

Leadership and Conflict Management Styles among Managers of Selected Insurance Companies Toward Strategic Management of Human Resources

Dr. Alemar de la Rosa Betito

<https://orcid.org/0009-0001-7527-5346>

alemarbetito@gmail.com

Philippine Christian University Taft
Avenue, Manila, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54476/apjaet/42360>

Abstract

This study explores how leadership styles shape conflict management strategies in selected insurance companies in Metro Manila. Since strong leadership is key to fostering teamwork and resolving workplace disputes, the research examines how top, middle, and lower-level managers approach conflict resolution. Using a descriptive-correlational research design with a quantitative approach, structured surveys were conducted among employees and managers to assess their leadership and conflict management styles. The results reveal notable differences across managerial levels as top-level managers tend to be more transformational and visionary, middle managers strike a balance between strategy and daily operations, while lower-level managers focus on task execution with a moderate emphasis on servant and authentic leadership. These findings emphasize the need for leadership development programs tailored to each managerial level to enhance conflict resolution skills. Organizations can strengthen leadership training to boost managerial effectiveness, align leadership styles with company goals, and promote a culture of proactive conflict management. Additionally, these insights support human resource strategies by encouraging structured mediation, ethical competition, and collaborative decision-making. Future research could explore deeper and valuable insights into long-term leadership trends, comprehensive and extensive cross-industry comparisons, and the significant impact of organizational culture and evolving market conditions on leadership and effective conflict resolution practices.

Keywords: Leadership, Conflict Management, Quantitative Approach, Managerial Levels, Metro Manila

Introduction

Effective leadership is fundamental to organizational success, shaping communication, collaboration, and teamwork across diverse sectors. In high-stakes industries such as insurance, where

*Proceedings of the International Conference on Robotics, Education, and Automation (ICREA), 29 - 30 March 2025,
Hilton Tokyo Hotel, Tokyo, Japan*

Betito, A. D., *Leadership and Conflict Management Styles among Managers of Selected Insurance Companies Toward Strategic Management of Human Resources*, pp. 69 - 81

decision-making errors can result in substantial financial and reputational consequences, leadership assumes heightened importance. Leaders provide strategic direction, motivate employees, and align teams with organizational objectives, directly influencing workplace harmony and productivity. Despite extensive research on leadership effectiveness, there remains a limited understanding of how leadership styles affect conflict management across organizational hierarchies—particularly within the insurance sector, where disputes often arise from policy disagreements, claims processing, and operational challenges.

This study examines the application of different leadership styles at three managerial levels—top, middle, and lower—and their influence on conflict resolution strategies in insurance companies. Managers in this industry must balance corporate objectives with employee and client satisfaction while addressing conflicts that threaten operational stability. Leadership, as defined by Natar (2022), is “a process of influencing an individual to accomplish goals to create projects,” underscoring the leader’s role in shaping culture, decision-making, and performance systems. Conflict management, identified by Huges (2017) as a key leadership competency, enhances workplace relationships, decision-making, and service delivery when handled effectively. People Hum Technology (2022) further emphasizes that successful conflict management requires fair, logical, and structured approaches to minimize organizational disruption.

Current literature offers limited insights into how specific leadership styles—such as transformational, transactional, servant, and authentic—relate to conflict resolution strategies, including collaborative, competitive, avoidant, accommodative, and compromising approaches, across different management levels in insurance organizations. Understanding these relationships is critical for designing leadership development programs and human resource strategies that strengthen managerial effectiveness.

The purpose of this study is to identify the leadership and conflict management styles exhibited by managers at different hierarchical levels within selected insurance companies and to examine the relationships between them. The findings aim to inform targeted leadership training, refine conflict resolution frameworks, and support the development of cohesive, resilient corporate cultures. By addressing this research gap, the study seeks to equip insurance industry leaders with the competencies necessary to manage conflicts effectively, enhance team performance, and drive sustainable organizational success.

Objectives of the Study

This study investigates the relationship between leadership styles and conflict management strategies among managers in selected insurance companies, emphasizing their implications for strategic human resource management.

The specific objectives are:

1. To identify the leadership styles exhibited by top, middle-, and lower-level managers in selected insurance companies.
2. To determine the conflict management strategies utilized by managers at different hierarchical levels.
3. To examine variations in leadership styles across managerial levels and their influence on conflict resolution approaches.
4. To assess the relationship between leadership styles and conflict management strategies in evaluating conflict resolution effectiveness.

5. To generate insights that will inform strategic human resource initiatives aimed at enhancing leadership and conflict management practices.
6. To recommend leadership training programs and conflict resolution strategies tailored to the needs of managers at various levels, fostering a cohesive and productive organizational culture.

Methodology

This study utilized a descriptive–correlational research design with a quantitative approach to investigate the relationship between leadership styles and conflict management strategies among managers in selected insurance companies. The descriptive component analyzed characteristics, behaviors, and patterns, while the correlational component examined associations between variables without manipulation. This design was deemed appropriate for assessing how leadership styles influence conflict resolution across different managerial levels.

The research was conducted in three insurance companies in Metro Manila—AXA Life Philippines, BDO Life, and PRU Life UK Philippines. Using the Raosoft Online Calculator with a 5% margin of error, 95% confidence level, and 0.50 distribution, the sample comprised 50 managers and 50 employees, selected through purposive sampling to ensure relevant expertise in leadership and conflict management.

Data were collected through a researcher-developed survey questionnaire structured into three sections: (1) demographic information, (2) leadership styles, and (3) conflict management approaches. The instrument was designed based on the study’s research framework and refined through expert review. Surveys were distributed both face-to-face and via Google Forms, with screening questions to verify participant eligibility. Informed consent was obtained from all respondents to ensure privacy and confidentiality.

The instrument underwent evaluation by the research adviser, followed by content validation from three academic or industry experts. Revisions were made based on their feedback to improve clarity, relevance, and accuracy. Validators also completed a standardized form to formally assess the survey’s validity.

A pilot test was conducted to determine reliability, using Cronbach’s alpha to measure internal consistency. The results confirmed that the instrument produced stable and reliable responses, validating its use for the main study.

To ensure a structured analysis, SPSS and Excel were used for statistical interpretation.

Various statistical tools were employed:

Frequency and Percentage Distribution to summarize respondent profiles.

Weighted Mean to assess perceptions of leadership and conflict management styles.

Standard Deviation to determine data variability.

Likert Scale to quantify respondent assessments.

Pearson r Correlation to measure the strength of relationships between leadership and conflict

management.

Regression Analysis to evaluate how leadership styles predict conflict management strategies.

Ethical Considerations

In the conduct of this study, the researcher strictly followed ethical principles to safeguard participant welfare, uphold confidentiality, and ensure research integrity. The following ethical considerations were observed:

Anonymity and Confidentiality. Respondents' identities were protected, and all collected data were kept confidential. A confidentiality statement was included in the survey, and responses were used solely for academic purposes.

Protection of Vulnerable Populations. The study excluded minors and vulnerable groups. All participants were capable of providing informed consent and could withdraw at any point without consequence.

Data Privacy. Compliance with data privacy regulations was maintained. All information was securely stored, anonymized, and accessible only to authorized personnel.

Minimizing Harm. The study posed no physical, psychological, or emotional risks. A safe and respectful research environment was ensured throughout the process.

Transparency. Participants were fully briefed on the study's objectives, procedures, and their rights before participation. Informed consent was obtained before data collection.

Reporting and Dissemination. Research findings were presented accurately, free from bias or misrepresentation. Participants may request a summary of results upon study completion.

Cultural Sensitivity. The cultural backgrounds and perspectives of participants were respected. Survey content and language were designed to avoid bias or offense.

Results and Discussions

1. Leadership Styles Exhibited by Top, Middle, and Lower-Level Managers in an Organization

Understanding leadership styles across managerial levels is critical for evaluating their influence on organizational performance, decision-making, and conflict resolution. Leadership approaches shape managerial interactions, strategic alignment, and operational outcomes. This study empirically assessed the prevalence of fifteen leadership styles—Laissez-Faire, Transactional, Transformational, Autocratic, Visionary, Servant, Democratic, Charismatic, Situational, Strategic, Authentic, Coaching, Bureaucratic, Positive, and Adaptive—across top, middle-, and lower-level managers, using mean scores, standard deviations, and p-values to determine statistical significance.

Findings reveal that leadership styles vary considerably by hierarchical position, with top-level managers generally exhibiting higher mean scores (3.7400) than middle (3.4730) and lower-level (3.4010) managers. Styles such as Transformational (3.8778, $p < .001$), Strategic (3.8000, $p = .002$), and Servant (3.8555, $p = .023$) leadership were strongly present at the top level but only moderately practiced at lower levels. Laissez-Faire (combined mean 3.7614, $p = .036$) and Transactional (3.5481, $p = .030$) leadership also showed significant variability across ranks.

Table 1
Leadership Style Practices Exhibited by the Top, Middle, and Lower-Level Managers within an Organization

Indicators	Level of Management	Mean	STD	P-Value	Interpretation
1. Focusing on fostering a positive work environment and culture.	Top Level	3.8222	0.53446	<0.001	Exhibited
	Middle Level	3.7778	0.97442	<0.001	Exhibited
	Lower Level	3.5778	0.98832	<0.001	Exhibited
	Combined	3.7259	0.8324	<0.001	Exhibited
2. Emphasizing the strengths and achievements of team members	Top Level	3.6667	0.70711	<0.001	Exhibited
	Middle Level	3.3556	1.09036	0.034	Moderately Exhibited
	Lower Level	3.2667	0.93905	0.063	Moderately Exhibited
	Combined	3.4296	0.9121	0.048	Moderately Exhibited
3. Encouraging optimism, resilience, and a can-do attitude among the team.	Top Level	3.7333	0.57997	<0.001	Exhibited
	Middle Level	3.6222	0.96032	<0.001	Exhibited
	Lower Level	3.2889	0.94441	0.046	Moderately Exhibited
	Combined	3.5481	0.8282	0.046	Exhibited
4. Promoting a sense of belonging and camaraderie within the team.	Top Level	3.6444	0.60886	<0.001	Exhibited
	Middle Level	3.6667	0.95346	<0.001	Exhibited
	Lower Level	3.2667	1.13618	0.123	Moderately Exhibited
	Combined	3.5259	0.8995	0.123	Exhibited
5. Believing in the power of positivity to drive motivation and performance.	Top Level	3.6667	0.70711	<0.001	Exhibited
	Middle Level	3.4444	0.96661	0.004	Moderately Exhibited
	Lower Level	3.4222	0.98832	0.006	Moderately Exhibited
	Combined	3.5111	0.8873	0.005	Exhibited
Composite Mean	Top Level	3.6555	0.6275	<0.001	Exhibited
	Middle Level	3.5555	0.9890	0.007	Exhibited
	Lower Level	3.3444	0.9992	0.047	Moderately Exhibited
	Combined	3.5184	0.8719	0.047	Exhibited

The statistical outcomes indicate that leadership adaptability and strategic orientation are more prominent at senior levels, aligning with Zhang et al. (2023), who note that top executives tend to demonstrate stronger leadership behaviors due to their strategic responsibilities. Conversely, middle and lower-level managers exhibit more operationally focused and moderately expressed styles. Overall, the results highlight the need for targeted leadership development programs that enhance style versatility across managerial levels, ultimately supporting organizational effectiveness.

2. Conflict Management Practices Exhibited by the Top, Middle, and Lower-Level Managers within an Organization

*Proceedings of the International Conference on Robotics, Education, and Automation (ICREA), 29 - 30 March 2025,
 Hilton Tokyo Hotel, Tokyo, Japan*
 Betito, A. D., *Leadership and Conflict Management Styles among Managers of Selected Insurance Companies Toward
 Strategic Management of Human Resources*, pp. 69 - 81

Table 2

Conflict Management Practices Exhibited by the Top, Middle, and Lower-Level Managers within an Organization

Indicators	Level of Management	Mean	STD	P-Value	Interpretation
1. Collaborative	Top Level	3.6818	0.61973	<0.001	Exhibited
	Middle Level	3.4000	0.92452	0.004	Moderately Exhibited
	Lower Level	3.3111	0.94783	0.015	Moderately Exhibited
	Combined	3.4643	0.83069	0.009	Moderately Exhibited
2. Competition	Top Level	3.6060	0.61906	<0.001	Moderately Exhibited
	Middle Level	3.0222	1.01856	0.164	Moderately Exhibited
	Lower Level	3.1111	0.97635	0.262	Moderately Exhibited
	Combined	3.2464	0.87132	0.213	Moderately Exhibited
3. Avoidance	Top Level	3.6515	0.72433	0.147	Moderately Exhibited
	Middle Level	3.1777	0.95513	0.163	Moderately Exhibited
	Lower Level	3.1555	1.00366	0.203	Moderately Exhibited
	Combined	3.3282	0.89437	0.171	Moderately Exhibited
4. Accommodative	Top Level	3.5000	0.63352	0.001	Moderately Exhibited
	Middle Level	3.4555	0.92333	0.001	Moderately Exhibited
	Lower Level	3.3444	0.99071	0.056	Moderately Exhibited
	Combined	3.4333	0.84918	0.019	Moderately Exhibited
5. Compromise	Top Level	3.5151	0.61654	<0.001	Moderately Exhibited
	Middle Level	3.2666	0.99855	0.110	Moderately Exhibited
	Lower Level	3.3333	0.99631	0.042	Moderately Exhibited
	Combined	3.3716	0.87046	0.076	Moderately Exhibited
Overall Mean	Top Level	3.5908	0.64264	0.074	Moderately Exhibited
	Middle Level	3.2644	0.96402	0.088	Moderately Exhibited
	Lower Level	3.25108	0.98297	0.115	Moderately Exhibited
	Combined	3.36876	0.86321	0.092	Moderately Exhibited

Effective conflict management is a critical leadership competency that shapes workplace harmony, team dynamics, and organizational performance. Managerial levels often adopt distinct resolution strategies—collaborative, competitive, avoidant, accommodative, and compromising—based on their roles, leadership styles, and decision-making authority. The table summarizes these practices across top, middle-, and lower-level managers, evaluated through mean scores, standard deviations, p-values, and interpretations.

Findings indicate that *collaboration* is the most prominently exhibited style, especially among top-level managers ($M = 3.6818$, $p < 0.001$), aligning with Zhang et al. (2023), who link collaborative approaches to higher engagement and innovation. *Competition* is also notable at the top level ($M = 3.6060$, $p < 0.001$), reflecting assertive decision-making in strategic contexts, while middle and lower levels employ it moderately. *Avoidance* is present but less dominant, with a combined mean of 3.3282, suggesting selective use to de-escalate tensions. *Accommodation* is moderately applied across all levels (combined $M = 3.4333$), supporting relationship maintenance without overcompromising leadership authority.

Overall, the data aligns with prior research showing that top-level managers emphasize

collaborative and, when necessary, competitive strategies, whereas middle and lower levels maintain more balanced but less assertive conflict management profiles.

Compromising Conflict Management Style. Compromise involves finding a middle ground where both parties make concessions to resolve conflicts. Top-level managers exhibited this style significantly (Mean = 3.5615, $p < 0.001$), while middle- (Mean = 3.4444, $p = 0.110$) and lower- level managers (Mean = 3.3333, $p = 0.076$) moderately exhibited compromise. The combined mean of 3.3716 indicates that compromise is a commonly used strategy throughout the organization.

The research by Zhang et al. (2023) highlights that compromise is one of the most effective conflict resolution styles in maintaining workplace stability while ensuring both parties feel satisfied. The data suggests that compromise is a key strategy in conflict resolution, especially among top management, who must balance organizational objectives with employee concerns.

The overall mean scores suggest that top-level managers (Mean = 3.5908, $p = 0.074$) exhibit conflict management strategies more prominently compared to middle-level (Mean = 3.3942, $p = 0.088$) and lower-level managers (Mean = 3.5201, $p = 0.115$). The combined overall mean of 3.3687 indicates that conflict management strategies are moderately exhibited throughout the organization.

The study by Zhang et al. (2023) reinforces the idea that effective conflict management enhances workplace productivity, employee well-being, and decision-making efficiency. The findings in Table 2 align with this perspective, indicating that top-level managers lead conflict resolution efforts more assertively than middle- and lower-level managers.

3. Leadership Styles Influence Conflict Management Approaches Among Managers in Selected Insurance Companies

Leadership styles significantly influence the conflict management strategies adopted by managers in insurance companies. Table 3 shows that transformational, visionary, and coaching leadership are strongly associated with collaborative approaches, especially at the top level, supporting Lee et al. (2022), who link transformational leadership to open communication and trust—key to maintaining teamwork and client relationships in insurance.

Transactional and autocratic leaders more often adopt competitive strategies, prevalent among top and middle-level managers, reflecting a focus on control and decisive action but with potential drawbacks for morale and collaboration. Servant and democratic leadership styles align with compromise, particularly in middle management, balancing assertiveness with cooperation to maintain workflow stability (Lee et al., 2022). Laissez-faire and bureaucratic leaders show higher tendencies toward avoidance, most common at lower levels, which may diffuse minor disputes but risks leaving conflicts unresolved. Adaptive and charismatic leadership styles correspond with accommodation, particularly in middle management, emphasizing harmony but occasionally at the cost of efficiency.

Overall, the findings indicate that collaborative strategies dominate among transformational and visionary leaders, competitive strategies are linked to transactional and autocratic styles, while compromising, avoiding, and accommodating approaches are distributed across other leadership types. The effectiveness of these strategies varies according to managerial level, organizational context, and workplace dynamics.

Table 3

Leadership Styles Influence Conflict Management Approaches Among Managers in Selected Insurance Companies

Leadership Style	Conflict Management Style	Level of Management	Interpretation
Laissez Faire	Avoidance	Lower Level	Moderately Exhibited
Transactional	Competition	Top Level	Exhibited
Transformational	Collaboration	Top Level	Exhibited
Autocratic	Competition	Middle Level	Moderately Exhibited
Visionary	Collaboration	Top Level	Exhibited
Servant	Compromise	Middle Level	Moderately Exhibited
Democratic	Collaboration	Middle Level	Moderately Exhibited
Charismatic	Accommodation	Middle Level	Moderately Exhibited
Situational	Collaboration	Top Level	Exhibited
Strategic	Compromise	Middle Level	Moderately Exhibited
Authentic	Compromise	Lower Level	Moderately Exhibited
Coaching	Collaboration	Top Level	Exhibited
Bureaucratic	Avoidance	Lower Level	Moderately Exhibited
Positive	Collaboration	Middle Level	Moderately Exhibited
Adaptive	Accommodation	Middle Level	Moderately Exhibited

4. Empirical Relationship Between Leadership Styles and Conflict Management Strategies

Effective conflict management is essential for sustaining workplace cohesion, productivity, and positive organizational relationships. Analysis of Table 4 shows statistically significant relationships between leadership styles and five conflict resolution strategies—avoidance, accommodation, compromise, competition, and collaboration. Avoidance correlates positively with autocratic ($r = 0.55$, $p < 0.01$) and bureaucratic ($r = 0.48$, $p < 0.05$) leadership, suggesting that rigid hierarchies discourage open dialogue, while transformational leadership correlates negatively ($r = -0.42$, $p < 0.01$), reflecting a proactive conflict-handling approach. Accommodation is strongly associated with servant ($r = 0.63$, $p < 0.001$), transformational ($r = 0.58$, $p < 0.01$), and visionary ($r = 0.52$, $p < 0.05$) styles, indicating an emphasis on harmony and inclusivity, though overuse may lead to imbalanced decision-making.

Compromise shows high correlations with transactional ($r = 0.61$, $p < 0.001$), charismatic ($r = 0.57$, $p < 0.01$), and adaptive ($r = 0.49$, $p < 0.05$) leadership, suggesting a preference for negotiation and flexibility, though excessive reliance may yield suboptimal outcomes. Competition aligns with autocratic ($r = 0.66$, $p < 0.001$), strategic ($r = 0.58$, $p < 0.01$), and bureaucratic ($r = 0.51$, $p < 0.05$) leadership, reflecting directive, performance-driven approaches that can be effective but risk fostering workplace tension. Collaboration exhibits the strongest associations, particularly with transformational ($r = 0.72$, $p < 0.001$), democratic ($r = 0.65$, $p < 0.001$), and servant ($r = 0.60$, $p < 0.01$) leadership, reinforcing its role in promoting shared decision-making and inclusivity, though it requires structured processes and adequate resources.

Overall, the findings indicate that no single conflict resolution strategy is universally optimal; however, collaboration and compromise, particularly under transformational, servant, and democratic leadership, appear most effective in fostering harmony and performance. From a policy standpoint,

leadership development should focus on conflict resolution, emotional intelligence, and strategic application of varied approaches, while minimizing overreliance on avoidance, accommodation, or competition in inappropriate contexts.

5. Dominant Leadership Style

Table 5
Dominant Leadership Style

Management Level	Dominant Leadership Styles	Key Characteristics
Top Level	Transformational, Servant, Strategic, Coaching	Visionary, innovative, long-term focus, employee empowerment
Middle Level	Transactional, Charismatic, Situational, Democratic	Balance's structure and flexibility, communication-driven, ensures strategy execution
Lower Level	Bureaucratic, Autocratic, Laissez Faire	Rule enforcement, structured approach, operational efficiency

Table 5 outlines the dominant leadership styles and core characteristics across organizational hierarchy levels. Top-level management—comprising executives and senior leaders—predominantly employs transformational, servant, strategic, and coaching leadership. These approaches facilitate long-term vision-setting, innovation, and employee empowerment, with transformational leadership inspiring goal achievement, servant leadership emphasizing workforce development, strategic leadership maintaining corporate focus, and coaching leadership enhancing skills through mentorship. Their decision-making role demands visionary thinking aligned with the organizational mission and growth.

Middle-level management—including department heads, managers, and supervisors—primarily demonstrates transactional, charismatic, situational, and democratic leadership. Acting as the link between executives and operational staff, they ensure strategic execution while addressing employee needs. Transactional leadership enforces performance-based systems, charismatic leadership motivates teams, situational leadership ensures adaptability, and democratic leadership fosters collaboration and shared decision-making. This level balances structure with flexibility to meet both corporate and team objectives.

Lower-level management—team leaders, supervisors, and frontline managers—predominantly applies bureaucratic, autocratic, and laissez-faire leadership. Bureaucratic leadership enforces rules and procedures, autocratic leadership ensures swift decision-making in high-demand contexts, and laissez-faire leadership grants autonomy where minimal supervision is sufficient. Their primary focus is operational efficiency and adherence to standards.

Overall, leadership styles vary systematically with managerial level: top-level leaders emphasize vision and innovation, middle-level leaders balance structure and adaptability, and lower-level leaders focus on rule enforcement and operational output. Recognizing these distinctions is essential for targeted leadership training and succession planning, ensuring smooth managerial transitions while sustaining organizational efficiency and employee engagement.

6. Conflict Resolution Strategies by Management Level

Table 6
Conflict Resolution Strategies by Management Level

Management Level	Dominant Conflict Management Style	Key Characteristics
Top Level	Collaborative, Competition	Focuses on problem-solving, negotiation, and strategic decision-making Encourages open communication and innovation
Middle Level	Mix of Collaborative, Competition, and Compromise	Balances decision-making and implementation, ensures conflict resolution through negotiation and adaptability
Lower Level	Accommodative, Avoidance, and Compromise	Emphasizes maintaining harmony, following directiveness, and minimizing disruptions in operations

Table 6 presents the distinct conflict management approaches adopted at different organizational levels, reflecting variations in managerial roles, responsibilities, and leadership styles. Top-level management primarily employs collaborative and competitive strategies, leveraging negotiation, open communication, and assertive decision-making to align conflict outcomes with strategic objectives. Collaboration facilitates stakeholder engagement, innovation, and consensus-building, while competition ensures decisive pursuit of organizational goals and market advantage.

Middle-level management combines collaborative, competitive, and compromise approaches, balancing the execution of executive directives with departmental advocacy. Collaboration fosters constructive engagement across hierarchical levels, competition supports the defense of departmental priorities, and compromise enables pragmatic resolution of disputes to maintain operational flow. This blend of strategies equips middle managers to navigate diverse workplace dynamics effectively.

Lower-level management relies chiefly on accommodation, avoidance, and compromise. Accommodation promotes team cohesion by yielding to higher priorities, avoidance minimizes disruptions in minor disputes, and compromise resolves issues without impeding productivity. These approaches reflect their operational focus on stability and compliance with organizational procedures.

Overall, conflict resolution practices vary systematically across management levels—top-level leaders prioritize strategic assertiveness, middle managers emphasize negotiation and balance, and lower-level managers focus on maintaining harmony and efficiency. Recognizing these differences enables organizations to design tailored conflict resolution frameworks that enhance cohesion, decision-making, and overall workplace productivity.

Conclusions

Based on the analysis of the gathered data, the following conclusions were drawn to address the research objectives and provide insights into the leadership dynamics within the organization.

1. The combined mean scores for all measured leadership styles fall within the “moderately exhibited” range, suggesting that these styles are present but not consistently or forcefully applied across the organization. This moderate level of application may reflect an organizational culture that values flexibility, yet still leaves room for strengthening leadership practices to achieve a more cohesive and robust managerial framework.
2. Top-level managers consistently demonstrate the highest mean scores across nearly all leadership

styles, indicating a stronger, more deliberate application of these approaches. This could be attributed to their broader strategic responsibilities and the need to influence a wide range of stakeholders. Their elevated use of transformational, visionary, and coaching leadership styles, for example, might stem from a desire to inspire, motivate, and steer the organization toward long-term objectives. This pattern underscores the role of senior leaders as key drivers of organizational culture and strategic direction.

Middle-level managers generally range between “exhibited” and “moderately exhibited” in their leadership style scores, placing them between the top-level’s more pronounced application and the lower-level’s more limited usage. This intermediate position may reflect their dual role: they are responsible for translating high-level strategic goals into actionable tasks while also supervising day-to-day operations. As a result, they might balance more visionary or transformational approaches with pragmatic, transactional methods to maintain alignment between upper management directives and frontline realities.

3. Lower-level managers predominantly score in the “moderately exhibited” category across the leadership styles. Their focus is often on direct supervision, task execution, and immediate problem-solving, which can limit the scope for applying more strategic or visionary leadership approaches. Nevertheless, their moderate use of styles like servant or authentic leadership indicates an underlying commitment to team well-being and ethical standards, albeit with fewer opportunities to fully leverage these styles in broader organizational decision-making.
4. The p-values for most leadership styles fall below the conventional 0.05 threshold, confirming that the observed differences among top, middle, and lower-level managers are unlikely due to chance. This finding reinforces the notion that managerial hierarchy and role scope significantly influence how leadership styles are practiced within the organization. By demonstrating clear, statistically significant distinctions, the data affirm that managerial responsibilities and contextual factors shape each level’s leadership approach.
5. The marked variations in leadership style usage across managerial levels highlight a critical need for targeted leadership development initiatives. Top-level managers, already demonstrating strong leadership styles, could refine and further align these styles with organizational goals. Middle-level managers might benefit from training that enhances their ability to serve as effective liaisons—translating strategic visions into operational successes—while lower-level managers could gain from development programs that empower them to employ broader leadership practices alongside their task-focused responsibilities. By tailoring leadership training to address the unique needs and challenges at each managerial level, organizations can foster a more cohesive and effective leadership culture, ultimately driving stronger performance, employee engagement, and sustainable growth.

Recommendations

Based on the study’s findings and conclusions, the following recommendations are proposed to enhance leadership effectiveness and address identified areas for improvement within the organization.

1. HR should develop targeted leadership training tailored to each management level, focusing on visionary skills for top managers, strategic and operational skills for middle managers, and adaptive leadership for lower-level managers. This ensures leaders at every tier are equipped to meet their unique challenges effectively.
2. Organizations should implement mentorship programs pairing top managers with middle managers and middle managers with lower supervisors to promote knowledge sharing and consistent leadership values. Such cross-level mentoring strengthens organizational culture and fosters professional growth.
3. HR must identify and develop high-potential leaders at all levels, especially middle and lower managers, to ensure a pipeline of well-rounded leaders ready for senior roles. This proactive approach prepares the organization for future leadership demands.
4. HR should foster continuous professional growth through collaborative forums and knowledge sharing to encourage leadership innovation and engagement across all management levels. Regular interaction promotes best practices and sustained improvement.
5. Leadership evaluations should be regularly conducted to assess effectiveness and identify development needs across all levels. Using feedback from these assessments, HR can tailor support programs to enhance leadership capabilities continuously.

References

- Forbes Coaches Council. (2017, October 20). 11 ways you can better resolve conflicts. Forbes. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbescoachescouncil/2017/10/20/11-ways-you-can-better-resolve-conflicts/>
- Goleman, D. (2024, April 18). 6 common leadership styles and how to decide which to use. Harvard Business Review. <https://hbr.org/2024/04/6-common-leadership-styles-and-how-to-decide-which-to-use>
- Hughes, R. L. (2017). Leadership and conflict management: Enhancing organizational effectiveness. *Journal of Leadership and Conflict Resolution*, 12(1), 23–35
- Lee, H. W., Lee, J., & Kim, S. (2022). Moderating role of transformational leadership in the relationship between perceived organizational justice and organizational commitment. *Cogent Business & Management*, 9(1), 2105578. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2022.2105578>
- Lee, Y. (2024). Interplay of organizational culture, communication, and conflict: Pathways to workplace harmony. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict*, 28(S5), 1–3.
- Natar, S. (2022). Leadership and organizational goal attainment: A conceptual perspective. *International Journal of Management and Leadership Studies*, 4(2), 45–56.

- Ogunsola, O. K., Arikewuyo, K. A., & Okwegbe, V. E. (2024). Effect of leadership styles on work performance: An empirical analysis. *Asian Journal of Research in Business and Management*, 6(1).
- PeopleHum Technology. (2022). Effective conflict management strategies for modern workplaces. PeopleHum. <https://www.peoplehum.com>
- Rusady, M. V., Fauzi, A., Bachri, A. T. S., Ballo, M. A. M., & Nuru, E. (2024). Conflict management strategies: Improving team performance through collaboration and communication (Human Resource Management literature study). *Journal of Human Resource Management Studies*, 12(2), 45–60.
- Sergi, G., & Hall, A. (2022). Nature versus nurture: What underpins great leadership? The case for nurture. *Clinical Oncology*, 34(1), e1–e3. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clon.2021.10.004>
- StatPearls. (2024). Conflict management. In StatPearls. StatPearls Publishing. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK559030/>
- Suripatty, L. (2021). The significance of assertive leadership style in school organizational development. *International Research-Based Education Journal*, 3(1), 8–13.
- Tabassi, A. A., Abdullah, A., & Bryde, D. J. (2019). Conflict management, team coordination, and performance within multicultural temporary projects: Evidence from the construction industry. *Project Management Journal*, 50(1), 101–114. <https://doi.org/10.1177/8756972818808986>
- Tao, Y., He, J., Wang, Y., & Ke, H. (2021). Strategic leadership: A bibliometric analysis on current status and emerging trends. *International Journal of Organizational Leadership*, 10, 439–458. <https://doi.org/10.33844/ijol.2021.60608>
- Thanh, N. H., & Quang, N. V. (2022). Transformational, transactional, laissez-faire leadership styles and employee engagement: Evidence from Vietnam's public sector. *Sage Open*, 12(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221094606>
- Udod, S. A., Hammond-Collins, K., & Jenkins, M. (2020). Dynamics of emotional intelligence and empowerment: The perspectives of middle managers. *Sage Open*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020919508>

- Van der Wal, A., Van der Walle, S., & De Dreu, C. K. W. (2023). The paradox of bureaucratic control and leader empowerment: A review and framework. *Journal of Management*, 49(8), 2465–2502. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01492063221120426>
- Vesperi, W., Ventura, M., & Cristofaro, C. L. (2021). Conflict management as an organizational capacity: Survey of hospital managers in healthcare organizations. *Measuring Business Excellence*, 25(4), 390–406. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MBE-01-2020-0008>
- Walls, E. (2019). The value of situational leadership. *Community Practitioner*, 92(3), 31–33. <https://www.communitypractitioner.co.uk/features/2019/03/value-situational-leadership>
- Wang, Y., Toseef, M., & Gong, Y. (2021). IT process alignment in business strategy: Examining the role of transactional leadership and organization culture. *Information*, 12(6), 237. <https://doi.org/10.3390/info12060237>
- Wang, Y., Wu, T., & Liu, X. (2020). Authentic leadership, psychological safety, and voice behavior: A moderated mediation model. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 580225. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.580225>
- Zhang, H., Liu, Z., & Wang, Y. (2020). How transformational leadership positively impacts organizational citizenship behavior in successful Chinese social work service organizations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 30(3), 467–485. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.21394>
- Zhang, Y., Zheng, Y., & Xie, J. (2023). The dark and bright side of laissez-faire leadership: Does subordinates' goal orientation make a difference? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1135281. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1135281>

Copyrights

Copyright of this article is retained by the author/s, with first publication rights granted to APJAET. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4>).