

Job Stubbornness and its Impact on Organizational Conflicts in Government Institutions

¹ Prof. Samir Suliman Aljamal; ² Prof. Nasser M.S. Jaradat;

³ Prof. Ahmad Ismaiel Al Maani

^{1,2} Palestine Ahlyia University

³ The World Islamic Sciences and Education University

Paper Number: 240087

Abstract:

The study aimed to identify the reality of workplace stubbornness and its impact on organizational conflicts from the perspective of employees in government institutions in Jordan and West Bank. A questionnaire was used as the primary tool for data collection. The study adopted the descriptive-analytical approach and included a convenient sample consisting of (202) respondents. The results indicated the following: the level of workplace stubbornness among employees was moderate, with the highest dimensions, also at a moderate level being: insistence on opinion, refusal to follow directives, followed by low adaptability to change, and finally adherence to traditional methods, which scored low. On the other hand, the level of organizational conflicts was found to be high, with the highest domains, also at a high level being: poor communication, conflict of interest, interdepartmental conflict, and finally interpersonal conflict. The results further revealed a statistically significant impact at the significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) of all dimensions of workplace stubbornness on all dimensions of organizational conflicts. The study concluded with several recommendations: promoting a culture of dialogue and effective communication between employees and management; developing change management programs to reduce employee resistance to new directives; fostering a collaborative work environment; and conducting periodic studies to measure levels of workplace stubbornness and organizational conflicts to evaluate the impact of administrative interventions and identify areas for continuous improvement.

Keywords: Job Stubbornness, Organizational Conflict, Government Institutions.

Introduction

In every governmental entity, professional ties are established not only via tasks and administrative frameworks but also through individual behaviors and interpersonal interactions. Among these behaviors, workplace obstinacy emerges as one of the most common occurrences observed in the work environment, even if it is not officially identified. We frequently observe an employee who resists change, adheres to their viewpoint despite its inaccuracies, or contests decisions solely because they did not originate from them. This form of obstinacy, while

occasionally appearing to arise from diligence or experience, rapidly devolves into resistant conduct that undermines productivity and fosters discord among colleagues, particularly in governmental settings that necessitate greater harmony and alignment than others (Robbins & Judge, 2019).

Government employees navigate economic pressures, administrative bureaucracy, and inadequate incentives, prompting some to exhibit obstinacy as a kind of self-defense or to convey discontent indirectly (Al-Sartawi, 2022).

This obstinacy extends beyond the individual level, infiltrating the workplace and engendering organizational disputes, evident in misunderstandings, competing interests, and a deficiency of collaboration among teams. Gibson et al. (2020) indicated that such actions, if not comprehended and addressed appropriately, could result in a deterioration of trust within the company and a decrease in overall performance. The urgency of the situation is exacerbated by the frequent misinterpretation of workplace obstinacy. This does not inherently indicate violent behavior or defiance of authority; rather, it may stem from inadequate listening, ineffective managerial communication, or the employee's perception of being undervalued (Al-Ajmi, 2020). This requires a comprehensive analysis of this phenomena and an understanding of its actual impact on organizational conflicts within government institutions.

The significance of this study arises from our daily reality and the pressing necessity to comprehend these behaviors not only theoretically but also to better the work environment, increase job harmony, and offer practical, implementable recommendations.

The problem of the study and its inquiries:

Government institutions of various types endeavor to promote the public good by refining their operations and elevating the level of services offered to beneficiaries. To accomplish this, collaboration and discipline must dominate among them. Nonetheless, many instances expose functional behaviors that transcend mere differences of opinion, manifesting as persistent obstinacy that obstructs progress, impedes workflow, and generates discord within work teams. This obstinacy in the workplace, sometimes arising from an employee's commitment to their perspective or expertise, can evolve into resistant conduct towards the organization, leading to personal disputes, internal divisions, and a decline in the work environment. It is essential to comprehend this obstinate behavior and its contribution to intensifying organizational conflicts that undermine team cohesion and impact overall performance quality. The complexity of this issue is exacerbated within government institutions, which have inherent structural and administrative challenges, hence requiring a comprehensive investigation of this phenomenon to suggest feasible and implementable remedies.

Therefore, this study elucidates the phenomenon of workplace obstinacy and its influence on organizational conflicts within government institutions, examining its underlying causes and offering recommendations to mitigate workplace obstinacy and curtail organizational conflicts to promote the public good. The research issue can be articulated by the following primary question: What is the nature of workplace obstinacy and its effect on organizational conflicts within governmental entities? This leads to the emergence of the subsequent sub-questions:

- What is the extent of functional obstinacy (persistence in opinion, refusal to comply with directions, inadequate adaptability to change, adherence to conventional ways) within government institutions?
- What is the extent of organizational conflicts (interpersonal conflict, departmental conflict, conflict of interest, ineffective communication) inside government institutions?
- Is there a statistically significant impact of functional stubbornness across all its dimensions on organizational disputes in all their dimensions among government institutions in the Jordan and West Bank?

The primary hypothesis of the study: it posits that functional stubbornness, across all dimensions, does not exert a statistically significant effect on organizational conflicts, in all their dimensions, within government institutions in the Jordan and West Bank at the significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$).

Objectives of the study:

The study sought to ascertain the prevalence of workplace obstinacy and its influence on organizational conflicts within government organizations, resulting in the following sub-objectives:

- Assessing the extent of obstinacy in the workplace (persistence in opinion, rejection of directions, resistance to change, commitment to conventional techniques) among governmental institutions.
- Assessing the extent of organizational conflicts (interpersonal conflict, interdepartmental conflict, conflict of interest, ineffective communication) inside governmental organizations.
- Analyzing the influence of workplace obstinacy on organizational disputes within governmental entities.
- Analyzing the variations in the responses of the study sample concerning the level of workplace obstinacy in government institutions based on the variables: (gender, age, educational qualification, years of service, kind of work).

Significance of the study:

The significance of the study can be encapsulated as follows:

- The study offers a scholarly contribution to the academic domain by elucidating the influence of workplace obstinacy on organizational conflicts.
- It underscores a detrimental organizational behavior that may directly impact the work environment in government institutions, namely job stubbornness. Given the ongoing transformations and administrative difficulties encountered by these organizations, comprehending this behavior and its implications is crucial for efficient human resource management.
- The study seeks to elucidate the correlation between workplace obstinacy and organizational conflicts, an area that has been underexplored in the research context, despite its evident impact on productivity and workplace cohesion.
- The study aims to offer pragmatic insights for decision-makers and senior management regarding the significance of cultivating a flexible organizational culture, fostering dialogue and comprehension among employees, and mitigating behaviors that obstruct teamwork.
- The findings of the study are anticipated to aid in formulating effective management techniques to mitigate workplace obstinacy and diminish organizational conflicts, hence enhancing overall institutional performance.

Academic literature:

Modern institutions have numerous issues that jeopardize their internal stability and organizational effectiveness, notably the rise of detrimental behavioral patterns among employees that impact the work environment. One such trend is termed "workplace stubbornness," defined by an employee's obstinacy in adhering to directions or reluctance to embrace change absent explicit professional rationales. Workplace obstinacy is deemed a behavior detrimental to organizational collaboration, as it signifies a condition of psychological inflexibility and persistent opposition to directives and changes dictated by the work environment (Shoss, 2017). Workplace obstinacy is closely correlated with organizational disputes, an intrinsic occurrence in teamwork, when viewpoints, positions, and expectations differ among persons inside the organization. When certain employees exhibit obstinacy or persistent dissent, the tension intensifies, heightening the likelihood of organizational conflicts that impact performance, morale, and internal cohesion (Jehn, 1995). Certain academics have suggested that organizations failing to handle workplace obstinacy in their administrative rules frequently experience diminished productivity, elevated absenteeism, and heightened employee burnout (Nasurdin et al., 2014). A work atmosphere marked by conflict and misunderstanding is deemed talent-repelling and fails to foster creativity and progress.

This study seeks to elucidate the correlation between job stubbornness and organizational conflicts by examining the fundamental causes and motivations of these issues, while also offering recommendations to enhance the work environment and foster a more cohesive organizational culture.

Workplace obstinacy:

The work setting inside government organizations is regarded as one characterized by numerous interactions among individuals and groups. It is occasionally marked by role overlap and divergent directions, perhaps leading to detrimental organizational practices that impact workflow. A notable manifestation of these behaviors is referred to as workplace obstinacy.

Workplace obstinacy denotes an excessive adherence to a certain idea or stance within the professional setting, disregarding contrary perspectives or formal directives, which results in discord among employees and diminishes the efficacy of collaboration (Al-Sartawi, 2022). This conduct may emerge as resistance to change, inflexibility in task execution, or confrontational interactions with colleagues, hence heightening the probability of organizational problems.

Organizational conflicts are characterized as a condition of tension or disagreement that emerges between individuals or groups due to divergent interests, objectives, or methodologies (Robbins, 2009). While certain disagreements can be useful and foster development, their persistent occurrence without due consideration can engender a detrimental work atmosphere, diminishing job satisfaction and undermining organizational loyalty.

Workplace obstinacy, characterized by inflexible thinking and resistance to constructive engagement, can significantly exacerbate organizational conflicts, particularly in government institutions that necessitate extensive cooperation and compliance with regulations (Al-Momani & Subih, 2019). Thus, comprehending the relationship between these two variables is crucial, considering the administrative and structural constraints encountered by governmental institutions, which require an emphasis on fostering a more adaptable and collaborative work environment.

The notion of workplace obstinacy: Obstinacy is a persistent behavioral inclination that compels an individual to uphold their idea or position while dismissing contrary perspectives, even when confronted with logical or social facts necessitating reconsideration or adjustment. Stubbornness is sometimes regarded as a behavior linked to personality qualities such as disobedience, a propensity for control, or inadequate cognitive flexibility (Beck, 1990; Millon, 1996).

Abdul Rahman (2012) asserts that obstinacy is characterized by an irrational insistence on denial and resistance, frequently arising as an automatic response driven by psychological factors such as dissatisfaction or a perceived loss of

control.

From a psychological development standpoint, stubbornness is viewed as a developmental behavior that may manifest in early life as a kind of self-assertion; nevertheless, it becomes maladaptive if it excessively persists in later stages (Shaffer, 2009).

Workplace obstinacy is regarded as a detrimental organizational behavior categorized as counterproductive work conduct. It denotes an employee's obstinacy over their beliefs or work practices, coupled with an unwillingness to modify or adjust to directives or organizational changes, even when such instructions serve the institution's best interests (Spector, 2006; Robbins & Judge, 2019).

Workplace obstinacy may present itself through resistance to change, noncompliance with administrative directives, or continued reliance on ineffective traditional procedures (Williams, 2007). Such behaviors are occasionally ascribed to psychological and personal factors, including cognitive rigidity and low emotional intelligence. Religious and social values held by employees may influence their motivations for maintaining a position (Al-Hadidi, 2018).

The aforementioned makes it abundantly evident that workplace obstinacy is a complex issue with organizational, psychological, and personal components that cannot be boiled down to a fleetingly bad behavior. Insisting on one's position is sometimes seen as a sign of stability and commitment to values, but when it turns into a persistent position of rejection and resistance, it betrays a dysfunction in professional relationships and jeopardizes workplace harmony. This conduct calls into question the institution's capacity to respect individual variations and offer an adaptable administrative setting that encourages communication and transparency rather than enforcing directives and choices from above. Furthermore, some obstinacy may be a result of an employee's awareness of or commitment to professional or ethical ideals that they believe are in danger due to certain administrative actions. Here, being stubborn is not only a bad habit but also a professional kind of resistance.

Resolving the issue of workplace obstinacy necessitates a thorough strategy that goes beyond changing individual conduct to examine the entire workplace, leadership styles, and communication channels in order to create an organizational culture built on openness, participation, and trust.

Reasons for workplace obstinacy:

There are factors contributing to workplace obstinacy include various explanations for this behavior among employees, with the most notable being:

- **Ineffective management:** Subpar leadership and inadequate management are primary variables that adversely influence employee behavior, potentially

leading to insubordination and resistance owing to insufficient guidance and administrative assistance (Robbins & Judge, 2019).

- Insufficient employee recognition: The perception that an employee's contributions are inadequately acknowledged results in diminished job satisfaction, potentially prompting them to display obstinate conduct as a means of protest or discontent (Armstrong, 2020).
- Perception of injustice: Organizational justice is a critical element in the workplace, and when an employee perceives inequity in task allocation or promotions, adverse emotions may emerge, resulting in workplace obstinacy (Greenberg, 1990; Colquitt et al., 2001).
- Inadequate communication channels within the organization result in misunderstandings and confusion between employees and management, adversely impacting individual behaviors, including stubbornness (Daft, 2018).
- Excessive pressure: Numerous studies indicate that ongoing psychological and professional stress can lead an employee to exhibit resistance and rejection, potentially resulting in workplace stubbornness. Leka et al. (2003); Quick & Henderson (2016)
- Personal factors: Personality qualities, including obstinacy, skepticism, and closed-mindedness, significantly influence employees' reactions to professional circumstances (McCrae & Costa, 1999; Judge & Bono, 2001).
- Infringement of privacy: When an employee perceives a violation of their private, such as excessive surveillance or inquiries into personal matters unrelated to work, they may exhibit defensive behavior (Westin, 1967; Smith, 2012).
- Deficiency of team spirit: A workplace devoid of engagement and collaboration may foster emotions of alienation and disconnection among employees, heightening the propensity for insubordination and obstinacy (Katzenbach & Smith, 2005).
- Unprofessional treatment: When an employee is subjected to inappropriate conduct or perceives insult, their response may be adverse and confrontational, occasionally exhibiting obstinate behavior. (Namie & Namie, 2011; Gloor, 2014)

Domains of obstinacy in the workplace:

The initial domain: Intransigence in viewpoint. Stubbornness in opinion is regarded as a psychological characteristic linked to an individual's personality and cognitive style. In educational and organizational contexts, this form of obstinacy frequently arises from inadequate cognitive flexibility or from pronounced subjective biases in the interpretation of situations and decisions. Millon (1996) posits that individuals who adhere to their ideas without accommodating new

information exhibit a rigid cognitive style, which obstructs constructive interactions with others and engenders difficulties within the workplace.

The second domain: The employee's rejection of repeated commands from superiors, absent a clear administrative rationale, is deemed a symptom of organizational indiscipline and is classified as "negative organizational behaviors." Spector (2006) asserts that rejecting directives and persistently challenging choices erodes leadership authority and fosters an environment of administrative disorder.

The third domain: Challenges in responding to change. Adapting to change is an essential talent in modern educational settings, as institutional advancement and innovation necessitate significant psychological and organizational flexibility from employees. Shaffer (2009) posits that individuals who find adaptation challenging frequently endure elevated levels of anxiety and stress due to change, particularly when such change is abrupt or unexpected.

The fourth domain: Compliance with Conventional Methods; inside educational institutions, adherence to old methodologies is regarded as a significant impediment to digital transformation and professional advancement. Fullan (2001) asserts that certain employees resist change due to their familiarity with traditional ways, perceiving modern technologies as a threat to their competence or status.

The concept of organizational conflicts:

Organizational conflicts are regarded as a natural and unavoidable occurrence in the workplace, stemming from divergent interests, conflicting objectives, or differing beliefs and perspectives among individuals or groups within the business. Robbins & Judge (2019) characterized it as "a process wherein one party perceives that another party is adversely impacting an aspect of concern, regardless of whether this effect is factual or perceived," suggesting that conflict is contingent not solely on actions but also on interpretations and personal perceptions.

Rahim (2011) defines organizational conflict as a social interaction that occurs when the goals, values, or perceptions of individuals and groups within an organization are in contradiction, resulting in tension, discord, or functional dissonance. He asserts that this style of conflict can be constructive if it enhances decision-making and fosters dialogue, although it can be detrimental if it results in relationship deterioration or a reduction in performance.

The severity of organizational conflicts is affected by various elements, such as leadership styles, role clarity, communication dynamics, and organizational culture. Organizations characterized by deficient internal communication or insufficient transparency in decision-making are more susceptible to the onset and intensification of conflicts (De Dreu & Gelfand, 2008).

Consequently, conflict management in organizations extends beyond mere dispute resolution; it encompasses the implementation of preventive and proactive strategies that channel conflict towards constructive objectives, thereby converting it from a hindrance into an opportunity for organizational advancement and collective progress.

Causes of organizational conflicts:

Organizational conflicts stem from various causes, where structural, behavioral, and psychological aspects converge. Administrative literature concurs that these factors are not inherently detrimental; instead, they can serve as accelerators for growth and development if appropriately handled (Robbins & Judge, 2019). The primary factors contributing to the onset of conflict inside organizations include:

- Divergent objectives and interests: When the aims of departments or individuals within the company vary, competition and opposing priorities arise, potentially resulting in functional discord. For instance, the marketing division may aim to enhance market share, but the production division endeavors to minimize costs (Rahim, 2011).
- Ambiguity in duties and responsibilities: The absence of explicit job descriptions or overlapping authorities among personnel results in performance disputes and persistent misconceptions, hence heightening the potential for conflict (Jehn, 1997).
- Inadequate organizational communication: The lack of efficient communication channels or the existence of information flow gaps results in misunderstandings, heightened rumors, and exacerbated disputes, hence fostering an environment conducive to discord (De Dreu & Gelfand, 2008).
- Individual and psychological disparities: Personalities in the workplace differ regarding style, cultural background, emotional intelligence, and tolerance, rendering conflict nearly unavoidable, particularly in high-pressure settings (Amason, 1996).
- Disparity in resource allocation: When employees perceive inequity in the distribution of resources, promotional prospects, or acknowledgment, tension and conflict emerge among individuals or groups (Pondy, 1967).
- Authoritarian or ineffective leadership: Management approaches characterized by domination or exclusion, which neglect employee participation in decision-making, frequently result in employee discontent and heightened organizational disputes (Luthans, 2011).

Aspects of Organizational Conflicts in Academic Literature

Organizational disputes provide a significant obstacle to effective performance inside institutions, particularly in educational and administrative settings that

depend on collaboration and integration. A multitude of studies has concentrated on dissecting this phenomena by examining its different dimensions, which encompass:

First: Interpersonal conflict: Interpersonal conflict is one of the most prevalent forms of conflict within organizations, frequently arising from divergent values, competition for resources, or a lack of personal rapport among employees. Jehn (1995) asserts that neglecting this form of disagreement can result in strained relationships, diminished morale, and a decline in mutual trust among colleagues. Secondly, inter-departmental conflict arises when the institution experiences inadequate horizontal and vertical coordination among its organizational units, or when there are no explicit processes for the allocation of tasks and authority. Mintzberg (1993) posits that ambiguity in positions and overlapping tasks engenders detrimental competition across departments, frequently resulting in an implicit conflict that impedes institutional performance. Pondy (1967) affirms that the lack of consultation among organizational units during decision-making cultivates a sense of marginalization and precipitates interest-based disputes among various departments.

Thirdly: Conflict of interest: A conflict of interest occurs when individual or group objectives contradict the institution's public interest, resulting in a disruption of organizational equity and a deficiency of confidence. Katz & Kahn (1978) assert that favoritism and subjective decision-making foster employee dissatisfaction and cultivate an environment conducive to the emergence of latent conflicts.

Fourth: Ineffective communication: Proficient communication is fundamental to attaining organizational cohesion, as its deficiency results in misunderstandings, information inconsistencies, and ill-considered actions. Daft (2012) established that inadequate communication channels are significant catalysts of conflict, resulting in role ambiguity, fragmented agendas, and diminished coordination efficacy among various units.

Previous studies:

Zakaria and Hamdouche (2025) conducted research to ascertain the influence of organizational conflict management strategies—namely cooperation, avoidance, compromise, concession, and dominance—on work alienation. The research was performed in both public and private hospitals located in the city of Jableh. A descriptive analytical approach was utilized to fulfill the study's objectives, employing a questionnaire administered to 150 employees. The data was collected manually and input into the statistical analysis program (SPSS 26). Hypothesis testing was performed utilizing the mean, standard deviation, t-test, and multiple regression analysis. The findings of the study were as follows: No statistically significant correlation exists between organizational conflict management practices

and job alienation in public and private hospitals in the city of Jableh. A statistically significant correlation exists between avoidance and cooperative methods and job alienation in public and private hospitals in Jableh. No statistically significant correlation exists between control, concession, and compromise techniques and job alienation in public and private hospitals in Jableh.

The study advocated for fostering a constructive culture for conflict resolution, promoting dialogue and negotiation, implementing training programs for employees on conflict management competencies, improving effective communication, encouraging direct and transparent interactions among colleagues, and ensuring an equitable work environment while recognizing employees for their exemplary performance.

Okolie (2024) did a study to investigate the influence of resistance to change on unproductive work practices within the Nigerian banking sector. The research utilized a cross-sectional design and implemented a simple random sample technique to gather data from 77 employees across various selected banks in Abraka, Delta State. Of the 70 questionnaires distributed, 57 were collected, for a response rate of 81.4%. There were 25 male employees and 32 female employees among them. The research employed statistical analysis methods such as correlation, linear regression, and T-test to examine the data. The findings indicated a robust and statistically significant correlation between resistance to change and unproductive work habits in the Nigerian banking sector. The study demonstrated that employees' resistance to change significantly and statistically influences undesirable behaviors in the workplace.

The study determined that employee resistance to change is a primary catalyst for the development of adverse behaviors in the workplace. Understanding these counterproductive habits is crucial for grasping the causes behind reluctance to change and the adverse reactions against employers or colleagues within the same firm. To mitigate adverse behaviors or sentiments regarding organizational change processes, employees require a thorough comprehension of the change's nature, procedures, and outcomes, which aids in surmounting resistance to change.

Lamprakis and Lampraki (2023) did a study on the phenomenon of employee resistance to organizational change. Following an examination of organizational change and its various types, the paper investigates the phenomenon of resistance over time, elucidating that it is no longer exclusively perceived as detrimental; instead, when effectively managed, it can yield advantages for the organization. The document further examines the three components of resistance: behavioral, cognitive, and emotional.

Moreover, there are other forms of resistance inside the job environment. The paper examines the primary causes leading to the development of resistance and

elucidates strategies for their effective mitigation or management. The notion of employee resistance is intrinsically connected to the idea of organizational transformation. Consequently, the study introduces a set of models that link the two notions temporally, finally concluding that resistance and change can coexist harmoniously and creatively, enhancing the organization's success and the well-being of its employees.

Ampfo, Mantey, and Aniah (2021) undertook a study to investigate the origins of organizational conflicts within the Tamale High Court in Ghana. Data was gathered from primary and secondary sources, utilizing a case study methodology and employing interviews as the principal data gathering instrument. This study purposefully selected 15 participants, comprising eight senior staff members and seven younger staff members.

The study identified that inadequate organizational frameworks, erratic and factional policies, misaligned objectives, ineffective communication, inequitable task allocation, absence of benefits, divergent perceptions of accountability, strained relationships between senior and junior personnel, conflicts between employees and employers, role ambiguities, self-interest among employers and employees, political dynamics, variances in educational backgrounds, personal experiences, religion, and gender contribute to discord within the Tamale High Court.

Paraskevas Petrou et al. (2020) undertook a study to investigate the correlation between employee revolt and creativity, noting that existing literature suggests rebellion may precede creative behavior, although this hypothesis has hardly been empirically validated. This study posits that rebellion as a personality trait may have an inverted U-shaped correlation with creativity. Furthermore, we anticipated this effect to be more significant in two instances: When individuals pursue success (i.e., they exhibit a strong emphasis on promotion) or when they do not evade failure (i.e., they have a weak emphasis on prevention). We executed a triadic weekly survey on a diverse sample of 156 employees. The findings revealed that the anticipated nonlinear correlation between rebellion and creativity manifested under conditions of strong promotion focus; nevertheless, a direct association between the two variables was not observed. Furthermore, the emphasis on prevention did not alter the nonlinear correlation.

Further analyses indicated that rebellion is directly correlated with creativity when the emphasis on promotion is elevated and the emphasis on prevention is diminished concurrently. Our research indicates that rebellion alone does not suffice to stimulate creativity; instead, we find that an emphasis on promotion is the factor that amplifies the connection between moderate rebellion and creativity. Moreover, when employees concurrently concentrate on promotion and cessation

of prevention, increased rebellion correlates with heightened levels of creativity reported.

Methodology of the study

The researchers employed a descriptive analytical methodology due to its appropriateness for this category of investigations.

The study population comprises all employees inside government entities in the Jordan and West Bank.

Study Sample: Given the imprecise definition of the study population and the challenges associated with comprehensive access due to administrative limitations and the enumeration of all individuals, a non-probability convenience sample was employed, selecting individuals who were accessible among the employees of these institutions. The Cochran formula was employed to calculate the sample size for the unspecified population.

With a confidence level of 95% and a margin of error of 5%, the optimal sample size was 384 persons. Nonetheless, owing to field limitations, data was gathered from 202 individuals, which is deemed an adequate sample size according to statistical literature that regards samples between 200 and 300 individuals as sufficient for performing correlation and regression analyses. Table 1 illustrates the distribution of the study sample participants:

Table (1): Distribution of the study sample members according to their variables

No	Variables	Number		Percentage
1	Gender	Male	108	53.6%
		Female	94	46.5%
		Total	202	100%
2	Years of experience	Less than 5 years	12	5.9%
		5-10 years	34	16.8%
		More than 10 years	156	77.2%
		Total	202	100%
3	Age	Less than 30 years	14	6.9%
		30-40 years	74	36.6%
		40 – less than 50 years	88	43.6%
		50 years and older	26	12.9%

		Total	202	100%
4	Qualification	Diploma degree	22	10.9%
		Bachelor degree	114	
		Postgraduate	66	32.7%
		Total	202	100%
5	Type of work	Administrative	138	68.3%
		Technical	64	31.7%
		Total	202	100%

Upon examining Table (1), the subsequent observations are evident:

- The sample predominantly consists of males, comprising 53.5%, while females account for 46.5%.

-A predominant 77.6% of the sample individuals possessed over 10 years of service.

-The predominant age group among the sample members was between 40 and less than 50 years, comprising 43.6% of the total. Individuals aged 30 to less than 40 years constituted 36.6%, followed by those aged 50 years and beyond at 12.9%, and lastly, individuals with less than 30 years of experience at 6.9%.

-The majority of the sample members own a bachelor's degree, accounting for 56.4%, followed by individuals with postgraduate degrees at 32.7%, and those with diplomas or lower qualifications at 10.9%.

- The predominant portion of the sample comprises administrators at 68.3%, while technicians constitute 31.7%.

Statistical processing:

Following the collection of study data, the researchers examined it in anticipation of inputting it into the computer. The data was input into the computer by giving particular numerical values to vocal responses. The response "Strongly Agree" received five points, "Agree" four points, "Neutral" three points, "Disagree" two points, and "Strongly Disagree" one point. This was executed for all portions of the study, rendering the questionnaire capable of assessing workplace obstinacy and its influence on organizational conflicts among government institutions in the Jordan and West Bank positively. The data was statistically processed by calculating the arithmetic means, standard deviations, conducting simple and multiple regression analyses, and applying Cronbach's alpha, utilizing the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

Results of the study, discussion, interpretation, and recommendations

This section delineates the findings obtained by the researchers through the responses of the study sample about workplace obstinacy and its influence on

organizational disputes within government institutions in the Jordan and West Bank, in accordance with the study's inquiries and hypotheses. The arithmetic mean value of the study instrument (the questionnaire) can be interpreted as follows:

Table (3): Significance of the Arithmetic Mean.

Arithmetic mean	Significance
1.80<1.00	Very low
2.60< 1.80	Low
3.40<2.60	Medium
4.20<3.40	High
5.00-4.20	Very high

Based on the statistical analysis of the study data, the researchers obtained the following results:

Question 1: What is the extent of obstinacy in the workplace (persistence in opinion, resistance to comply with directions, difficulty in adapting to change, adherence to conventional techniques) within government institutions?

The averages and standard deviations for the study dimensions and the overall score were obtained, as presented in Table 4.

Table (4): Means and standard deviations of job stubbornness in government institutions by importance

Study Dimensions	Arithmetic Mean	Standard deviation	Rank
Opinions of stubbornness	2.83	0.745	Medium
Refusal to follow instructions	2.83	0.662	Medium
Poor change adaption	2.76	0.775	Medium
Respect for conventional techniques	2.37	0.641	Low
The total level of functional obstinacy	2.70	0.576	Medium

Table (4) indicates that the level of functional obstinacy in government institutions within the Jordan and West Bank was moderate, with a mean of (2.70) and a standard deviation of (0.576). The most pronounced aspects of functional obstinacy, even at a low degree, were the adherence to personal opinion, with a

mean of 2.83 and a standard deviation of 0.745, and the dismissal of directives, with a mean of 2.83 and a standard deviation of 0.662. This was succeeded by challenges in adapting to change, with a mean of 2.76 and a standard deviation of 0.775, and lastly, adherence to old techniques, which was low, with a mean of 2.37 and a standard deviation of 0.671.

This results from a relative equilibrium between job devotion and job obstinacy on one side, and the adherence to or defense of personal positions on the other. This can be elucidated by the characteristics of the work environment in government organizations, which are defined by explicit organizational processes and procedures that curtail excessive obstinacy, while yet permitting a degree of personal expression and viewpoints. Both dimensions of emphasis on viewpoint and rejection of commands rated first with a significant degree of significance. This may be ascribed to certain employees' conviction that their experiential knowledge renders them more adept at identifying the most effective approach for task execution, resulting in their adherence to personal perspectives or dismissal of directives they perceive as impractical or inappropriate for the situation. The attribute of limited adaptability to change also obtained a moderate rating, attributable to the bureaucratic nature prevalent in governmental operations. The component of commitment to traditional procedures obtained a low rating, suggesting that employees are somewhat inclined to forsake outdated practices in favor of more contemporary and efficient alternatives. This may represent professional development initiatives and ongoing training, or the influence of technological advancements in the governmental workplace.

This diminishes dependence on conventional procedures, suggesting that employee obstinacy in these institutions is not inherently detrimental, but frequently arises in contexts pertaining to personal conviction or the evaluation of the practicality of decisions and directives. The findings of the study aligned with those of Okolie (2024) and Lamprakis & Lampraki (2023). The second inquiry: What is the extent of organizational conflicts (interpersonal conflict, interdepartmental conflict, conflict of interest, inadequate communication) inside government institutions?

The means and standard deviations were extracted, as shown in Table (5):
Table (5): Means and standard deviations of organizational conflicts in government institutions in the Jordan and West Bank:

Study Dimensions	Arithmetic Mean	Standard deviation	Rank
Lack of communication	3.85	0.776	High
Conflict of interests	3.61	0.806	High
Departmental conflict	3.58	0.796	High
Individual conflict	3.53	0.827	High
The general level of disagreement within the organization	3.64	0.732	High

The statistics in Table (5) demonstrate that the degree of organizational conflicts within government institutions in the Jordan and West Bank is elevated, with a mean of (3.64) and a standard deviation of (0.732). The highest scores were observed in the area of communication weakness, with a mean of 3.85 and a standard deviation of 0.776, followed by the area of conflict of interest, with a mean of 3.61 and a standard deviation of 0.806. Next was the area of inter-departmental conflict, with a mean of 3.58 and a standard deviation of 0.796, and lastly, the area of interpersonal conflict, with a mean of 3.53 and a standard deviation of 0.827.

This outcome is ascribed to the characteristics of the work environment, marked by administrative intricacy and frequent overlaps of authority and responsibilities, hence elevating the likelihood of confrontations between employees and management. Poor communication, which obtained the highest average score, indicates weaknesses in communication channels or uncertainty in information flow, resulting in misunderstandings and divergent perspectives. Additionally, conflicts of interest signify disparities in objectives or priorities among persons or agencies, thereby intensifying the conflict. The conflict among departments and individuals frequently arises from competition for resources or influence, as well as disparities in work styles and personalities, necessitating effective administrative intervention to alleviate its impact. The findings of the study aligned with those of Ampofo, Mantey, and Aniah (2021), as well as Zakaria and Hamdouche (2025).

Question three: Does functional stubbornness, in all its dimensions, have a statistically significant impact on organizational disputes across all dimensions within government institutions?

The study hypothesis addresses this question, asserting that there is no statistically significant effect, at the significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$), of functional

stubbornness in all its dimensions on organizational conflicts across all dimensions within government institutions in the Jordan and West Bank.

To evaluate this hypothesis, simple linear regression analysis employing the entry technique was utilized to assess the influence of workplace obstinacy on organizational conflicts within government organizations in the Jordan and West Bank. The findings shown in tables (6) – (8) demonstrate this:

Table (6): R values to determine the correlation coefficients of functional stubbornness with organizational conflicts

R value	Square	Adjusted R square	Estimated standard error
0.248	0.06	0.057	0.71140

Table (6) indicates that the correlation coefficient between job stubbornness and organizational conflicts, as perceived by employees in government institutions, is (0.248), signifying a poor association. The R-squared value signifies the percentage of variance in the dependent variable elucidated by the independent variable, specifically indicating that job stubbornness accounts for 6.00% of this explanatory power.

Table (7): One-way ANOVA to determine the relationship between workplace stubbornness and organizational conflicts

Model	Source of variation	Sum of squares	Freedom degrees	Mean Square	F	Significance level
1	Regression	6.612	1	6.612	13.064	00.00
	Remainder	101.217	200	101.217		
	Total	107.829	201	107.829		

The data in Table (7) demonstrate the significance of the regression, indicating a substantial relationship between job stubbornness and organizational conflicts from the perspective of employees in government institutions in the Jordan and West Bank, with a statistical significance of < 0.05 and a calculated "F" value of 13.064, which exceeds the tabulated value of 3.84.

Table (8): Transactions that illustrate the impact of workplace stubbornness on organizational conflicts

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T value	Semantic significance
	Standard error	B	Beta		
Constant	0.274	2.793-		11.594	0.647
The perpetual functional obstinacy in all its aspects	0.087	0.315	0.248	3.614	00.00

Table (8) clearly indicates that organizational conflicts in government institutions fluctuate in relation to employee obstinacy, with each one-degree increase in job obstinacy resulting in a 0.315-degree rise in the rate of organizational conflicts. This validates the hypothesis asserting that there exists a statistically significant impact, at the significance level ($\alpha < 0.05$), of job stubbornness across all dimensions on organizational disputes in all dimensions among government institutions in the Jordan and West Bank.

Results of the study:

The study's findings indicate that the level of job stubbornness among employees in government institutions within Jordan and West Bank is moderate. The highest dimensions of job stubbornness, namely persistence in opinion and refusal of directives, also exhibit moderate levels. This is followed by a moderate difficulty in adapting to change, while adherence to traditional methods is comparatively low. The level of organizational disputes within government institutions in the Jordan and West Bank was determined to be elevated. The areas with the highest degree of concern were: inadequate communication, conflict of interest, interdepartmental conflict, and interpersonal conflict.

- Work stubbornness, in all its dimensions, has a statistically significant effect on organizational disputes, across all dimensions, in government institutions within the Jordan and West Bank at the significance level ($\alpha < 0.05$).

Recommendations of the study:

Based on the findings and aims of the study, the researchers propose the following:

- Fostering a culture of dialogue and effective communication between employees and management through training programs that emphasize communication skills and constructive conflict resolution techniques, aimed at minimizing misconceptions that result in growing confrontations.

- Formulating change management initiatives that mitigate employee resistance to new directions by engaging them in decision-making processes to foster acceptance of changes and diminish instances of workplace obstinacy.
- Reevaluating leadership strategies inside governmental institutions to prioritize motivational and supportive leadership, fostering creativity rather than adhering to conventional techniques.
- Establish explicit processes for conflict resolution, such as creating specialist committees or instituting written policies that delineate procedures for addressing disagreements between individuals or departments, to ensure they are promptly contained before escalation occurs.
- Fostering a collaborative work environment through group activities and joint initiatives across many departments, thereby mitigating conflicts of interest and enhancing team cohesion.
- Perform regular assessments to evaluate workplace obstinacy and organizational discord, to gauge the effectiveness of administrative measures and pinpoint areas for ongoing enhancement.

References:

1. Al-Ajmi, R. (2020). *Workplace resistance and its impact on team dynamics. International Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18(2), 145–160.
2. Abdulrahman, M. (2012). *Educational Psychology*. Cairo: Dar Al-Fikr Al-Arabi.
3. Al-Hadidi, M. S. (2018). *The impact of psychological rigidity on organizational behavior: An applied study. Jordan Journal of Business Administration*, 14(3), 245–267.
4. Al-Momani, M., & Subih, M. (2019). *Job Stubbornness and Its Impact on Organizational Conflict in Public Sector Institutions. Journal of Business and Management Research*, 14(2), 45–60.
5. Amason, A. C. (1996). *Distinguishing the Effects of Functional and Dysfunctional Conflict on Strategic Decision Making. Academy of Management Journal*, 39(1), 123–148.
6. Ampfo, J. A; Mantey, I; Aniah, E. (2). *Causes of Organizational Conflict in Public Institutions in Ghana: A study in Tamale High Court. International Journal of Applied Research in Social Sciences*, 3(4), 77–91.
7. Armstrong, M. (2020). *Armstrong's Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice (15th ed.)*. Kogan Page.
8. Colquitt, J. A. (2001). *On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386–400.
9. Daft, R. L. (2012). *Organization Theory and Design (11th ed.)*. South-Western Cengage Learning.
10. Daft, R. L. (2018). *Organization Theory and Design (13th ed.)*. Cengage Learning.

11. De Dreu, C. K. W., & Gelfand, M. J. (Eds.). (2008). *The Psychology of Conflict and Conflict Management in Organizations*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
12. Gloor, J. L. (2014). *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice*.
13. Fullan, M. (2001). *The New Meaning of Educational Change*. Teachers College Press.
14. Gibson, J. L., Ivancevich, J. M., Donnelly, J. H., & Konopaske, R. (2020). *Organizations: Behavior, Structure, Processes* (15th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
15. Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16(2), 399–432.
16. Jehn, K. A. (1995). A Multimethod Examination of the Benefits and Detriments of Intragroup Conflict. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40(2), 256–282.
17. Jehn, K. A. (1997). A Qualitative Analysis of Conflict Types and Dimensions in Organizational Groups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42(3), 530–557.
18. Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations traits—self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability—with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 80–92.
19. Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The Social Psychology of Organizations* (2nd ed.). Wiley.
20. Katzenbach, J. R., & Smith, D. K. (2005). *The Wisdom of Teams: Creating the High-Performance Organization*. HarperBusiness.
21. Lamprakis, A., & Lampraki, A. (2023). Employees' Resistance to Change: A Literature Review and Conceptual Models. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 13(2), 21–50.
22. Leka, S., Griffiths, A., & Cox, T. (2003). *Work Organization and Stress: Systematic Problem Approaches for Employers, Managers and Trade Union Representatives*. World Health Organization.
23. Luthans, F. (2011). *Organizational Behavior* (12th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
24. McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. Jr. (1999). A Five-Factor theory of personality. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nd ed., pp. 139–153). Guilford Press.
25. Millon, T. (1996). *Disorders of Personality: DSM-IV and Beyond* (2nd ed.). Wiley.
26. Mintzberg, H. (1993). *Structure in Fives: Designing Effective Organizations*. Prentice Hall.
27. Namie, G., & Namie, R. (2011). *The Bully-Free Workplace: Stop Jerks, Weasels, and Snakes from Killing Your Organization*. Wiley.
28. Nasurdin, A. M., Ramayah, T., & Beng, Y. K. (2014). Organizational Justice, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Gender as a Moderator. *The International Journal of Business and Society*, 15(3), 1–18.

29. Okolie, U. C. (2024). *Resistance to Change and Counterproductive Work Behaviour in the Nigerian Banking Sector*. *Journal of Administrative Science*, 21(2), 206–230.
30. Paraskevas P, Dimitri, v, Charalampos M, Oana, C. (2020). *Rebel with a cause: When does employee rebelliousness relate to creativity?*. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 93 (4), 811-833.
31. Pondy, L. R. (1967). *Organizational Conflict: Concepts and Models*. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 12(2), 296–320.
32. Quick, J. C., & Henderson, D. F. (2016). *Occupational stress: Preventing suffering, enhancing wellbeing*. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 13(5), 459.
33. Rahim, M. A. (2011). *Managing Conflict in Organizations (4th ed.)*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
34. Robbins, S. P. (2009). *Organizational Behavior (13th ed.)*. Pearson Education.
35. Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2019). *Organizational Behavior (18th ed.)*. Pearson.
36. Sartawi, S. (2022). *Organizational Behavior in the Palestinian Public Sector*. *An-Najah University Journal for Research (Humanities)*, 36(4), 455–472.
37. Shaffer, D. R. (2009). *Developmental Psychology: Childhood and Adolescence (8th ed.)*. Wadsworth.
38. Shoss, M. K. (2017). *Job Insecurity: An Integrative Review and Agenda for Future Research*. *Journal of Management*, 43(6), 1911–1939.
39. Smith, R. J. (2012). *Privacy and Power: A Transatlantic Dialogue in the Shadow of the NSA-Affair*. Springer.
40. Spector, P. (2006). *Counterproductive Work Behavior: Investigations of Actors and Targets*.
41. Williams, K. D. (2007). *Ostracism*. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.*, 58(1), 425-452.
42. Zakaria, R. A & Hamdoush, R. (2025). *The Impact of Organizational Conflict Management Strategies on Job Alienation: A Comparative Study between Public and Private Hospitals in the City of Jableh*. *Journal of Legal Science*, 2025(2), 256–267.