

The Resolution Strategies and Leadership's Role in Managing Organizational Conflict

Jefferson Almirol Milad

Business Education Department, Core Gateway College Inc., SanJose City, Nueva Ecija, Philippines

Email for correspondence: miladjefferson@gmail.com

Submitted: December 2024. Accepted: April 2025. Published Online: June 2025.

ABSTRACT

Conflict management is essential for creating harmony and productivity within organizations. The study analyses the conflict resolution strategies and the role of leadership in managing conflicts in Core Gateway College, Inc. A structured questionnaire was distributed to 19 leaders to collect data on the effectiveness of various strategies, including avoidance, accommodation, competition, cooperation, and compromise, as well as the impact of leaders' experience, competence, and active participation. Results show that cooperation and accommodation are the most preferred strategies, which promote trust and collaboration. Leadership attributes, such as experience and proactive participation, also have a significant influence on conflict resolution. Such findings underscore the need for tailored approaches to conflict resolution and leadership involvement in fostering a healthy work environment.

Keywords: *Conflict management, resolution strategies, leadership, cooperation, accommodation, organizational harmony*

INTRODUCTION

Conflicts are unavoidable in organizations due to varying perspectives, interests, and objectives, making effective conflict management crucial for maintaining a productive and harmonious workplace. Research suggests that conflicts within relationships can have a detrimental impact on team performance and employee satisfaction. De Dreu and Van Vianen (2001) indicate that avoidance strategies enable team members to concentrate more effectively than collaborative or confrontational methods when addressing relationship conflicts. DeChurch and Marks (2001) highlight that task conflicts can enhance group satisfaction when managed collaboratively but diminish satisfaction if approached neutrally or uncooperatively.

In the Philippines, the demand for efficient conflict management has increased as numerous organizations implement systematic methods for resolving disputes. According to the Philippine Society for Human Resource Management (PSHRM, 2023), 65% of domestic firms have implemented conflict management training to enhance workplace dynamics and team unity. The Asian Institute of Management (AIM, 2023) found that organizations implementing effective conflict management strategies have significantly reduced employee turnover and enhanced job satisfaction. At the state level, the Civil Service Commission's mediation program has decreased workplace conflicts by nearly 30%, promoting a culture of cooperation. These results underscore the importance of structured conflict resolution approaches in fostering organizational dynamics and overall well-being.

The significance of resolution strategies in fostering a productive organizational atmosphere cannot be exaggerated. The five main strategies for resolving conflicts—avoidance, accommodation, competition, cooperation, and compromise—are crucial for encouraging a peaceful work environment. Avoidance refers to evading or sidestepping conflict, often when the matter is minor or when addressing it might lead to adverse outcomes (Thomas, 1976). Although avoidance provides short-term comfort, it usually results in unresolved problems and can deteriorate over

time (Blake & Mouton, 1964). Accommodation involves accommodating the needs of the other party, emphasizing the importance of preserving relationships over pursuing individual objectives, which helps sustain harmony (Rahim, 2002). Competition, in contrast, entails vigorously chasing one's goals, frequently to the detriment of relationships, and proves effective when rapid decisions are essential (Thomas-Kilmann, 1974). Cooperation, or collaboration, focuses on joining efforts to discover solutions that benefit all parties, especially in complex scenarios that require varied perspectives (Tjosvold, 1998). Lastly, compromise seeks a middle ground where both parties make concessions, applicable when time or resources are limited but less optimal for achieving the best possible solution (Pruitt & Rubin, 1986).

Effective leadership is crucial for managing and resolving conflicts within an organization. Experienced, skilled, and actively engaged leaders are crucial in resolving disputes and promoting harmony within organizations. Seasoned leaders possess valuable insights gained from previous conflicts, enabling them to anticipate potential challenges and implement effective resolution strategies (Yukl, 2013). Their achievements in earlier conflict resolution scenarios build trust and collaboration among teams, enhancing overall organizational harmony (Schein, 2010). Additionally, leaders adept in communication, emotional intelligence, and negotiation promote effective conflict resolution (Goleman, 1995). Engaged leadership—fostering transparency and inclusiveness—guarantees that every team member feels acknowledged and appreciated, thereby avoiding miscommunications and enhancing teamwork (Blake & Mouton, 1964). This inclusive method not only addresses existing conflicts but also fosters team unity, thereby decreasing the likelihood of future disagreements.

Therefore, the integration of leadership skills, proficiency, and active participation is essential for successfully handling conflicts, encouraging a positive organizational culture, and nurturing a cooperative and trustworthy workplace. These traits are vital for maintaining team cohesion and enhancing organizational efficiency.

METHOD

This quantitative research aimed to explore conflict resolution techniques and the influence of leadership on conflict management. Information was gathered through a standardized questionnaire distributed to the institution's leaders, particularly the Council of Heads. A complete population sampling approach was employed to guarantee that the sample accurately reflected the various tiers of leadership. The survey encompassed socio-demographic data, conflict situations, resolution tactics, leadership functions, and the perceived efficacy of conflict management initiatives. Data analysis utilized statistical software, incorporating ethical aspects such as informed consent, confidentiality, and voluntary involvement.

The research took place in San Jose City, Nueva Ecija, with Core Gateway College, Inc. serving as the primary institution for choosing participants. San Jose City boasts a diverse population along with an array of industries. It provides an excellent opportunity to evaluate leadership across various areas of work. The group consisted of 19 members of the Council of Heads (COH). Out of these, only 18 leaders completed the survey, as one participant was unable to respond due to scheduling issues. The participants were selected based on their leadership positions and had a minimum of six months of experience in those roles.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Profile of the Respondents

The socio-demographic profile indicates that the majority of leaders (56%) fall within the 21–30 age bracket, followed by 33% aged 31–40, and a minority (11%) above 40 years old. This age distribution suggests a predominantly younger leadership group, which may influence the choice of conflict resolution strategies. Younger leaders, particularly those early in their leadership tenure, may be more inclined to adopt cooperative or accommodating styles to establish rapport and maintain group harmony. Their strategies may also reflect contemporary training

in emotional intelligence and collaborative management. Additionally, the standard deviation of 6.73 years indicates a moderate variation in age among the respondents, suggesting that while most are young, some diversity in age may contribute to varied perspectives on leadership approaches.

The sample also includes slightly more females (56%) than males (44%), suggesting balanced gender representation. Prior research indicates that gender can influence conflict management tendencies: women often prioritize harmony and relationship preservation, which aligns with the high ratings for accommodating and cooperative approaches seen later in the findings. This demographic insight partially explains the preference for non-confrontational strategies among CGCI leaders.

Civil status is evenly split between single and married respondents. While civil status is less frequently examined in organizational behavior, some studies suggest that married individuals may draw on interpersonal conflict resolution skills developed in personal settings, favoring compromise and long-term solutions. However, given the even split, it is unlikely to be a major differentiator in this study.

In terms of educational attainment, half of the respondents hold bachelor's degrees, and half hold master's degrees, with no doctorate holders in the sample. This suggests a well-educated leadership group, which could enhance their understanding and application of structured conflict resolution frameworks. Those with graduate-level education may also be more reflective in their approach and more likely to employ evidence-based strategies, such as cooperation and problem-solving methods, over impulsive or authoritarian ones.

The socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents provide context for interpreting their preferred conflict strategies. The predominance of young, educated, and gender-diverse leaders at CGCI likely contributes to the institution's leaning toward cooperative and accommodating methods, reflecting values of inclusivity, dialogue, and mutual understanding in leadership practice.

Table 1. Socio-Demographic Profile of the Respondents

	Frequenc y	Percentag e
Age		
Below 20 years old	0	0%
21-30	10	56%
31-40	6	33%

	Above 40 years old		2	11%
		Total	18	100%
	Standard Deviation: 6.73			
			years	
<hr/>				
Sex	Male		8	44%
	Female		10	56%
		Total	18	100%
Civil Status	Single		9	50%
	Married		9	50%
		Total	18	100%
Educational Attainment	Bachelor's		9	50%
	Master's		9	50%
	Doctorate		0	0%
		Total	18	100%

Resolution Strategies

Avoiding

Table 2 shows that the respondents moderately agreed with using avoidance as a conflict resolution strategy. While seen as contextually applicable, it is not widely preferred due to concerns that unresolved tensions may escalate over time.

The highest mean shared between the first and third items is 3.22, corresponding to an "Agree" Rating. These attributes imply an affinity for avoiding conflict, as one would want to maintain peace, and also that sometimes one may encounter more serious problems due to the fear of conflict later on. This demonstrates a sophisticated understanding of avoidance (the concept that the goal of avoidance is "keeping things from me ") for harmony, but it can worsen issues if not adequately addressed.

The lowest mean, 2.56, is observed in the fourth item: "I use avoidance to prevent immediate damage tensions from escalating." Although still rated as "Agree," this comparatively low mean suggests ascribing avoidance to somebody as a less preferred or effective method for de-escalating immediate tensions. This may reflect skepticism about whether avoidance adequately addresses underlying issues or its effectiveness in preventing escalation.

The grand mean of 2.97, which falls within the "Agree" range, indicates a moderate level of agreement with avoidance as a conflict management strategy. Although avoidance. It seems reasonable to consider it useful in a limited range. The overall mean suggests that participants may not like it as their "go-to " style for responding to

disagreements. This balance demonstrates an understanding of both the problems and advantages of avoiding them in order to reduce tension and maintain a calm focus on priorities.

Table 2. Conflict Resolution Strategies in terms of Avoiding

A. AVOIDING	Mean	Adjective Rate
1. I prefer to avoid conflicts whenever possible to maintain harmony.	3.22	Agree
2. Avoiding conflicts is an effective strategy in certain situations.	3.11	Agree
3. I have found that avoiding conflicts can sometimes lead to more serious issues later on.	3.22	Agree
4. I use avoidance to prevent immediate tensions from escalating.	2.56	Agree
5. Avoiding conflicts helps me focus on more important tasks.	2.72	Agree
OVERALL MEAN	2.97	Agree
STANDARD DEVIATION	0.31	

Legend: 3.25-4.00, Strongly Agree, 2.50-3.24, Agree, 1.75-2.49, Disagree, 1.00-1.74, Strongly Disagree

Accommodating

Table 3 highlights that the respondents strongly favored accommodating strategies, especially in situations where preserving relationships or harmony is paramount. The data reflects leadership values centered on empathy and collaboration.

The highest recorded mean is 3.78, corresponding to the statement, "I believe that accommodating others' points of view is an indication of strong leadership." This suggests that a respondent negatively correlates surrender with good leadership, which is a virtue that results in mutual understanding and cooperation. That people in leadership positions value these listening practices so highly speaks to the general importance placed on flexibility and inclusiveness in conflict resolution and relationship maintenance.

At the other extreme, the lowest mean is 3.22 in the item "I often give way to others' wishes in order to resolve conflicts." Although rated as "Agree," this low mean suggests that, although attendees agree that they need to make accommodations in the resolution of conflict, they do not always do so in practice, as they often prioritize their own needs over those of others. It is a selective thing; one might say the accommodation

is more situational, based on the specific relationship or issue at hand.

The average score of 3.51, indicating “Strongly Agree,” suggests that accommodating is perceived by respondents as an effective and valuable method of conflict resolution. This approach is appreciated since it helps resolve tensions and sustain important relationships, especially within the contexts of work and leadership. Respondents value accommodation in resolving disputes, which facilitates cooperation, strengthens relationships, fosters minimal conflicts, and sustains a vibrant organizational climate.

Table 3. Conflict Resolution Strategies in terms of Accommodating

Statements	Mean	Adjective Rate
1. I often accommodate others' needs to resolve conflicts.	3.22	Agree
2. Accommodating is useful when the relationship is more important than the issue at hand.	3.39	Strongly Agree
3. I use accommodating to maintain a positive work environment.	3.56	Strongly Agree
4. Accommodation helps resolve conflicts without lingering tensions.	3.61	Strongly Agree
5. Accommodating others' viewpoints is a sign of strong leadership.	3.78	Strongly Agree
OVERALL MEAN	3.51	Strongly Agree
STANDARD DEVIATION	0.21	

Legend: 3.25-4.00, Strongly Agree, 2.50-3.24, Agree, 1.75-2.49, Disagree, 1.00-1.74, Strongly Disagree

Competing

The findings show that the highest mean value in Table 4, at 3.06, is associated with the statement, "I know that competition sometimes brings about resentment among colleagues." This means that respondents recognize the adverse effects of competition on relationships, but they are also aware of the costs associated with competition in a relational context. They would be less likely to use it.

The lowest mean, 2.56, is found in the statement, "I rely on competing when I am confident that my solution is the best." Still within the range of "Agree," this relatively lower score indicates that respondents may not rely too heavily on competing solutions, even when

they are confident that the chosen solution is the best. This preference is for more collaborative or conciliatory approaches toward resolving arguments, where one considers the perspectives of others, even if one's solution appears to be the best.

The general mean rests at 2.74, which translates to "Agree," denoting an intermediate level of acceptance of competition as a means of conflict management. The awareness of participants regarding the malleability of its use tends to be in severe cases, where there is less average usage than in other styles' development. This could be construed as a perception of some appreciation for both the benefits and disadvantages of the competitive style while also being more cautious about how it would affect team dynamics and interpersonal relations.

The respondents acknowledge the necessity of competing in specific contexts; they generally approach it with caution due to its potential impact on team relationships.

Table 4. Conflict Resolution Strategies in terms of Competing

Statements	Mean	Adjective Rate
1. I use my authority to resolve conflicts in my favor when necessary.	2.78	Agree
2. Competing is effective when a quick and decisive resolution is needed.	2.61	Agree
3. Competing helps me achieve the best outcomes for my team.	2.72	Agree
4. I am aware that competing can sometimes lead to resentment among colleagues.	3.06	Agree
5. I rely on competing when I am confident that my solution is the best.	2.56	Agree
OVERALL MEAN	2.74	Agree
STANDARD DEVIATION	0.19	

Legend: 3.25-4.00, Strongly Agree, 2.50-3.24, Agree, 1.75-2.49, Disagree, 1.00-1.74, Strongly Disagree

Cooperating

Figures indicated in Table 5 indicate that the highest mean, 3.94, corresponds to the statement, "I believe that cooperation strengthens team relationships." This suggests that respondents generally agree with the positive role of cooperation in team settings. Rather than making a broad assertion, this finding highlights a shared perception among the participants that cooperative approaches are beneficial for maintaining

harmony and collaboration. While this does not definitively prove that cooperation leads to stronger team relationships, it reflects a commonly held belief that cooperation may contribute to building trust and fostering positive interpersonal dynamics within teams. This insight aligns with existing literature suggesting that cooperative conflict resolution styles are often associated with increased group cohesion and mutual respect (Rahim, 2002; Johnson & Johnson, 2005).

The lowest mean, 3.78, was linked to the statement, "I believe that cooperating leads to mutually beneficial solutions." Though it is low compared to the other items, it remains within the "Strongly Agree" range and is, therefore, uniform in supporting the cooperative approach. The score emphasizes how respondents believe that cooperation is an approach that will ensure a fair solution with mutual satisfaction in resolving conflicts, despite some feeling that it is less effective than its contribution to relationship building.

The overall mean of 3.88, scored as "Strongly Agree," reflects a strong endorsement of cooperation as the preferred style of conflict management. They overwhelmingly recognize its effectiveness in fostering open communication, achieving equitable outcomes, and maintaining harmony. This average is high, suggesting that cooperation is highly regarded as a constructive and sustainable means of addressing conflicts, wherein resolution and relationship enhancement become the priority.

The consistently high scores reflect a clear institutional preference for collaboration, aligning with the leadership's focus on relationship-building and inclusive decision-making.

Table 5. Conflict Resolution Strategies in terms of Cooperating

Statements	Mean	Adjective Rate
1. I encourage open dialogue to resolve conflicts in a cooperative and mutually beneficial manner.	3.89	Strongly Agree
2. Cooperating leads to mutually beneficial solutions.	3.78	Strongly Agree
3. Cooperation strengthens team relationships.	3.94	Strongly Agree
4. Cooperating is my preferred method for handling conflicts.	3.89	Strongly Agree
5. I allocate sufficient time to discuss conflicts and reach a cooperative solution thoroughly.	3.89	Strongly Agree
OVERALL MEAN	3.88	Strongly Agree
STANDARD DEVIATION	0.06	

Legend: 3.25-4.00, Strongly Agree, 2.50-3.24, Agree, 1.75-2.49, Disagree, 1.00-1.74, Strongly Disagree

Compromising

Table 6 highlights that the compromise is viewed as a practical strategy that provides balanced solutions, especially in time-constrained scenarios, although it was rated slightly lower than cooperation or accommodation.

The highest mean in the table, which is 3.28, appears in two statements: "I know that compromising helps to resolve conflicts quickly and fairly" and "I often use compromising to ensure that all parties feel heard and valued." These results indicate that the respondents view compromising as a potent strategy to ensure prompt conflict resolution while maintaining an equitable nature; they tend to emphasize this approach in ensuring that various parties have a say, with mutual respect, in balancing their needs.

The lowest mean, 3.22, is also found in three statements: "I aim for compromise to find a middle ground in conflicts," "I believe that compromise is essential for maintaining harmony in the team," and "I know that compromising allows me to balance different viewpoints effectively." Although scored as "Agree," these slightly lower scores suggest that while respondents still appreciate the value of compromise, they may perceive its impact as less effective compared to more decisive and relationship-oriented strategies, such as cooperation.

The overall mean of 3.24, rated "Agree," indicates moderate agreement in the use of compromising as a strategy to manage conflicts. Respondents have acknowledged that seeking a balanced solution to be just is helpful, but it may not be their first choice in every scenario. This score indicates that the act of compromise is regarded as a pragmatic measure valued because it can sustain harmony and accommodate diverse viewpoints without leaning towards one side more than the other.

Table 6. Conflict Resolution Strategies in terms of Compromising

Statements	Mean	Adjective Rate
1. I strive to find a compromise to resolve conflicts.	3.22	Agree
2. I know that compromising helps to resolve conflicts quickly and fairly.	3.28	Strongly Agree
3. I believe that compromise is essential for maintaining harmony in the team.	3.22	Agree

4. I recognize that compromising enables me to balance different viewpoints effectively.	3.22	Agree
5. I often use compromise to ensure that all parties feel heard and valued.	3.28	Strongly Agree
OVERALL MEAN	3.24	Agree
STANDARD DEVIATION	0.03	

Legend: 3.25-4.00, Strongly Agree, 2.50-3.24, Agree, 1.75-2.49, Disagree, 1.00-1.74, Strongly Disagree

Leadership's Role in Conflict Management

Experience

The data presented in Table 7 underscores the critical role of leadership experience in addressing and preventing conflicts, with respondents strongly agreeing that their past experiences enhance their effectiveness in conflict resolution and prevention.

The highest mean in the table, 3.67, is attached to the statement, "My past experiences have equipped me to handle conflicts more effectively." This means that the respondents strongly believe that their past experiences have greatly helped them to manage conflicts. It points out the aspect of experience in terms of building confidence and competence when dealing with and resolving conflicts.

The lowest mean is 3.53 in two statements, "I believe that my experience helps prevent conflicts from escalating" and "My experience in leadership roles contributes to my ability to mediate disputes successfully." Still rated as "Strongly Agree," these slightly lower scores indicate that respondents recognize the value of experience but think there may be limitations on how far experience extends, such as preventing escalation or mediating more complex situations.

It, being a 3.59-rated "Strongly Agree," points to a consensus on valuing experiences related to conflict resolution. Respondents believed that their long-term experience was a key factor that defined their approach and ensured success in managing such conflicts. The score emphasizes the importance of learning to manage and moderate conflicts through past experiences.

Table 7. Role of Leadership in Addressing and Preventing Conflicts in terms of experience

Statements	Mean	Adjective Rate
1. My past experiences have equipped me to handle conflicts more effectively.	3.67	Strongly Agree

2. I draw on my previous experiences when resolving conflicts at Core Gateway College.	3.60	Strongly Agree
3. My experience helps prevent conflicts from escalating.	3.53	Strongly Agree
4. My experience in leadership roles contributes to my ability to mediate disputes successfully.	3.53	Strongly Agree
5. My experience influences my approach to resolving conflicts.	3.60	Strongly Agree
OVERALL MEAN	3.59	Strongly Agree
STANDARD DEVIATION	0.06	

Legend: 3.25-4.00, Strongly Agree, 2.50-3.24, Agree, 1.75-2.49, Disagree, 1.00-1.74, Strongly Disagree

Competence

Table 8 highlights the respondents' strong agreement on the importance of leadership competence in addressing and preventing conflicts, emphasizing its role in fostering fairness, efficiency, and a positive work environment.

The highest mean in the table is 3.40, appearing in two statements: "I trust my conflict resolution skills to handle disputes fairly and efficiently" and "I believe that my competence is crucial in preventing conflicts from arising." The score indicates that respondents highly value their conflict resolution abilities, as they understand that they can rely on these skills to achieve fairness and proactively prevent disharmony in the workplace.

The lowest mean, 3.13, is found for the statement, "I am well-equipped to resolve complex conflicts at Core Gateway College." Although rated "Agree," this score suggests that respondents feel confident but not entirely assured that they can manage even the most complex disputes. This could reflect an awareness of the complexities involved in dealing with multilayered or high-stakes conflicts.

A high score of 3.29 is the overall mean, which reads as "Strongly Agree." It reflects the level of confidence respondents have in their ability to resolve the conflicts they face. What gives them such confidence is the perceived skill in conflict resolution while ensuring it has a positive impact on work environments. This is a strong endorsement of competence as a significant principle for managing and preventing core conflicts at Core Gateway College.

Table 8. Role of Leadership in Addressing and Preventing Conflicts in terms of competence

Statements	Mean	Adjective Rate
1. I am competent in addressing conflicts at Core Gateway College.	3.20	Agree
2. I trust my conflict resolution skills to handle disputes reasonably and efficiently.	3.40	Strongly Agree
3. My competence in conflict resolution has a positive impact on the work environment.	3.33	Strongly Agree
4. My competence is crucial in preventing conflicts from arising.	3.40	Strongly Agree
5. I am well-equipped to resolve complex conflicts at Core Gateway College.	3.13	Agree
OVERALL MEAN	3.29	Strongly Agree
STANDARD DEVIATION	0.12	

Legend: 3.25-4.00, Strongly Agree, 2.50-3.24, Agree, 1.75-2.49, Disagree, 1.00-1.74, Strongly Disagree

Participation

The highest mean in Table 9 is 3.67, which corresponds to the statement, "I actively participate in conflict resolution when needed." This indicates that respondents have a strong desire to participate in conflict resolution processes. It shows that individuals are proactive and feel responsible enough to address workplace disputes as they arise, reflecting readiness to contribute to problem-solving efforts.

The lowest mean is 3.40, shared between the two statements: "My active participation in conflict resolution leads to more effective outcomes" and "I believe that my active participation is essential in maintaining a harmonious work environment." Although still rated "Strongly Agree," the scores are slightly lower, and respondents may see value in their participation, but still feel that other factors or colleague contributions are needed for effective conflict resolution and harmony in the workplace.

The overall mean of 3.48, rated as "Strongly Agree," reflects a strong consensus on the importance of active participation in conflict resolution. Respondents perceive their involvement as crucial for fostering effective outcomes, supporting colleagues, and preventing conflicts from escalating. This high score underscores the collective responsibility and commitment to maintaining a collaborative and harmonious work environment.

The findings underscore the respondents' strong agreement on the importance of active leadership participation in conflict resolution, emphasizing its impact on supporting colleagues, fostering harmony, and achieving effective outcomes.

Table 9. Role of Leadership in Addressing and Preventing Conflicts in terms of competence

Statements	Mean	Adjective Rate
1. I actively participate in conflict resolution when needed.	3.67	Strongly Agree
2. My participation in conflict resolution supports my colleagues.	3.47	Strongly Agree
3. My active participation in conflict resolution leads to more effective outcomes.	3.40	Strongly Agree
4. I am proactive in addressing conflicts before they escalate.	3.47	Strongly Agree
5. My active participation is essential in maintaining a harmonious work environment.	3.40	Strongly Agree
OVERALL MEAN	3.48	Strongly Agree
STANDARD DEVIATION	0.11	

Legend: 3.25-4.00, Strongly Agree, 2.50-3.24, Agree, 1.75-2.49, Disagree, 1.00-1.74, Strongly Disagree

CONCLUSION

Based on the research study, conflict management at Core Gateway College indicates that the most effective strategies employed by the institution are cooperation and accommodation, as they foster trust and a sense of collaboration among team members. Socio-demographic data indicate that leaders differ in their perspectives; however, experience, competence, and active participation are key factors in resolving conflicts successfully. Cooperation emerged as the preferred strategy because it helped strengthen relationships and achieve mutual benefits, whereas avoidance, competition, and compromise were used situationally with varying effectiveness. These findings underscore the need for customized conflict resolution strategies tailored to specific organizational dynamics and highlight the crucial role of leadership in fostering a harmonious and productive work environment.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the findings of this study, it is recommended that Core Gateway College enhance its conflict management strategies through tailored training and development initiatives. With the majority of leaders aged 21 to 30 and holding bachelor's or master's degrees, the institution should implement workshops focused on cooperative and accommodating strategies, which were the most frequently used. Scenario-based learning and peer mentoring programs can also be introduced, allowing experienced leaders to guide newer ones in handling diverse conflict situations. These efforts will build strategic flexibility and promote a deeper understanding of effective resolution techniques across leadership levels.

Additionally, to support the strong preference for cooperative approaches, the college should foster a culture of open communication by facilitating regular team dialogues, safe-space forums, and anonymous feedback mechanisms. Given the higher representation of female leaders, integrating gender-sensitive training can help ensure inclusivity and empathy in conflict resolution. Encouraging reflective practices, such as journaling and post-conflict assessments, can also contribute to continuous learning. While less common, the appropriate use of competitive and avoidant strategies should be included in training to help leaders respond effectively in high-pressure or safety-sensitive situations.

REFERENCES

- Asian Institute of Management (AIM). (2023). Impact of Conflict Management on Employee Retention and Satisfaction.
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The Managerial Grid: The Key to Leadership Excellence*. Gulf Publishing Company.
- De Dreu, C. K., & Van Vianen, A. E. (2001). Managing relationship conflict and the effectiveness of organizational teams. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 22(3), 309–328. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.71>
- DeChurch, L. A., & Marks, M. A. (2001). MAXIMIZING THE BENEFITS OF TASK CONFLICT: THE ROLE OF CONFLICT MANAGEMENT. *The International Journal of Conflict Management/International Journal of Conflict Management*, 12(1), 4–22. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb022847>
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter More Than IQ*. Bantam Books.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2005). *Creative conflict: Learning to manage conflict constructively*. Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.
- Pruitt, D. G., & Rubin, J. Z. (1986). *Social Conflict: Escalation, Stalemate, and Settlement*. McGraw-Hill.
- Rahim, M. A. (2002). Toward a theory of managing organizational conflict. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 13(3), 206–235.
- Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Thomas, K. W. (1976). Conflict and conflict management. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 889–935). Rand McNally.
- Thomas, K. W., & Kilmann, R. H. (1974). *Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument*. Xicom.
- Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations*. Pearson Education.