

Construing The Personality Constructs and Work Values of The Administrators in The Higher Education Institutions

MARIA MAMBA, PhD

Cagayan State University, Carig Campus

ABSTRACT

The battle begins when an individual has made the decision to go into a certain working environment, and it lasts until the individual has reached the point when he may eventually retire from their chosen line of work. The primary objective of this research is to identify some personality constructs that are associated with different approaches to conflict management used by administrators working in higher education institutions (HEIs) in the province of Cagayan. The descriptive- correlational research design was utilized in the conduct of the investigation. The data suggest that a great number of the respondents have ESTJ (extrovert, sensing, thinking, judging) as their personality type, vary in the extent of use of authoritarian, democratic, and delegative leadership styles but democratic style as being frequently used, and always observe good work values specially on loyalty, justice, and orderliness. In terms of the respondents' style of managing conflict, the findings reveal that majority of them are inclined at using self-disclosure which is, to honestly bare one's thoughts, opinions, needs and concerns when faced with conflicts. Remarkably, the study revealed that leadership styles have statistically significant correlation with conflict management styles. From the findings of the study, it has been made abundantly clear, that the administrators possess the qualities that are very essential to the discharge of their duties and responsibilities.

Keyword: personality construct, conflict management styles, higher education institutions, personality types

Introduction

The world of work is possibly the most difficult endeavour that an individual is required to immerse himself in after having been equipped with the requisite information and abilities earned after toiling away in the academic world for a significant number of years. The struggle begins at the time an individual has decided to go into a selected working environment and continues until he may ultimately retire. But what really makes work difficult are the experiences that are inextricably bound up in the entirety of the work cycle, which each and every worker is obligated to go through.

When delving further into the world of work in organizations, it is necessary to develop a critical awareness of, and provide objective answers to, the question, "What then makes work the most demanding engagement of a person to almost or more than half of his life?" Within the scope of this research project, a response to such a question is provided in the context of leadership and organizational conflict. Due to the nature of the respondents participating in this endeavour, a focus has been placed on leadership. These respondents are the deans, who are in charge of a certain group inside the academic institution. In addition, conflict is highlighted since it serves as the primary focus of the research, which is directed toward gaining a knowledge of how it should be managed most effectively by leaders (Westen & Rosenthal, 2005). Everyone will experience conflict at some point in their lives, and it should be viewed as a normal process that happens on a daily basis (Vazire,2006).

In point of fact, everyone, regardless of who or what they are, goes through the experience of conflict on a regular basis. It is possible anywhere as long as there are individuals who interact with one another and whose requirements, priorities, and viewpoints are distinct from those of one another. In the context of an academic organization, in which administrators are unquestionably considered to be the best educators

and model leaders to their subordinates, it is really nice to determine how well they have managed conflicts in their respective area of concern in the past and how well they will manage conflicts in the future.

With the aforementioned ideas, the study aimed to investigate how some personality constructs are linked with the conflict management styles of administrators. Specifically, it sought to determine the personality types, leadership styles, and work values of the respondents, examined their conflict management styles, and ascertained the relationship of these personality constructs to conflict management styles. The findings of the study could showcase best practices of academic administrators in terms of good leadership and conflict management.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study employed a descriptive-correlational design to examine the relationship between the personality types, leadership styles, work values, and conflict management styles of the respondents. This design effectively describes significant relationship among variables, but they do not show cause and effect relationship.

The research was conducted in Cagayan Valley, Region 02. It covered 25 out of the 27 higher education institutions that are being regulated by the Commission of Higher Education for Region 02. Cagayan is renowned as the center of large and independent higher education institutions in the area which is why a significant number of students hailing from various other provinces at the region choose to complete their degrees in Cagayan.

Purposive sampling was utilized in this study since it only targeted those who were in charge of the academic programs at the several tertiary institutions in Cagayan. The participants totalled to 83 deans or vice presidents whose participation was determined from the official list provided by the person in-charge of employee records from each institution covered in the study.

The researcher utilized four data gathering instruments. The first tool utilized was the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) which is by far the most common type of measure of personality types. This psychological test comprises more than one hundred questions that probe the respondent's thoughts and preferences on how they would want to act in a variety of settings. This personality test was based on the work of Carl Jung, a psychologist who held the belief that distinctions in an individual's behaviour were the consequence of preferences in decision-making, interpersonal communication, and information collection.

The second tool used was the Leadership Style Survey which was developed by Clark to assess what leadership style a leader normally operates out of. It consists of 30 statements about leadership style beliefs and are scored using Almost Always True – 5; Frequently True – 4; Occasionally True – 3; Seldom True – 2; and Almost Never True – 1. The leadership styles that are being revealed by the survey are authoritarian style or autocratic, participative style or democratic, and delegative style or free-reign.

The edited version of Susan Goldstein's Conflict Management Inventory was used to determine the different styles and feelings which individuals have when handling conflict. It contains five subscales which are (1) confrontation; (2) emotional expression; (3) public/private behaviour; (4) conflict avoidance; and (5) self-disclosure.

The first step which the researcher had undertaken was to obtain the official list of higher education institutions in Cagayan from the Commission on Higher Education Regional Office 02 in order to identify

the institutions that participated in the study. The researcher had formally sought permission from each institution to get the official list of deans or coordinators, as well as some personal and professional information that are part of the study variables. In addition, permission to carry out the administration of the questionnaires was looked at. Following the granting of permission for the researcher to proceed with the aforementioned requests, the distribution of questionnaires began immediately. The aforementioned questionnaires were handed out to the respondents in person, and they were collected from them a week or two to give them sufficient time to complete the questionnaires.

Prior to the study's implementation, the respondents' free and prior informed consent (FPIC) was also sought. In compliance with research ethics, consent from each school administration involved in the study was also requested. Proper test administration procedures, verification, and scoring were carried out by the researcher to ensure validity of data that were gathered.

Discussion of Results and Findings

Personality Types of Administrator Respondents

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator found that out of the 16 personality types that it typically evaluates, the respondents fell into 11 of those categories. The ESTJ personality type was found to have the greatest frequency among the 11 kinds, with 49 or 59.04 percent of respondents, which is more than half of the total number of respondents. Seven people, or 8.43 percent, have the ISTJ or ENTJ personality type, while six people, or 7.23 percent, have the ESTP personality type. The INTJ make up four of the responses, which is 4.82 percent of the total, and they are followed by ESFJ and ISTP kinds, both of which have a frequency of three, which is 3.61 percent. Personality types that appeared to have the fewest number of responders, such as ENTP, ESFP, INTP, and ISFJ, are equally represented by one or 1.20 percent of the administrators.

The conclusion that can be drawn from this is that the majority of administrators fall under the ESTJ personality type. Extrovert, sensing, thinking, and judging are the four components of the ESTJ personality type. Extroverts are persons who have a tendency to get the majority of the stimulation they need from outside sources, such as the thoughts, ideas, people, and events that occur in the objective outer world. Respondents who have this sort of personality are likely to be extroverts. When it comes to the manner in which the respondents take in information, they have a tendency to put their faith in their five senses.

On the other hand, when it comes to making judgments, the respondents have a tendency to base their choices on logic and objective consideration. The last preference, which is judgment, suggests that the person is more likely to be intentional and organized, and that they are more at ease in situations that are scheduled and structured. The characteristics of a person with an ESTJ personality type have been described above, and many of those characteristics are important for administrators to have. As a result, the discovery demonstrates that the majority of the respondents are blessed with a favourable combination of personality types, which, when applied to their job, may indicate the majority of outputs or success in terms of accomplishing the goals of the business. In addition, this may give the impression that the replies are deserving of their position.

On the other hand, the ENTJs or the strategist-mobilizer as named by Berens and Nardi, are great leaders and decision makers according to Westen & Rosenthal (2005). They easily see probabilities in all things and are happy to direct others. They are ingenious thinkers and great long-range planners. Driven to achieve competence in all they do, they can naturally spot flaws and see immediately how to improve them. Career satisfaction for them means doing work that lets them lead and be in control, perfecting the operating systems of an organization so that it runs efficiently and reaches its goal on schedule. Undoubtedly, ENTJ is a personality type suited for leaders as its descriptions are concerned. This type of

personality makes it clear that leaders are born not made. Such type may be represented by only a few of the administrators in the study, at least, it is amusing to know that there are leaders in the academe who tend to have the type's endearing leadership qualities.

Propounded by March (2022), ISTJs are respected members of society because of their seriousness, sense of responsibility, and common sense. They are practical and realistic; are meticulously exact and have high capacities of focus. They can be trusted on to do whatever they are doing in an ordered manner. The ISTJ personality type is known as the planner-inspector. Planning is one of the most important tasks that an administrator is responsible for, and checking is the very next step once plans have been put into action.

In addition, because of the importance placed on the particulars, the results may nearly never contain any errors. The ESTP kind of personality is the one who acts as a promoter and executor. People that have an ESTP personality tend to be spontaneous, easy going, and energetic. They like to focus on the here and now rather than making plans for the future. They have an open mind and are tolerant of others because they are content with the way things are (John & Soto, 2007). In other words, the performance of the responsibilities that come with their employment can be done in a laid-back way. They may treat their subordinates with great consideration, and as a result, they may have an easier time gaining their subordinates' respect and compliance when they give orders about the completion of duties. It would appear that those administrators who display the aforementioned personality type have a very pleasant working environment.

According to Gosling, Vazire, Srivastava & John (2004), INTJs strive for excellence in all they do . Their strong requirements for autonomy and personal competency, as well as their unwavering conviction in their own unique ideas, are the driving forces behind their successful completion of their goals. INTJs are demanding individuals, both with themselves and with others because they are logical, critical, and inventive. They are the most autonomous of all personality types, and as a result, they like to accomplish things in their own unique manner. Administrators that fall under this category are often thought of as output-oriented, as they have a strong belief in their own ability to get things done and rarely seek the assistance of others.

These are the individuals who would like their notion to be fully adhered to in the event that they require assistance of any kind. When it comes to their interactions with their subordinates, people working for them may be scared to provide suggestions about how things should be done, and even if they aren't, they may adhere to the philosophy that "less speak, less error" ISTPs are known for their practical nature and their preference for action over discourse. Because they are analytical, inquisitive, and attentive, they are often only persuaded by hard, solid data. They are able to make effective use of the resources that are available to them and have a good understanding of when to do so since they are realists (Erdheim, Wang, Zickar, 2006). It would appear that the responders are the kind of leaders that subscribe to the philosophy that "to see is to believe." This type has an advantage in terms of interpersonal connections since they do not quickly believe in hearsay. As a result, they do not get readily irritated with subordinates who may be reported of conducting flawed behaviours , nor do they mistrust them. It would appear that these leaders always give themselves the benefit of the doubt by contemplating possible reasons before deciding on a course of action. These individuals are referred to as analyzer-operators by Gosling, Rentfrow & Swann (2003). If there are individuals who are tremendous pleasers, then there must also be others who are realists. These people are known as ESFJs.

Frick (2016) characterizes them as people who place a high value on their interpersonal connections and who, as a result, are often well-liked and ready to fulfill the wishes of others. It would appear that they are the kind of leaders that are able to scarcely refuse the demands of their subordinates and only seldom turn

down their proposals. For them, having meaningful interactions with other people throughout the day and playing an active role in the making of decisions is an essential component of a satisfying profession. This is the case because, as a leader, it is essential to earn the trust of the group in order to increase the likelihood that the members of the group will support or adhere to the plans as well as choices that the leader would like to have carried out in the business.

According to the findings, the respondents may have a variety of personality types. As the findings have shown, each of the personality types the respondents possess has its own set of advantages and disadvantages. This idea is implicitly consistent with Busse & Flowers (2017), viewpoint, which she expressed when she argued that: "Just as every individual has uniquely formed feet and toes from every other person, so will have differently shaped personalities." The form of a person's personality is similar to the shape of their foot in that no one has a perfect or imperfect foot. The fact that they possess qualities that are very essential to the discharge of their duties and responsibilities in light of the fact that they are expected to give their best effort in light of the fact that they are seen as leaders of the group is something that has been made abundantly clear and is of particular significance in this regard.

Discussion

In order to evaluate this result, it is necessary to have an understanding of the relevance and implications of the ESTJ personality type within the framework of the management of conflicts and the administration of higher education.

Extraverted, Sensing, Thinking, and Judging are the four pillars that make up the ESTJ personality type. People who have this personality type are sometimes characterised as being people who are realistic, organised, logical, and determined in their actions. Typically, they are adept at finding solutions to problems, making plans, and taking charge of various circumstances. They have a propensity to be forceful and assertive when they are in a professional setting.

Management Strategies for Conflict

Conflict is a natural and unavoidable part of any organisation, including educational institutions of higher learning. Administrators are responsible for efficiently managing disagreements in order to preserve harmony in the workplace and guarantee efficiency. The manner in which an individual chooses to settle a dispute varies from person to person and can be broken down into a number of distinct styles. Some of these styles include cooperating, compromising, accommodating, avoiding, and competing.

Studies have shown that certain personality qualities can have an effect on an individual's chosen method of conflict management. This relationship between personality and conflict management has been suggested. For instance, people whose personalities are forceful and task-oriented, such as ESTJs, may have a greater tendency towards a competing or collaborating conflict resolution style, which focuses on completing goals and establishing one's own wants.

When attempting to evaluate the findings, it is critical to keep in mind the constraints imposed by the research and their potential impact on the generalizability of the results. The findings may not be generalizable depending on the size of the study's sample, the demographics of the participants, or the geographical scope of the research. It is possible that the results of the study do not represent the larger population of higher education administrators because the research may have been carried out in a specific region or institution with a small sample size.

Implications for Practice

If the finding is correct, it may have repercussions for hiring practises and the development of teams in educational institutions at the postsecondary level. If institutions are able to position individuals in roles that fit with their strengths and preferred techniques of conflict management, this may lead to more effective leadership and the resolution of conflicts. Understanding the personality qualities of administrators can help organisations do this.

Diversity and Adaptability

It is vital to highlight that although if the majority of administrators in the study may have the ESTJ personality type, this does not suggest that other personality types are unfit for the task. In fact, it is quite the contrary. An administrative team that has a diverse range of personality types can bring a variety of viewpoints and talents to the table, which can improve the team's ability to solve problems and make decisions.

In conclusion, the discovery that the majority of administrators working in higher education institutions have the ESTJ personality type hints at the possibility of a connection between personality and the manner in which one resolves conflicts. However, it is essential to take into account the limits of the study and acknowledge the usefulness of a diverse range of personality types for the purpose of successful leadership and the settlement of conflicts in academic contexts. The finding and the practical consequences it has need to be strengthened by conducting additional study and obtaining validation.

Work Values of Administrator Respondents

The study shows that the value of industriousness is “always” manifested by the administrators in their work. Specifically, three of the statements which describe how the said value is exercised at work got a descriptive scale of “always” while the other two were rated as “almost always”.

An industrious person looks for ways and means of overcoming the objective difficulties that are being experienced at work. The respondents “always” manifest this as seen in item number 2 (“I make an effort to overcome difficulties that come my way”.) and “almost always” in item number 1 (“I don’t complain when I experience difficulties at work.”). These are signs of being responsible, mature and patient. Moreover, maintaining a happy disposition at work despite handling situations is also a manifestation of industriousness. This is always practiced by the respondents.

Industriousness involves more than merely showing up and going through the motions. People who tell that they have worked all day were not really working very hard at all, certainly not to the fullest extent of their abilities. Industriousness is the most conscientious, assiduous, and inspired type of work. An appetite for hard work must be present for success because without it, a worker, at most the leader has nothing to build on.

As seen in Table 9, justice is “always” manifested by the administrator in the discharge of their duties and responsibilities in their respective workplaces. All statements concerning the practice of justice have a descriptive scale of “always”.

Rumor mongering, back-biting, and smearing the reputation of co-workers must be avoided. No one has the right to think or speak badly about others because they have a right to their good name and reputation. A motto for this is: “If you can’t praise, say nothing.”. These are observed by the respondents as they have expressed “always” in item number 1 (“I respect my colleagues, superiors, and subordinates.”) having the highest weighted mean as compared from the rest of the statements. Along this is being considerate towards co-workers. “Always” (Item number 5, “I consider the welfare of others.” Having this sense of justice will allow a person to consider how his performance affects others who work within his vicinity. As leader respondents, there is always a

Table 10 illustrates the deans' value of responsibility. The respondents have "always" as an answer to this (Item number 5, "I work well even if nobody is watching."). A responsible worker can be left alone to manage himself. As administrators, there is always a need to plan and organize their work. They abide by set work standards and even try to surpass them if they can so that those they lead will follow them.

To give relevant information about one's work should be a habit among workers. Considering the respondents as those who supervise subordinates and at the same time are under the supervision of big bosses, it is worthwhile to "always" handle information with care (item number 2). Their superiors as the Deans have the right to know what might be going on with them, with their work, with people who work for and with them, and with those they serve through their work.

For efficient conduct of the respondents' work, proper space, considerable care, readiness and availability of materials for work are always considered by them. This calls for a conscious effort on their part to "always" put materials for work in their proper place, and assure that they are always in serviceable condition (Item number 4, "I see to it that things are in good working condition."). The advantage is obvious, that is, unnecessary delays, inconveniences, tensions, and embarrassment in the work environment (Item number 5, "I am conscious of the aesthetic value of my work environment.") to ascertain that the things used for work can be found in specific places and are readily available for use when needed. The respondents "always" practice this as they may be guided by the belief that the kind of working environment depicts the kind of people working in it.

In addition, the value of order demands that one should attune oneself to the general corporate objective which is "always" considered by the respondents (item number 1, "I am committed to both my corporate and personal goals."). It is for the very purpose that one is hired in a company to attain its objectives which greatly depend on how well one performs the assigned tasks.

Table 12 shows that the respondents manifested a descriptive rating of "always" to the value of good use of time. Like justice and order, this work value obtained a similar descriptive rating of "always" in all statements describing it.

Item number 4, ("I prepare myself for meetings.") obtained the highest weighted mean. This is so because of the nature of work the respondents have which is supervision of a group of [people. As expected, the administrator prepares the agenda and presides over the meeting. The one presiding should be ready to propose plans, courses of action, or approaches to the issues or concerns to be tackled. With these, meetings will be speedy and very productive.

Good use of time means making a list of possible activities that a person may do. Time should not be wasted thinking on things to do because there are a lot of things out there that can be done. Item number 1, ("I make a schedule of my time instead of thinking on things to do.") with a descriptive scale of "always" describes the respondents as having control over their time. This implies that aside from their respective assignments, they engage in a number of good projects and try new activities which make them more active and enhance their personal development as well. In connection to this, item number 2 ("I create opportunities instead of waiting for them to come.") emphasizes more that there is always a time for everything. Time is never a problem in not being able to do the things people have been wanting to do. It is just knowing how to prioritize activities, plan and organize oneself.

On the study related to the value of cooperation and teamwork is always observed by the respondents. This is seen on its category mean interpreted as "always". The first condition for the practice of cooperation and teamwork according to Kliatchko (1995) is the personal identification of the worker on the company's objectives in general. After having a clear grasp of the objectives, one should understand the specific role to play in the organization (Item number 1, "I fully understand my role in the organization.")

and establish the manner by which he may effectively contribute towards the attainment of objectives. By always doing so, respondents of the study learn to recognize the value of the seemingly routine yet very important tasks they fulfil in the organization.

On the study related to the work value of obedience is at all times applied by the respondents in the performance of their duties. This is consistently shown by the description of the weighted means of all the statements under the said category. The findings in this table are explained in consideration of the respondents as still having superiors to follow in the institution.

According to Kliatchko (1995), much of the success one achieves in obeying begins with the ability to listen. Listening already requires the act of willingness which is evident among the respondent (Item number 1, "I listen to people."). As people who exactly implies. The respondents "almost always" do this. This explains that the respondents adhere to the fact that any other way of fulfilling the task assigned to them denotes reluctance to obey. Besides, part of obeying unconditionally is a matter of trusting the capability of the person in authority, the fact that the person has been assigned to a position of authority indicative enough of his ability to perform his duties accordingly.

The administrators always practice humility (Item number 2, "I respect the opinion of others."). Doping this is simply leaving behind the belief that "What you do or say is always better than what others do or say." They may be leaders but they must learn to give in and respect the ideas of others, especially when discussing issues that are but matters of opinion. As Sanchez and Berin (1997) pointed out never tell a man he is wrong because doing this means a struck of direct blow at his

Humility also means permitting others to extend their attendance in times of difficulties at work. As leader respondents, expressing acceptance that they encounter hardships at work and needing the help of others also signifies their humility. This is found to be "always" manifested by them (Item number 1, "I allow people to help me whenever I find some difficulties with my work."). It only goes to show that respondents as people in authority accept the fact that they do not have a monopoly of all.

To be loyal entails a lot of commitment to all aspects of work. Some of which are expressed on the statements seen in Table 16 where each got an "always" as a descriptive scale. Loyalty should really start from leaders so that others will learn to follow.

To engage in activities that conflict with corporate interest is not a practice of the respondents. This is shown in item number 4("I never engage in activities that conflict with corporate interest.") in which they expressed "always". The respondents think that doing so would make them inefficient and ineffective in either or both.

CONFLICT MANAGEMENT STYLES OF ADMINISTRATORS

This study reflects the dominant style used by administrators in managing conflicts. Evidently, the majority of the respondents employ self-disclosure style in facing conflicts. There are more than half or 50.60 percent of them. Some of the respondents, 27 or 32.53 percent find emotional expression as their effective style while, only a few resort to emotional expression and avoidance style. There are 8 or 9.64 percent and 6 or 7.23 percent of the respondents, respectively. No one from them chooses confrontation style as their way out to deal with conflict.

The choice of the majority of respondents to self-disclosure style over the other styles rationally means that the very best way to approach conflicts which they encounter in their respective workplaces is to honestly bare one's thoughts, opinions, needs and concerns. This goes with the argument of Middlebrook that, in order to effectively resolve any external conflict – i.e., one which is perceived to exist, whether real

or imagined, with another – there only not must be true self-knowledge within the individual perceiving the conflict, but the inherent difficulties of self-discover require self-disclosure to others, even and often especially to those with whom one perceives to be in conflict. As explained by Middlebrook, when a person honestly reveals aspects of himself, he provides a realistic picture of himself that can counter all the false images and allow him to relate more closely to another person.

What seemingly makes the respondents adhere to self-disclosure style is that the purposes of the other styles are already integrated therein. This is supported by the fact that self-disclosure involves issues such as the self as the subject, it is intentional, directed at another person, is honest, and is revealing. For example, in uncovering one's view to a certain conflict, it is always articulated with feelings to give more emphasis on how one would like to make his views happen. This is the intention of emotional expression. Another instance is on the manifestation of confrontation in the style. Through self-disclosure, the other person involved in conflict is encouraged to also speak about what he would like to transpire, which is among the objectives of confrontation. Also, self-disclosure implicitly considers the place to which it should be applied as there are issues to be disclosed which entail the presence or absence of people. This is the main concern of the public-private style.

Furthermore, in self-disclosure style, the benefits gained from employing so is that those who use it will gain self-knowledge and that it enhances meaningfulness of relationships. The former is attained because it is through self-disclosure that one can be able to make an assessment of oneself while the latter is because everybody is encouraged to be honest about oneself, thus, promoting understanding between conflicting people.

Emotional expression as a choice of the 27 or 32.53 percent of the administrators explains that they can resolve conflict more easily when they express their emotions. What is being implied here is the fact that, whatever type of conflict people experience, their feelings are always involved which to the respondents find them beneficial in arriving at a solution to a conflict.

The respondents in this style of conflict management are leaders who see the essence of resolving a conflicting situation when real sentiments are told. For them, being hypocritical to what one truly feels complicates the situation. They adhere to the practicality of the style which is being able to know the sincerity of both those involved to settle things.

However, emotional expression applied to conflict bears certain limitations. Schmidt and Tannenbaum gave a good reason behind these limitations. They stated that when conflict occurs, strong feelings are frequently aroused, objectivity flies out of the window, egos are threatened, and personal relationships are placed in jeopardy which seemingly are the consequences of the mentioned style. Propounded by Gosling, Rentfrow and Swann (2003). because people live in a social world, emotional reactions cannot be given free expression. One must learn to handle his emotions so that he achieves not only personal satisfaction but also social acceptance. This is hard to implement but actual experience has proven that one way to succeed is controlling one's temper if one is really determined to do so.

In the case of the preference to the public-private style, the eight or 9.64 of the respondents give so much importance as to where they should handle conflicts. Since there are only two options in this style which are public or private, the choice of either may simply depend upon the situation in which they are in at the moment. Their image as leaders is what they are trying so hard to project in here. As leader respondents, as much as possible, other people must not see them to be in conflict with others in as much as their uncontrollable situations which may drive them to lose control and might result in forgetting their position in the organization.

Meanwhile, avoidance style is utilized by people who tend to "look the other way". These people repress emotional reactions or withdraw from a situation altogether. The three respondents having preferred such style are leaders who seemingly avoid resolutions that come too soon or too easily. They are individuals who need time to think about all possible solutions and the impact of each. Quick answers

for them may disguise the real problem and conflict resolutions should not be rushed. Confrontation style on the other hand having not been preferred by any of the respondents reflects the risks involved when using it and at the same time are being recognized by them. To confront means giving opinions, ideas, suggestions, and comments very quickly, often without thinking about the consequences. A web page indicated that the consequence of this style is that other members become fearful of saying anything that might be ridiculed or criticized. As other members say less, a confronting person begins to dominate. After a while, members begin to resist confronting a person's ideas, even the good ones. Reasonably, the respondents tend not to use such style because of its aforementioned disadvantage. The finding also encounters the fact that some factors like status affect how one behaves in the face of conflict. It was mentioned that people in higher-status positions usually feel freer to engage in conflict and are less likely to avoid confrontation.

Conflict is experienced at various levels by each one throughout one's personal, private and public life. The manner in which one reacts to those experiences depends upon the dynamics, not only of relationships that are inherent to the conflict itself, but of the nature of one's own thoughts, feelings and images of previous conflicts that one brings along into one's prevailing relationships.

Discussion

The dominating style that administrators employ while resolving conflicts can vary based on a variety of circumstances. These elements include the administrators' personality qualities, leadership style, organisational culture, and the nature of the disagreement itself. On the other hand, one might frequently witness various distinct conflict management approaches in administrative contexts. These styles can generally be broken down into the following categories:

The process of actively soliciting the input of all parties engaged in a conflict and actively working together to create solutions that are mutually acceptable is what is meant by the term "collaborative conflict management." Administrators that employ this management style encourage open communication and are willing to put time and effort into resolving the conflict in a way that is satisfactory to all stakeholders. When dealing with a situation that calls for a high level of cooperation and when it is necessary to retain long-term relationships between the parties involved, collaboration is one of the most effective methods.

To reach a satisfactory agreement, compromise requires both parties to make concessions of some kind. Administrators who use this approach work towards discovering a resolution that can satisfy, at least partially, the needs and interests of all parties concerned. Compromise is helpful when a speedy resolution is required, and it is crucial to keep a positive working relationship. Nevertheless, it is possible that it does not adequately address the underlying difficulties, and that some parties may continue to be dissatisfied with the outcome.

Administrators that take on an accommodating approach to conflict management place a higher value on maintaining unity and meeting the requirements of the opposing party than they do on meeting their own requirements. They may give in to the requests of the other party in order to prevent the situation from escalating and to maintain their ties. When the matter at hand is not of the utmost importance or when one party has significantly more power or authority than the other, accommodating can be an appropriate course of action.

Administrators who are conflict avoiders would rather not deal with any disagreements at all, and they do this either by ignoring the matter, postponing its resolution, or passing it off to someone else. This strategy may bring about some immediate relief; nevertheless, in the long run, it is likely to result in lingering tensions

and make the issue much more difficult to resolve. When the topic at hand is relatively unimportant, when feelings are running high, or when more pressing concerns require immediate attention, avoidance is the most effective strategy.

Administrators who practise a form of conflict management known as competitive conflict management put their own interests and goals ahead of those of others. They are intent on achieving victory in the fight, and they might use whatever power or authority they have available to impose their will. This strategy may be useful in circumstances that call for prompt and decisive action; nevertheless, it also carries the risk of provoking hostility and harming interpersonal connections.

It is vital to keep in mind that there is no technique to conflict management that is applicable to all situations. However, good administrators are typically able to modify their approach to be more appropriate for the given environment. It's possible that effective conflict management could require a mix of different approaches, depending on the specifics of the situation and the people who are involved.

In addition, a truly great administrator is someone who appreciates the significance of active listening, empathy, and emotional intelligence when it comes to the resolution of conflicts. Administrators are able to cultivate a pleasant and productive work environment by first gaining an understanding of the underlying causes of disputes and then resolving those causes in a constructive manner. This allows disagreements to be viewed more as chances for personal development and advancement rather than as disruptive problems.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions are drawn:

College administrators in Higher Education Institutions in the province of Cagayan are predominantly in their mid-years, females, married, Roman Catholics, have professional advancement and are relatively young in service as dean.

Generally, college administrators are output-oriented, employ democratic leadership style and highly exhibit positive work values in the performance of their duties and functions.

Recommendations

1. Heads of Higher Education Institutions should encourage their college administrators to finish their post graduate studies and to continuously provide them opportunities for training and other HRD interventions in order to upgrade their knowledge, skills and competencies as front-line managers.
2. Higher Education Institution heads should sustain the environment for developing positive personality constructs not only to college administrators but also to all employees of their organization.

References

- [1] Busse, R T & Flowers, J. M (2017). Development of a Rating Scale for the Measurement of Other-Esteem, *Contemporary School Psychology*, 10.1007/s40688-017-0144-z, 22 (3,)258-265.
- [2] Frick, P.J. (2016). Current research on conduct disorder in children and adolescents, *South African Journal of Psychology*, 10.1177/0081246316628455, 46 (2)160-176.

- [3] Gosling, S. D., Rentfrow, P. J., & Swann, W. B. (2003). A very brief measure of the Big-Five personality domains. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 37, 504-528.
- [4] Gosling, S. D., Vazire, S., Srivastava, S., & John, O. P. (2004). Should we trust web-based studies? A comparative analysis of six preconceptions about Internet questionnaires. *American Psychologist*, 59, 93-104.
- [5] Jesse Erdheim, Mo. Wang, Michael J. Zickar (2006). Linking the Big Five personality constructs to organizational commitment. *Personality and Individual Differences*. 41 (5), 959-970. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2006.04.005>.
- [6] John, O. P., & Soto, C. J. (2007). The importance of being valid: Reliability and the process of construct validation. In R. W. Robins, R. C. Fraley & R. F.
- [7] March E. (2022). Psychopathy: Cybercrime and cyber abuse, *Psychopathy and Criminal Behavior*, 10.1016/B978-0-12-811419-3.00015-7, 423-444.
- [8] McCrae, R. R., & Weiss, A. (2007). Observer ratings of personality. In R. W. Robins, R. C. Fraley & R. F. Krueger (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods in personality psychology*. 259-272.
- [9] McMurrin, M. & Howard, R. (2019). *Personality Disorders and Offending*, *The Wiley International Handbook of Correctional Psychology*, 10.1002/9781119139980, (265-281).
- [10] Mehl, M. R., Gosling, S. D., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2006). Personality in its natural habitat: Manifestations and implicit folk theories of personality in daily life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90, 862-877.
- [11] Robert E. (2020). Life course persistent antisocial behavior silver anniversary, *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 10.1016/j.avb.2019.101344, 50, (101344).
- [12] Tiffany M. Harrop, Joye C. Anestis, Olivia C. Preston, Randolph Arnau, Bradley A. Green, Michael D. Anestis (2021). A Comparison of Psychopathic Trait Latent Profiles in Service Members, *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 10.1007/s10862-021-09872-5, 43, 3, (532-544).
- [13] Vazire, S. (2006). Informant reports: A cheap, fast, and easy method for personality assessment. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40, 472-481.
- [14] Westen, D., & Rosenthal, R. (2005). Improving construct validity: Cronbach, Meehl, and Neurath's Ship. *Psychological Assessment*, 17, 409-412.
- [15] Xinyi Cao, M.P. Somerville, J.L. Allen (2023). Teachers' perceptions of the school functioning of Chinese preschool children with callous-unemotional traits and disruptive behaviors, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 10.1016/j.tate.2022.103990, 123, (103990).