributed to other factors other than the independent variables mentioned in the regression model.

Significance of the Influence of Conflict Management Styles and Workplace Incivility on Organizational Commitment

| Predictors | Beta | t | | p- | Remarks |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------|-------|-------|------------|
| | coefficient | | value | • | |
| Conflict Management Styles | 0.357 | 7.14 | | < 0.0 | Significar |
| - | | 6 | 01 | | _ |
| Workplace Incivility | -0.124 | _ | | 0.01 | Significar |
| 1 | | 2.485 | 3 | | C |

| Predictors | R- | F | P- | Interpretatio |
|------------|---------|------|--------|---------------|
| | squared | V | alue n | |
| Combined | 0.172 | 38.3 | < 0.0 | Significant |
| | 53 | (|)1 | _ |

Note: R = 0.414; R-squared = 0.172; F = 38.353; p < 0.001

Standpoints of the Participants on Conflict Management Styles

Confirmed High Rating of Conflict Management Styles. The participants confirmed that they prioritize open communication to prevent misunderstandings and encourage collaboration. They have developed conflict-management skills and teamwork to resolve issues effectively, fostering a positive and harmonious in their workplace. The results of this study align with the findings of Rayo et al. (2022), which highlighted a strong presence of normative commitment among teachers, indicating their deep devotion and loyalty to their organization.

Standpoints of the Participants on Workplace Incivility

Confirmed Low Rating of Workplace Incivility. The participants emphasized that effective leadership in schools sets respectful standards that staff and teachers follow which promote ethical behavior and reducing incivility. A close-knit environment fosters mutual respect, with teachers distancing themselves from rumors or conflicts to maintain a positive atmosphere. While friction exists between younger and older teachers, the former often introduce new, respectful approaches that help minimize tension. Further, Gragasin (2024) revealed that the consistent presence and extent of interpersonal relationships among public elementary teachers indicate a strong and pervasive culture of collaboration, communication, and mutual support within the teaching community.

Standpoints of the Participants on Organizational Commitment

Confirmed High Rating of Organizational Commitment. The participants mentioned that the stability of a teaching job and the sense of responsibility to follow school rules help teachers stay committed to their profession. Teachers are motivated by passion for making a positive impact on lives of students. There are those who go an extra mile to support them. Hence, Munian and Hassan (2020) contend that teachers will dedicate themselves to their student's success at school by continuously innovating and incorporating new concepts into teaching practice.

Standpoints of the Participants on the Significance of the Influence of Conflict Management Styles, Workplace Incivility and Organizational Commitment

Shown still on Table 3.4 are he standpoints of the participants on the significance of the influence of conflict management styles, workplace incivility and organizational commitment of junior high school teachers. Based on the result, the participants confirmed the significance of the influence on conflict management styles, workplace incivility and organizational commitment. Moreover, a toxic environment that damages the confidence, morale, and peace of mind of teachers which leads to reduced commitment and motivation. This negativity strains relationships and drives teachers to seek healthier, more supportive environments. Thus, to manage conflict, the organization should maintain relationship through discussion, cooperation, adaptability, and establishing trust in a harmony work environment (Abou Ramadan & Eid, 2020). Conflicts that are not managed will make it more difficult to attain organizational objectives and distributing negative energy among the work environment (Shabani et al., 2022).

Standpoints of the Participants as Regards the Salient Findings from the Quantitative Data

| Level | Essential Theme | Typical Reason |
|-------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | Teachers in Region XI |
| | | address issues openly, |
| | | which helps prevent misunderstandings and |
| | | misunderstandings and fosters collaboration |
| | | Many experienced |
| | | teachers have developed |
| | | effective conflict- |
| | | management skills over |
| | | time, reducing stress and |
| | | maintaining harmony |
| | | Educators recognize |
| | | and respect diverse |
| | | personalities, which |
| Conflict | | minimizes |
| Management Styles | Confirmed high level | misunderstandings and |
| Mean: 3.611 | of conflict management | promotes a positive work environment |
| SD: 0.529 | | Teachers rely or |
| SD. 0.329 | | teamwork to manage |
| | | conflicts, focusing or |
| | | shared goals to maintain |
| | | effective relationships |
| | | Teachers prefer |
| | | practical and amicable |
| | | conflict resolution methods |
| | | promoting a peaceful |
| | | workplace |
| | | Large institutions like |
| | | the Department of |
| | | Education provide protocols |
| | | that guide teachers in |
| | | handling conflicts with |

| | | 11 , 1 1 |
|--|---|---|
| Workplace Incivility Mean: 3.790 SD: 0.860 | Confirmed low level of workplace incivility | Effective leadership discourages incivility, as administrators set respectful standards that staff follow Teachers uphold ethical behavior and professional values, reducing incidents of incivility Schools promote a close-knit environment, fostering mutual respect and reducing tension While gossip exists, it's often focused on constructive feedback rather than personal attacks Many teachers choose to distance themselves from rumors or conflicts to maintain a positive atmosphere younger staff often bring fresh, respectful approaches, minimizing incivility despite occasional friction with older colleagues |
| Organizational Commitment Mean: 3.590 SD: 0.595 | Confirmed high level of organizational commitment | The security provided by a teaching position encourages commitment, as teachers rely on it as their main source of income Teachers feel a strong sense of duty to follow school rules and fulfill responsibilities, which reinforces their commitment Many teachers view teaching as a calling, driven by passion rather than just financial motivation Teachers are committed because they find purpose and fulfillment in positively impacting students' lives Commitment is |

Significance of the Influence of Conflict Management Styles, Workplace Incivility and Organizational Commitment

R-squared = 0.172

Confirmed
Significance of the
Influence of Conflict
Management Styles,
Workplace Incivility and
Organizational
Commitment

reinforced by the professional oath and dedication inherent in the teaching profession

Teachers often go the extra mile, including personal financial sacrifices, to support students, showing high levels of dedication

A harmonious work setting fosters teacher commitment by creating a sense of companionship

Unresolved conflicts can cause stress, decreasing commitment and leading some teachers to consider leaving

Teachers are more committed when they feel included and free from incivility, reducing turnover

Teachers with conflict management skills and pleasant workplace tend to stay committed, feeling equipped to handle challenges

Conflict and negativity make teachers lose interest, prompting them to seek better environments

Conflict management skills enhance teacher commitment, as addressing issues directly prevents stress and prevents conflicts from escalating.

Joint Display of Quantitative and Qualitative Results

Conflict Management Styles. The results consistently show that teachers in Region XI frequently practice conflict management, as shown by its high rating. This aligns with both quantitative results and qualitative findings. The IDI and FGD participants confirmed that teacher oftentimes practice the conflict management styles. This is manifested through their high level of professional identity. Further, they corroborated utilized open communication, teamwork, practical conflict-resolution skills, and established protocols to foster collaboration, reduce stress, and maintain a positive work environment. Thus, the nature of integration is connecting-confirmation.

Workplace Incivility. The quantitative results of this study presented that the workplace incivility of teachers got a low rating. This was also confirmed with the qualitative results by the participants. Workplace incivility is seldom observed, this which reflected their strong professional identity. This is supported by effective leadership and shared professional values, a respectful and close-knit environment among younger and seasoned staff. All of which helps maintain a positive and harmonious school atmosphere. Hence, the two results are connecting-confirmation.

Organizational Commitment. In terms of organizational commitment of Region XI teachers, this variable got a high quantitative rating. The implication that commitment is oftentimes manifested is parallel to the results of the qualitative finding. The interview and discussion of the participants highlighted their strong professional identity and sense of duty. Their commitment is fueled by passion, a desire to make a difference for students, and dedication to their profession, extending beyond financial motivation. Therefore, these are connecting-confirmation.

Joint Display of Quantitative and Qualitative Results

| Research Area | Quantitative | Qualitative Results | Nature of |
|----------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------|
| | Results | | Integration |
| Conflict Management Styles | Based on the result of the quantitative strand of this study, the overall mean of the Conflict Management Styles among Region XI teachers is 3.61 described as high, which implicates that it is oftentimes practiced. | level of professional identity. Basing on the interviews and FGD, it could be gathered that teachers in Region XI use open communication, teamwork, practical conflict-resolution | Connecting-confirmation |
| Workplace Incivility | Based on the result of the quantitative strand of this study, the overall mean of the Workplace Incivility among Region XI teachers is 3.79 which is described as low, which means that incivility is seldom observed. | Participants confirmed the high level of professional identity. Basing on the interviews and FGD, it could be gathered that effective leadership, professional values, a close-knit environment, and a mix of respectful | Connecting- confirmation |

| ganizational mmitment | Based on the result of the quantitative strand | and promote a positive atmosphere in schools Participants | |
|--|--|--|--------------|
| | result of the quantitative strand | | |
| | result of the quantitative strand | Participants | |
| mmitment | quantitative strand | | |
| | - | confirmed the | |
| | | high level of | |
| | of this study, the | professional identity. | |
| | overall mean of the | Basing on the | Connecting- |
| | organizational | interviews and FGD, it | confirmation |
| | commitment of | could be gathered that | |
| | among Region XI | teachers' commitment | |
| | teachers is 3.59, | is driven by a sense of | |
| | which is described | duty, passion for their | |
| | as high and is | work, a desire to | |
| | oftentimes | positively impact | |
| | manifested. | students, and | |
| | | dedication to their | |
| | | profession, often going | |
| | | beyond financial | |
| | | motivation | |
| gnificant | Combined | Participants | |
| luence of | influence of | confirmed the | |
| nflict | Conflict | high level of | |
| nagement | Management | professional identity. | |
| les, Workplace | Styles, Workplace | Basing on the | |
| civility and | Incivility and | interviews and FGD, it | Connecting- |
| ganizational | Organizational | could be gathered that | confirmation |
| mmitment | Commitment | teachers are more | |
| 111111111111111111111111111111111111111 | | agentited wiles there | |
| mmumem | | committed when they | |
| mmument | | feel supported, work in | |
| mmunent | | - | |
| mmunent | | feel supported, work in | |
| mmunent | | feel supported, work in a harmonious | |
| mmunent | | feel supported, work in a harmonious environment, address | |
| mmunent | | feel supported, work in a harmonious environment, address conflicts directly, and | |
| immunent | | feel supported, work in a harmonious environment, address conflicts directly, and strengthened teacher | |
| luence of nflict inagement vles, Workplace civility and ganizational | influence of Conflict Management Styles, Workplace Incivility and Organizational | confirmed the high level of professional identity. Basing on the interviews and FGD, it could be gathered that teachers are more | |

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following conclusions were drawn from the findings of the study.

The study revealed that the status of conflict management styles of junior high school teachers is high which means that teachers oftentimes practice conflict management styles in their workplace. For the status workplace incivility, the results revealed is low which means that this is seldom observed by teachers in their schools. As to organizational commitment, the result is high which implies that public junior high school teachers oftentimes manifest commitment in their institutions.

Furthermore, conflict management styles and workplace incivility significantly influence organizational commitment. Thus, having effective ways in handling issues and lessening rudeness in the workplace such as fostering collaboration, finding solutions, and maintaining a respectful environment can positively impact the commitment of teachers in

engaging in their roles. In contrast, poor conflict management and intense incivility could lead to weakened organizational commitment.

In the qualitative phase, the essential themes that emerged were confirmed high conflict management styles, confirmed low workplace incivility, confirmed high organizational commitment, and confirmed significance of the influences of conflict management styles, workplace incivility, and organizational commitment. The interviews and discussions revealed that teachers often practice effective conflict management styles, schools maintain respectful and professional cultures, and teachers are passionate for their teaching.

Moreover, the qualitative findings support the quantitative findings since the data integration of all results was connecting-confirmation. The participants shared insights on the contribution of conflict management styles, workplace incivility, and organizational commitment which strengthened the outcomes of the responses on all the indicators and variables of the first data set. Therefore, this creates a seamless and established corroboration for both findings.

The following recommendations are proposed after a comprehensive review and evaluation of the findings and conclusions.

Since the conflict management styles of teachers were rated as high, this could be maintained or further improved. For this to happen, the school administration may integrate strategies that promote collaboration, understanding, and problem-solving into the organization. School heads can invite external speakers to provide regular professional development trainings focusing on practical conflict resolution skills, and communication techniques that are important for teachers to harness their skills.

In terms of maintaining low workplace incivility, it is important to have proactive approach in creating a respectful and inclusive work environment. School heads and faculty may collaborate in establishing clear policies on acceptable behavior for professional interactions. To further build trust and connection between colleagues, subject coordinators may include team-building activities, continuous feedback and support for further improvement in relationships, starting in their level.

Since the organizational commitment of teachers is rated high, its maintenance may include on schools focusing on creating a supportive and goal-oriented workplace. The schools division office's human resource management office may strengthen the importance of teacher rewards and recognition cascaded in school levels. Providing the necessary resources for teaching and ensuring work-life balance ensures that teachers feel supported and cared which further strengthens their loyalty to the organization.

For future research, researchers may integrate applying concepts to a broader audience, such as private or public elementary, senior high school and higher education institutions. They may explore the influence of work civility towards work commitment. To add, future researchers may identify gaps and propose policy and improvements based on research findings. Lastly, future research may focus on developing and testing intervention programs aimed to reducing work incivility and improving conflict management skills among educators.

REFERENCES

Agbakwuru, A., Kevin, N. & Yusuf, J, Conflict Management Styles and Organisational Commitment amongst Library Staff in ABUAD (2021). *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. 5942. https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/5942

Akhtar, N. & Syeda, S. H. (2021). Conflict management styles as predictors of organizational commitment in university teachers. *Journal of Behavioural Sciences* 31(1)

- Alshehri, K. (2022). The relationship between the conflict management styles of the heads of academic departments and the organizational commitment of the faculty members at Imam Abdulrahman Bin Faisal University. *Journal of Positive Psychology and Wellbeing* 6(1)
- Bading, W. C. (2023). Organizational Commitment of Teachers: Its effects on the performance of students in the high Schools of Sanchez Mira, Cagayan. AIDE Interdisciplinary Research Journal, 2, 92–108. https://doi.org/10.56648/aide-irj.v2i1.21
- Cemaloğlu, N., & Duykuluoğlu, A. (2019). Relationship between teachers' workplace friendship perceptions and conflict management styles. *International Education Studies*, 12(9), 42. https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v12n9p42
- Creswell, J.W., Plano Clark, V.L., Gutmann, M.L., & Hanson, W.E. (2003). Advanced mixed methods research design. In Tashakkori A & Teddlie C (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research* (pp. 209–240). SAGE.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches (3rd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- De Cordova, F., Berlanda, S., Pedrazza, M., & Fraizzoli, M. (2019). Violence at School and the Well-Being of Teachers. The importance of positive relationships. Frontiers in Psychology, 10. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01807
- Guiab, R. R., & Miguel, C. G. (2023). *International Journal of Current Science Research and Review*, 06(09). https://doi.org/10.47191/ijcsrr/v6-i9-25
- Güleryüz, İ., Sürücü, L. ve Yıkılmaz, İ. (2023). The Role of Job Stress in the Effect of Workplace Incivility on Organizational Commitment. *Journal of Erciyes Communication*, 10(2), 525-542 https://doi.org/10.17680/erciyesiletisim.1317176
- Holm, K., Torkelson, E., & Bäckström, M. (2015). Models of Workplace Incivility: The Relationships to Instigated Incivility and Negative Outcomes. *BioMed research international*, 2015, 920239. https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/920239
- Homans, G. C. (1958). Social behavior as exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, 63(6), 597–606. https://doi.org/10.1086/222355
- Jamail, M., Don, Y., & Zain, F. M. (2019). Distributed Leadership and Conflict Management Style of Generation Y Teachers: Malaysian Context. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social *Sciences*, 9(7), 1298–1320.
- Kashif, M. F., Zabrin, T. & Tabassum, T. (2024). Effect of conflict management styles on organizational commitment of university teachers. *Annals of Human and Social Sciences*, 5(1), 209–216. https://doi.org/10.35484/ahss.2024(5-I)19
- Khalid, S., Hashmi, H. B. A., Abbass, K., Ahmad, B., Niazi, A. a. K., & Achim, M. V. (2022). Unlocking the effect of supervisor incivility on work withdrawal behavior: Conservation of Resource Perspective. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13.

- https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.887352
- Kolenova, Z., & Halakova, Z. (2019). The teaching profession according to communication styles while solving conflict situations. International Journal of Educational Methodology, 5(4), 535-545. https://doi.org/10.12973/ijem.5.4.535
- Lobrigo, R, J. M., Dalion, K., Legaspi, J. M. & Carlos, M. R. E. (2023). A path model of organizational commitment of teachers as estimated by work engagement, accountability and autonomy. Southeast Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies, 3, 2.
- Mehmood, B. Ramzan, M., & Yasmeen, B. (2021). Workplace incivility and organizational commitment: The case of public sector women colleges in Punjab, Pakistan. *Bulletin of Business and Economics*, 10(4), 205-210. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6861025
- Morallos, P. A. (2018). Weathering the school climate: role of teachers' conflict management styles. *International Journal of Current Innovations in Advanced Research*, 1(5): 63-72.
- Rachman, M. (2022). Impact of motivation on performance: the role of organizational commitment. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Management. Vol. 15. Pp. 376-393*. https://doi.org/10.20473/jmtt.v15i3.37848
- Rambuyon, R., & Domondon, C. (2021). Conflict management styles of faculty. *Psychology and Education (2021) 58(4): 1709-1713*
- Rayo, F., Pablo, J. A., Tuazon, R., Versoza, E., Pacut, R. M., Cruz, W. D., Mergenio, M., Pacano, S. M., Plamenco, P. M., Porras, E., Recaña, C. P., & Teaño, J. (2022). Amidst the COVID-19 pandemic: Teacher's commitment and its influence on job performance. Zenodo (CERN European Organization for Nuclear Research). https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6534542
- Saldanha, A S., Johney, A. M., Souza, C. V. D., S, N. A., Rodrigues, A. V., & Rodrigues, D. E. (2023). Relationship between personality type and conflict management style among Teachers. International Journal of Science and Research Archive, 9(2), 732–738. https://doi.org/10.30574/ijsra.2023.9.2.0651
- Uslukaya, A., & Demirtas, Z. (2024). The relationships between supervisor and colleague support interaction with teacher presenteeism and work engagement: A multilevel moderated mediated analysis. *Current Psychology: A Journal for Diverse Perspectives on Diverse Psychological Issues*, 43(24), 20948–20963. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-024-05918-5
- Volkova N. V., Zaichenko N. A., Chiker V. A., Gyuninen O. V. (2021) Kontsept "talantmenedzhment" i organizatsionnaya priverzhennost' pedagogov [The Concept of Talent Management and Organizational Commitment of Teachers]. Voprosy obrazovaniya / Educational Studies Moscow, no 3, pp. 168–188. https://doi.org/10.17323/1814-9545-2021-3-168-188
- Werang, B. R., Betaubun, M., & Pure, E. A. G. (2015). Factors influencing teachers' organizational commitment (Case study on primary schools' teachers in remote area

- of Merauke regency, Papua, Indonesia). *Journal of Educational Policy and Entrepreneurial Research.* 2. 122-130.
- Yazdanmehr, E., Ramezani, Y., & Aghdassi, F. (2020). Teacher Leadership and Conflict Management in EFL Classroom in the light of the Contingency Theory of Human Resource Management: an Interdisciplinary study. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 10(8), 916. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1008.09
- Zakaria, N., Ahmad, A., & Azman, N. (2023). Conflict management styles and organizational commitment: A study among Perbadanan Kemajuan Negeri Selangor employees. *International Journal of Professional Business Review*, 8(9), e03568. https://doi.org/10.26668/businessreview/2023.v8i9.3568
- Zia-Ud-Din, M., Arif, A., & Shabbir, M. A. (2017). The impact of workplace incivility on employee absenteeism and organization commitment. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business & Social Sciences*, 7(5). https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v7-i5/2893
- Zhu K, Wang X and Jiang M (2022) The impact of organizational commitment on turnover intention of substitute teachers in public primary schools: Taking psychological capital as a mediator. Front. Psychol. 13:1008142. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1008142