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Abstract: This study addresses the emergence of unwarranted conflicts and ruptured ties within teacher-to-principal and teacher-to-teacher interactions. It highlights the neglect of emotions in relationships, which has been a gap in this research. Unlike existing scholarly focus on cognitive and pragmatic aspects of relationships, this study explores emotional geographies. Its objective is to promote positive relationships between and among teachers and principals by examining emotionality in their political and professional geographies. Furthermore, it seeks to formulate a policy and develop a program that restores ruptured interactions. This research employed an exploratory sequential mixed method. The qualitative analysis involved thematic and reflexive analysis. Statistical methods, such as frequencies and percentages, weighted mean, and Pearson correlation coefficient, were employed for quantitative analysis. The findings identified both positive and negative behaviors in the political and professional geographies. The results of the interviews produced a four-quadrant chart. Positive behaviors were positioned in Quadrants I and IV, and negative behaviors in Quadrants II and III. Pearson correlation coefficient indicated a moderate positive correlation in the interactions of teachers with the principal and interaction with colleagues in both political and professional geographies. This study concludes that addressing emotional geographies is crucial to repairing strained relationships between teachers and principals and among teachers. The formulation of educational management policies and programs is a vital step toward achieving this goal.
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Introduction

In today's ever-changing educational landscape, effective collaboration between teachers and school administrators is critical in defining educational policies and practices. Policy formulation and implementation success is dependent not only on the technical components of policy design but also on the deep emotional dynamics that underpin teacher-to-principal and teacher-to-teacher interactions.

As educators face a variety of challenges, including the demands of an increasingly diverse student population, changing pedagogical approaches, and the growing expectations of accountability, the need to explore the emotional aspects of their professional relationships becomes increasingly important. Effective policy formulation in an education setting involves a thorough grasp of the emotional contexts in which it functions since emotions may either act as a catalyst for positive change or as barriers to progress.

Hargreaves (2001) investigated emotionality in education through the concepts of emotional geographies and emotional understanding. He defines “emotional geography” as the closeness or distance in relationships and interactions in humans that help interpret feelings and emotions they experience about themselves, others, and the society they live in. “Emotional Understanding” is the capacity to understand and interpret the emotions of people based on the opinions and feelings of others (Denzin, 1985). This includes understanding one’s own and other people's emotions and their causes and effects (LaBounty et al., 2008). On Hargreaves’s point, emotional understanding is a process of experiencing what others have experienced so that one will be able to understand the emotions of others.
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Studies on emotional geographies contribute significantly to understanding how emotions influence social interactions within schools, encompassing relationships between teachers and students (Hargreaves, 2001), with parents (Hargreaves & Lasky, 2004), and with colleagues (Hargreaves, 2001).

In his analysis of how teachers negotiate emotional understanding, Hargreaves (2001) and his colleagues found five (5) forms of emotional geographies: physical geographies, sociocultural geographies, political geographies, moral geographies, and professional geographies. Exploring all forms of emotional geographies was daunting; hence, this study explored two (2) typologies of emotion particularly salient in teacher-to-principal and teacher-to-teacher relationships and interaction—i.e., political and professional geographies.

“Political geography” is concerned with individuals’ position in the organization’s hierarchical structure. This structure can have a strong influence on people’s feelings because emotion is bound up with people’s experiences of controlling or being controlled by others (Dowling, 2008). Hargreaves (2001), as well as Dowling, defined “Professional geography” as the closeness or distance in interaction caused by competing forms of professionalism that help or handicap emotional understanding.

As Rapti (2013) found, positive environments promote positive outcomes in students’ and schools’ performance. However, Rapti (2013) further argued that the school environment is defined by the relationships established by principals and teachers between and among themselves.

Understanding emotionality in school relationships is most needed in the Philippines today. This may serve as the baseline for school leaders in formulating their policy that would best work in establishing and maintaining strong relationships between them and their teachers and among teachers in their schools.

Gallup, a global analytic group, said in its latest Global Emotions Report that Filipinos are among the most emotional people in the world. The Gallup survey showed that 6 out of 10 Filipinos experienced positive and negative emotions. Positive emotions may range from being treated with respect, laughing, smiling, feeling rested, and learning something interesting. Negative emotions range from experiencing physical pain, sadness, worry, anger, and stress (Filipino Times, 2019).

In the context of Public Junior High Schools in the Philippines, unwarranted conflicts and rapture of ties have arisen in the teacher-to-principal and teacher-to-teacher relationships because emotions in the relationships have been ignored, if not neglected. Scholars, instead, have turned their attention to the production of knowledge that describes, explains, and interprets the cognitive and pragmatic dimensions of the teacher-to-principal and teacher-to-teacher relationships. Likewise, school administrators have not formulated policies and developed programs that consider emotions in facilitating interactions.

This study fills in the lack in the literature by producing knowledge that explores the often-overlooked emotional dimensions of teacher-to-teacher and teacher-to-principal interactions, with a specific focus on their implications for educational management policy formulation.

The main objectives of this study are to describe the emotionality in teacher-to-principal and teacher-to-teacher relationships in terms of their political and professional geographies, to formulate a policy that incorporates emotional dimension in assessing and satisfying the needs arising from the teacher-to-principal and teacher-to-teacher relationships, and to facilitate teacher-to-principal and teacher-to-teacher relationships by developing programs based on the policy formulated.

Methodology

Research Design

This study utilized the exploratory sequential mixed method. The exploratory dimension of the design employed a case study qualitative design, and the sequence of this design was the non-experimental survey quantitative design. The initial phase in exploratory sequential design was qualitative, where the views of the participants were explored first. Data collected in this phase were analyzed. They were used to construct the instrument that fitted the phenomenon of interest to the researcher, and identified variables were used in the follow-up quantitative phase (Ishtiaq, 2019). As a result, this design conducts three stages of analyses: after the qualitative phase, after the quantitative phase, and after the integration phase that connects the two strands of data and extends the initial qualitative exploratory findings (Creswell & Clark, 2017).

Sample and Data Collection

This study was conducted in Quezon City, which is the largest city in Metro Manila. Quezon City has forty-six public junior high schools distributed in six (6) congressional districts. From the 46 public secondary schools, the researcher purposefully selected the participating schools for the study.

The purposeful sampling method, specifically the maximum variation sampling strategy (MVSS) of Patton (2002), was employed to select the schools so that the schools with the highest teacher population and the schools with the lowest
teacher population were the participating schools. In the school with the highest teacher population, a group of teachers who are oldest in the service and a group who are youngest in service were chosen according to the following criteria: The group of older in-service-teacher must be 40-60 years old, must be 15-30 years in service, must have at least 2-3 school assignments, and undergone the leadership of five (5) principals.

For the younger group – a teacher must be 25-30 years old, must be 1-5 years in service, must have 1-2 school assignments, and must have undergone the leadership of at least two (2) principals. The same technique was applied in selecting teachers in the school with the lowest teacher population. In the school with the highest teacher population, five (5) males and five (5) females were chosen for both groups (the oldest and youngest in service), for a total of 20. In the school with the lowest teacher population, two (2) males and two (2) females were chosen for both groups (the oldest and the youngest in service), for a total of eight (8). Therefore, the total number of participants was 28. The schools and teachers selected in this stage were the participants in the qualitative phase of the study.

The participating schools in the quantitative phase were schools with the highest teacher population in each district. Teacher participants were selected through systematic random sampling (Thomas, 2020). Teachers who are 25 years old and above, with a length of service of 1 year and above, and not participants in the qualitative phase, were invited to participate in the study. A total of 225 teachers were selected.

On top of this, all selected respondents must be willing to be part of the study and be knowledgeable about the topic, which was the emotions in interactions. The questionnaire in the survey was self-constructed, and the questions in the questionnaire were framed from the result of the qualitative phase. Experts and the adviser validated the contents of the questionnaire. Then, the reliability of the questionnaire was validated through piloting, employing Cronbach’s alpha. For this study, the Cronbach’s alpha was 0.95.

**Demographic Profile**

The data presented in Table 1 provides demographic information about the respondents. The table includes respondents' sex, age, civil status, no. of years in service, and highest educational attainment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Profile</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>31.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>68.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>20 – 30</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 – 40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>33.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 – 50</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>27.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51 and above</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Status</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>41.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>58.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Years in Service</td>
<td>1 – 10</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>57.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 – 20</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 – 30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 &amp; above</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Educational Attainment</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>69.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.S./M.A.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ph.D./Ed.D.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen that the majority of respondents in the study were females, comprising 153 or 68.30% of the sample, while males accounted for 71 or 31.70%. The data indicate that respondents aged 31-40 constitute the largest age group (75 or 33.48%), followed by those aged 20-30 (65 or 29.02%), 41-50 (62 or 27.68%), and 51 and above (22 or 9.82%). The majority of respondents were married (130 or 58.04%), followed by single individuals (92 or 41.07%), and a small percentage of respondents were separated (2 or 0.89%). The data indicate that the largest proportion of respondents had 1-10 years of service (129 or 57.59%), followed by 11-20 years (54 or 24.11%), 21-30 years (31 or 13.84%), and 31 years and above (10 or 4.46%). The majority of respondents held a bachelor's degree (155 or 69.20%), followed by master's degree holders (64 or 28.57%), and a small percentage held doctoral degrees (5 or 2.23%).

**Analyzing of Data**

The qualitative analysis involved two levels. The first level involved the use, in general, of thematic analysis and documentary, interview, and observational thematic analyses, in particular. To ensure the reliability of the qualitative data analysis, the researcher employed rigorous methods/steps to enhance the trustworthiness and consistency of
findings. The first level of analysis consisted of the following steps: 1) transcription of verbalization of the participants; 2) coding the data by segmenting, comparing, and grouping similar codes; and 3) formulating the themes arising from the coded data. The second level involved a reflexive analysis of the themes generated, which involved the following steps: 1) comparison of the generated themes with the conceptual framework and 2) interpretation of the result of the comparison according to the theoretical framework and reviewed literature.

Quantitative analysis, in general, uses statistical analysis. The researcher analyzed the data using descriptive statistics (frequency count, percentage, and weighted mean). The responses were measured through a scale with a point system and interpretation presented as Always (3.26 – 4.00), Most of the Time (2.51 – 3.25), Sometimes (1.76 – 2.50), and Never (1.00 – 1.75).

Moreover, inferential statistics such as Pearson correlation coefficient (r) were computed to test whether a statistically significant relationship existed between interactions with the principal and with colleagues in terms of political and professional geographies using the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS). In addressing the assumptions vital for these analyses, factors such as normal distribution, interval level of measurement, and linearity were taken into account, ensuring the robustness and validity of the statistical techniques employed.

**Findings/Results**

**Qualitative Results**

It cannot be denied that outcomes in schools depend on how principals and teachers behave toward and treat each other. However, it must be remembered that the principal, who has greater power, must initiate and establish good and strong relationships with his/her teachers because they are partners in their students’ and schools’ success. This study aimed to explore emotionality in teacher-to-principal and teacher-to-teacher relationships and where this could serve as a baseline in formulating educational management policy and developing programs that would restore broken relationships between and among principals and teachers. This study developed a "four-quadrant chart" on the political and professional geographies of principals and teachers, comprising good and bad behaviors that affected their feelings and consequently affected their relationships and their work performance (Please see Figure 1). The findings were all based on the personal accounts of the participating teachers.

![Figure 1. Four Quadrant-Chart](image)

*Quadrant 1* (upper right quadrant) shows the positive behaviors in the political geography in teacher-to-principal and teacher-to-teacher relationships, and *quadrant IV* (lower right quadrant) shows the positive behavior in the professional
geography in teacher-to-principal and teacher-to-teacher relationships. Proceeding toward the right, positive behaviors in these quadrants influenced teachers’ work motivation.

**Quadrant I. Caring and Uplifting**

This quadrant describes positive behaviors in the political geography of the principal-teacher relationship, including an open-minded, friendly, accommodating, respectful, kind, and supportive principal. On being open-minded, a teacher articulated: “Our principal listens to you when a distance.” (R8). A teacher also expressed the accommodating behavior of their principal: “She allows teachers to go directly to her office if they have problems and concerns. Actually, you can approach him wherever you see him to mention your problem.” (R12). On being supportive and kind, a teacher related: “She personally extended financial support when I was hospitalized.” (R20). Another one said: “She tells teachers with schooling children to check on their children’s schedule so that a teacher’s load and schedule could be adjusted. Even when it is not always possible, she sends signals that problems have solutions.” (R22).

Meanwhile, almost all teachers expressed happiness in their relationships with their colleagues (or fellow teachers). As one teacher articulated: “Teachers here are very welcoming and supportive to new teachers, and respectful too. They treated me like their family, especially when I first arrived here. The senior teachers mentor the new teachers.” (R14).

These behaviors demonstrated by the principals and teachers in their political relationship describe a behavior that is caring and uplifting. As described by the teachers, the principal does not take advantage of her position. Instead, reach out to teachers.

**Quadrant IV. Rising and Lifting Together**

This quadrant described the positive behavior in the professional geography in principal-to-teacher and teacher-to-teacher relationships. As the principal exhibits and demonstrates fairness and support, a positive relationship is established between the principal and teachers. Being supportive and fair, one teacher expressed: “She guides new teachers on how to prepare instructional materials and on how to improve their work. He encourages everyone to help each other, to collaborate so that everyone can improve.” (R20). Another one said: “There are some instances that you could see his looks annoyed and frustrated. That is when he sees things that are not properly done. He is strict, especially when it comes to compliance with the work he assigned, but explains that it is all for the school’s sake and everyone’s because he wants us to excel, give pride and honor to the school, and with that, he will give you the support you need.” (R14). The principal also exhibits an appreciation for teachers’ accomplishments. As one teacher articulated: “He is appreciative. He recognizes the efforts of every teacher, even for a very simple accomplishment. You can really feel that you are important, that you are a part of the organization” (R8).

When teachers were asked what they felt about the behavior exhibited by the principal and their colleagues, all participants responded positively, like: “Of course I am happy, feel good and excited to come to work.” (R8). Another one expressed: “I feel valued. Inspired. I can feel serenity.”

Demonstrating good behavior in schools’ political and professional geographies promotes positive relationships that make teachers experience positive emotions, leading them to work enthusiastically and be inspired to innovate. As related: “Emotion is important in interactions and relationships. If teachers feel that one who is in the lead has a heart toward teachers, teachers become good followers. A good principal can also influence good relationships among teachers so that no matter how hard and tiring the work is, teachers are willing to follow because they want to follow because they love work. They are willing to take risks because they want to impress their good principal.” (R12).

**Quadrant II (upper left quadrant) shows negative behaviors in the political geography in teacher-to-principal and teacher-to-teacher relationships, and quadrant III (lower left quadrant) shows negative behaviors in the professional geography in teacher-to-principal and teacher-to-teacher relationships. These quadrants describe how negative behaviors can lead to poor performance of the teachers. As a result of the interviews, the study revealed both good or positive and bad or negative behaviors in the political and professional geographies of teacher-to-principal and teacher-to-teacher relationships. Positive behaviors, such as compassion, support, fairness, and teamwork, were seen in the positive quadrants (Quadrants I and IV), which resulted in positive feelings, job satisfaction, and enthusiastic work engagement. Negative behaviors such as mistreatment, favoritism, and unsupportiveness seen in Quadrants II and III caused teachers’ performance to suffer.

**Quadrant II. Demoralizing**

This quadrant describes the bad behaviors in the political geography of school principals and teachers. This part of the chart describes a principal being close-minded, mistreating (e.g., yelling, shouting, embarrassing, humiliating the teachers), invisible, unfair, unapproachable, and unreasonably strict. Most of the teachers expressed that they are uncomfortable with the mistreatment of their principal towards many teachers. One teacher lamented: “I always feel anxious and afraid. I am afraid of seeing and approaching the principal because I see many teachers being yelled at and shouted at by her, even for a simple mistake” (R3). Another related: “She confronts teachers in front of others, especially
during professional meetings. She humiliates and insults teachers. Our interaction with her during professional meetings is always a bad experience. She also plays very strong favoritism.” (R6). Another teacher talked about the close-minded and unreasonably strict behavior of the principal.

The teacher narrated: “She does not listen to the views of others. Instead, she lambasts suggestions by teachers. She is very authoritative, rejecting work repeatedly, not even considering that the teachers took it hard to do the work. She keeps rejecting works that are products of hard labor but does not suggest anything on how to improve the work.” (R10). On being invisible, another teacher described the principal: “She stays in her office. You cannot see her going around the campus to check situations. If she comes out of her office, it is a disaster because she comes out only to confront people and yell at them. Since she loves staying in her office, she delegates and channels all work to the department heads.” (R4).

In their interaction with their colleagues, a few teachers expressed dismay over their colleagues, who became disrespectful and felt advantaged over other teachers. One teacher mentioned: “Some of our colleagues have changed. They are no longer collaborating with us. They became selfish and refused to share their materials with us. It is because they are running after a promotion. They do not let someone pass ahead of them. They are like leeches clinging to the principal, even acting spies for the principal, and slandering their fellow teachers to the principal.” (R13). These behaviors lower teachers’ or even principal’s morale.

**Quadrant III. Dragging and Pulling Apart**

This quadrant describes the negative behaviors in the professional geography of principals and teachers. There is no collaboration between the principal and the teachers. Instead of putting teachers close together, the principal is unfair to the teachers, giving favors only to those who are his/her favorites. One teacher articulated: “Only people she wants to be promoted are given a chance for professional development. The principal helps their favorites gather papers and meet requirements for promotion. Promotion is based on influence, not on qualification and true performance.” (R7)

The unsupportive behavior of the principal prevents teachers from growing professionally. Teachers are not given equal opportunities for professional development. One of the teachers mentioned: “She only tells teachers to attend training and seminars but never extends financial support. We spend money from our own pockets, so our fellow teachers who are financially hard up have no chance for professional development at all. I understand that expenses for seminars and training should be shouldered by the school, or at least a part of the expenses if the school cannot afford to pay all the expenses. If there are seminars conducted for free, they will send their favorites to attend.” (R13) The principal’s unfair and unsupportive behavior creates professional distance between teachers because teachers become jealous of those favored by the principal. Favorized teachers become uncooperative and selfish. As a teacher related: “Before, teachers in our department were very supportive of each other. We were happy to share our instructional materials, teaching strategies, and ideas. However, they have become selfish and are not collaborating with us anymore. They become disrespectful and even disdain some of our colleagues.” (R25)

These behaviors exhibited by principals and some teachers in their professional relationships drag and pull them apart.

The political and professional distance between and among principal and teachers in school are widened by the bad behaviors demonstrated by principals and some teachers. These behaviors caused teachers to experience negative emotions that made them lose their taste of work- working only because of fear of the principal, not because of their love of work.

When teachers were asked how important emotion is in the relationship between principals and teachers and between teachers, their responses were of the same tune. A teacher said: “Emotion gives motivation. If you feel that the one in the lead has a heart, listens and talks with a heart, looks towards teachers’ needs, collaborates with the teachers with a heart, and feels what teachers feel, you can work efficiently. You cannot feel tired at work because you work with passion, because you like to follow and obey the principal, and you like to give honor to the school. No matter how difficult tasks are, you are still happy because you are satisfied with the principal.” (R4). Another teacher expressed: “I agree that there should be compassion on the part of the principal. He/she should not treat teachers merely as workers. We are not machines- giving us assignments and tasks today and a deadline the next day. We feel so stressed. We have to bring home schoolwork because the principal demands immediate compliance, so we cannot perform our duties to our families anymore. The worst is that this way of treating teachers makes them sick. One of my colleagues had a heart attack because of stress and was rushed to the hospital. He was comatose and unluckily did not survive.” (R22)

Negative behaviors of principals and some teachers greatly affect teachers’ emotions. Teachers’ experiences of exasperation affect not only their work but also their well-being.
**Quantitative Results**

Table 2 shows that there are areas of strength and need improvement in the teacher-to-principal relationships with regard to political geography. The three (3) highest mean ratings indicate positive aspects. These include *my principal supervising the distribution of teaching assignments/ load per department* (2.79), providing enough time for teachers' submission of reports (2.75), resolving issues arising between teachers and parents, and being upright in doing transactions with his/her teachers, students, parents, and stakeholders (2.71) with verbal interpretations of "most of the time."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>W.X.</th>
<th>V.I.</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>My principal supervises the distribution of the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Teaching assignment/ load per department</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Advisory classes</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Club advisership</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Construction of periodical tests</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>My principal trusts my judgment in making classroom decisions.</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>My principal is very accommodating to everyone.</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>My principal treats me like his/her family member.</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>My principal provides good and comfortable working areas for teachers.</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>My principal listens to the ideas and suggestions of his/her teachers.</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>My principal treats teachers equally.</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>My principal gives rewards and recognition to teachers who work beyond expectations.</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>My principal communicates his/her expectations clearly to his/her teachers.</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>My principal resolves issues arising between teachers and parents.</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>My principal works with teachers or their representatives to formulate policies and procedures.</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>My principal provides enough time for teachers to submit reports.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>My principal listens to the problems and concerns of his/her teachers.</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>My principal is upright in doing transactions with his/her teachers, students, parents, and stakeholders.</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>My principal pays attention to teachers' efforts for school improvement.</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Weighted Mean**

2.66 MT

On the other hand, the three (3) lowest mean ratings are associated with areas where there is room for improvement in the principal-to-teacher relationships in political geography. These include *my principal supervising the distribution of club advisership* (2.59) and *treating me like his/her family member* (2.57) with the same verbal interpretation of "most of the time."

The last item is that *my principal supervises the distribution of construction of periodical tests* (2.49) with a verbal interpretation of "sometimes."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>W.X.</th>
<th>V.I.</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>My colleagues are very accommodating.</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>My colleagues treat me like a family member.</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>My colleagues resolve conflicts at appropriate times and places.</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>My colleagues follow the majority's decision.</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>My colleagues provide constructive criticisms concerning my teaching and other related tasks assigned to me.</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>My colleagues listen to the ideas and suggestions from me and others.</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>My colleagues provide advice to newcomers regarding effective strategies in classroom management.</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Weighted Mean**

3.10 MT

Table 3 shows positive interactions among teachers regarding political geography, with all items rated “most of the time.” The highest mean rating is for the item *my colleagues treat me like a family member* (3.15), followed by *my colleagues are very accommodating* (3.13), follow the decision of the majority (3.11), listen to the ideas and suggestions from me and others (3.11), resolve conflicts in appropriate time and place (3.04), and provide constructive criticisms concerning my teaching and other related tasks assigned to me (3.04).
It can be observed in Table 4 that the three (3) highest mean ratings are associated with the positive aspects of principal-to-teacher relationships regarding professional geography. These include my principal being upright in dealing with his/her teachers, students, and parents (2.71), listening to teachers’ ideas and suggestions regarding teaching and learning (2.70), and providing appropriate training for faculty development (2.70). These responses indicate that, on average, teachers perceive their principals as exhibiting these positive behaviors most of the time.

On the other hand, the three (3) lowest mean ratings are associated with areas where there is room for improvement in the principal-to-teacher relationships in professional geography. These include confidentially discussing with me issues pertaining to my teaching work, as well as complaints from students and parents (2.59), supporting me in improving my instructional skills and abilities (2.58) with the same verbal interpretation of “most of the time.” The last item is that my principal provides opportunities to improve teachers’ skills and knowledge related to classroom management and instruction (2.61), with a verbal interpretation of “sometimes.”

It can be observed in Table 5 that the three (3) highest mean ratings are associated with positive teacher-to-teacher relationships. These include my colleagues deal with each other respectfully (3.11), my colleagues support me in my work-related problem (3.13), and my colleagues deal with each other respectfully (3.11). These items received the highest mean ratings, indicating strong positive relationships among teachers.

Based on Table 5, it is evident that teachers’ interactions with their colleagues regarding professional geography receive high mean ratings. It can be seen that the highest mean ratings are associated with positive teacher-to-teacher relationships.

These include the items my colleagues deal with each other professionally (3.13), my colleagues support me in my work-related problem (3.13), my colleagues deal with each other respectfully (3.11), my colleagues each other in looking for innovations that help improve their teachings (3.10), my colleagues listen to other’s ideas and suggestions pertaining to instructional skills (3.09), my colleagues criticize my works and teaching positively (3.05), and my colleagues offer mentoring to new teachers (3.05) with the same verbal interpretations of “most of the time.”
As shown in Table 6, the computed Pearson correlation coefficient is $r(222) = .517$, $p < .001$, indicating a moderate positive correlation between interactions with the principal and interactions with colleagues in terms of political geography. The correlation coefficient suggests that as the level of interaction with the principal increases, the level of interaction with colleagues also tends to increase. These results imply that teachers with positive and supportive relationships with their principals are also more likely to have positive interactions with their colleagues in their political geography. It suggests a collaborative and cooperative school environment where ideas are shared, conflicts are resolved, and decisions are made collectively.

As shown in Table 7, the computed Pearson correlation coefficient ($r$) is $r(222) = .539$, $p < .001$, indicating a moderate positive correlation between interactions with the principal and interactions with colleagues in terms of professional geography. The correlation coefficient suggests that as the level of interaction with the principal increases, the level of interaction with colleagues also tends to increase. This finding implies that teachers who maintain positive and supportive relationships with their principals are also more likely to have positive interactions with their colleagues in their professional geography. This indicates a conducive and collaborative work environment in which teachers and their principals support one another and can extend to interactions with colleagues.

**Discussion**

**Political Geography – Interaction with Principal**

Based on the result of quantitative data, a noteworthy strength is highlighted in the principal's supervision of the distribution of teaching assignments/load per department. Other positive aspects are the provision of ample time for teachers to submit reports and positive conflict resolution. This indicates a positive perception among teachers regarding the fairness and effectiveness of this aspect of leadership.

Some literature supports these findings. According to Nyamugoro et al. (2023), effective supervision of teaching assignments and load distribution can contribute to a fair and equitable workload distribution among teachers, positively impacting their job satisfaction and well-being. Also, providing sufficient time for teachers to submit reports allows for quality preparation and reduces stress levels, positively influencing their job performance (Kelchtermans et al., 2011). Principals' involvement in resolving issues between teachers and parents fosters a supportive and collaborative school climate, improving overall communication and relationships within the school community (Morris-Rothschild & Brassard, 2006). School leaders' behaviors can affect the morale of employees' job satisfaction and ultimately influence the effectiveness of the teaching and learning environment (Smith Waller, 2016). Moreover, principals who are accommodating to everyone create an inclusive and supportive work environment that promotes teacher well-being and job satisfaction (Day et al., 2016).

This quantitative data confirms the qualitative data gathered from interviews and coded as Quadrant I – Caring and Uplifting, positive behaviors in the political geography of teacher-to-principal relationships - i.e., the principal being open-minded, fair, friendly, accommodating, respectful, kind, and supportive are evident within this quarter.

These behaviors demonstrated by the principals to the teachers describe a behavior that is caring and uplifting. As described by the teachers, the principal does not take advantage of her position. Instead, reach out to teachers.

However, Quadrant II – Demoralizing, as a result of interviews, describes the negative behaviors in the political geography in teacher-to-principal relationships coded as demoralizing. This quadrant describes the bad behaviors of school principals and teachers in political geography. This part of the chart describes a principal being close-minded, mistreating (e.g., yelling, shouting, embarrassing, humiliating the teachers), invisible, unfair, unapproachable, and unreasonably strict. Most of the teachers expressed that they are uncomfortable with the mistreatment of their principal towards many teachers.
Political Geography – Interaction with Colleagues

The findings in quantitative data underscore a positive and supportive atmosphere among teachers in the political geography context, contributing to a conducive working environment that values mutual respect, effective communication, and collaboration in decision-making and conflict resolution. This confirms the results of interviews that almost all teachers expressed happiness in their relationships with their colleagues (or fellow teachers). One teacher articulated: “Teachers here are very welcoming and supportive to new teachers, and respectful too. They treated me like their family, especially when I first arrived here. The senior teachers mentor the new teachers.” (R14). Literature also supports this result, as Datnow and Park (2018) said, that colleagues who follow the majority’s decisions and listen to each other’s ideas and suggestions promote a culture of collaboration and shared decision-making.

However, a few teachers expressed dismay over their colleagues, who became disrespectful and felt advantaged over other teachers. Some of their colleagues have changed and are no longer collaborating. They became selfish and refused to share their materials. It is because they are running after a promotion. They do not let someone pass ahead of them. They even act as spies for the principal and slander their fellow teachers to the principal. These behaviors lower teachers’ or even principal’s morale.

Professional Geography – Interaction with Principal

The quantitative results unveil insights into teacher-to-principal relationships in professional geography, identifying strengths and areas for improvement. The highest mean ratings highlight positive aspects, including principals’ ethical dealings, openness to teacher input, and effective faculty development training. Conversely, lower mean ratings suggest opportunities for enhancement, such as fostering confidential communication, providing consistent instructional support, and offering guidance in preparing classroom activities. These findings imply the need for policies promoting confidential dialogue, structured support programs, and encouragement for regular guidance to strengthen professional relationships in these dimensions.

Tyler (2016) said that effective communication and confidentiality in discussing teaching-related issues contribute to a trusting and supportive environment. When principals confidentially discuss teaching works and address complaints, it fosters open dialogue and problem-solving. This supports the importance of the aspect related to confidentiality in the provided table. Puruwita et al. (2022) concluded that school administrators’ instructional leadership practices are high in defining school goals, managing instructional programs, and promoting positive school climate dimensions.

The quantitative data confirms and contradicts the result of interviews conducted by the researcher, coded as Quadrant IV – Rising and Lifting Together, which described the positive behavior in the professional geography in teacher-to-principal relationships.

As the principal exhibits and demonstrates fairness and support, a positive relationship is established between the principal and teachers. Being supportive and fair, “principal guides new teachers on how to prepare instructional materials and on how to improve their work. She encourages everyone to help each other, to collaborate so that everyone can improve” (R20). The principal also exhibits an appreciation for teachers’ accomplishments. One teacher articulated: “He recognizes the efforts of every teacher, even for a very simple accomplishment, so you can feel that you are important” (R8).

However, Quadrant III – Dragging and Pulling Apart, coded by the researcher, shows the negative behaviors in the professional geography of principals and teachers. There is no collaboration between the principal and the teachers. Instead of putting teachers close together, the principal is unfair to the teachers, giving favors only to those who are his/her favorites. Only people the principal wants to be promoted are given a chance for professional development. The unsupportive behavior of the principal prevents teachers from growing professionally. Teachers are not given equal opportunities for professional development.

Professional Geography – Interaction with Colleagues

The quantitative results reflect positive teacher-to-teacher interactions in professional geography, characterized by professionalism, support in problem-solving, respectful dealings, collaborative innovation-seeking, active listening, constructive criticisms, and mentorship for new teachers.

Some literature indicates that positive teacher-to-teacher relationships are built on professionalism and respectful interactions. When colleagues demonstrate professionalism by upholding ethical standards, maintaining a positive work environment, and treating each other respectfully, it fosters a supportive and collaborative culture (Bryk & Schneider, 2002). Teacher collaboration is associated with professional growth and instructional improvement. Collaborative efforts among colleagues in seeking innovative teaching practices and sharing ideas contribute to professional development and the enhancement of teaching effectiveness (Muijs & Harris, 2007).

Moreover, colleagues providing constructive feedback and mentoring support contribute to professional growth and instructional development. Constructive criticism and mentoring programs for new teachers create opportunities for reflection, improvement, and the sharing of expertise (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011).
However, based on the interview results, the principal’s unfair and unsupportive behavior creates professional distance between teachers because teachers start to become envious of those favored by the principal. Favored teachers become uncooperative and selfish. These behaviors exhibited by principals and some teachers in their professional relationships drag and pull them apart.

**Pearson r – Political Geography**

The results highlight the importance of fostering positive and collaborative relationships among teachers and between teachers and principals in political geography. When teachers have a supportive network of colleagues and engage in positive interactions with them, it can enhance their overall professional experiences and contribute to a positive school culture. Furthermore, positive interactions with the principal in matters related to political geography can promote effective decision-making, coordination, and alignment within the school.

Overall, the results suggest the significance of cultivating positive interpersonal dynamics, collaboration, and communication among teachers and between teachers and principals in the context of political geography. This can contribute to a positive school climate, effective decision-making processes, and, ultimately, improved educational outcomes.

Some literature supported the results. Daly et al. (2010) studied the relationship between school leadership, teacher collaboration, and teacher-learning communities. It highlights the positive impact of collaborative relationships between teachers and leaders on teacher collaboration and professional growth. Such collaboration is crucial in navigating policy contexts, including political geography.

**Pearson r – Professional Geography**

This finding implies that teachers who maintain positive and supportive relationships with their principals are also more likely to have positive interactions with their colleagues in their professional geography. This indicates a conducive and collaborative work environment in which teachers and their principals support one another and can extend to interactions with colleagues.

These results emphasize the significance of cultivating positive and collaborative relationships between teachers and principals and among teachers. When teachers have a supportive network of colleagues and engage in positive interactions with them, it can enhance their overall professional experiences and contribute to a positive school culture. Furthermore, positive interactions with the principal can promote a sense of trust, open communication, and mutual understanding, which are crucial for effective leadership and a healthy work environment.

Overall, the findings suggest the significance of fostering positive interpersonal dynamics and collaboration among teachers and between teachers and principals, as it can contribute to a more supportive and productive educational environment.

Some literature supported the results above. Huang et al. (2020) found a positive relationship between principal support and teacher collaboration. When principals actively supported and encouraged collaboration among teachers, it resulted in positive interactions and improved student achievement.

**Proposed Educational Management Policy and Programs**

Based on the findings, the researcher formulated an emotion-centered educational management policy that aims to acknowledge and address the emotions in assessing the needs and program development related to teacher-to-principal and teacher-to-teacher interactions. By incorporating emotional understanding, empathy, and supportive practices, this policy aims to create a positive and inclusive school environment that promotes healthy relationships and enhances overall educational outcomes. This policy includes (1) emotional understanding, (2) needs assessment, (3) program development, (4) supportive practices, (5) collaborative decision-making, and (6) continuous evaluation and improvement.

Moreover, the developed programs suggested by the researcher are based on the formulated policy that aims to enhance interactions between teachers and principals and among teachers by considering emotions within the educational setting. These programs are based on the policy guidelines formulated by the researcher to promote a positive and emotionally aware school culture. By addressing the emotional dynamics within teacher-to-principal and teacher-to-teacher relationships, these programs seek to create a supportive and collaborative environment that fosters effective communication, empathy, and mutual respect.

**Conclusion**

In summary, the study highlights the critical role of emotional geographies, specifically in political and professional contexts, in shaping the overall school environment. Positive behaviors exhibited by principals and teachers contribute to a caring and uplifting atmosphere, fostering collaboration and support. Conversely, negative behaviors lead to demoralization, hindering performance and cooperation. Teacher-to-principal relationships reveal both positive aspects,
such as supervision and respect, and negative aspects, including mistreatment and a lack of openness, impacting teacher morale. Positive teacher-to-teacher relationships in both political and professional geographies are marked by camaraderie and support, but negative behaviors disrupt this harmony. The findings emphasize the interconnectedness of positive relationships among colleagues and their influence on interactions with principals. The proposed emotion-centered educational management policy and programs aim to address and enhance emotional dynamics, recognizing their crucial role in fostering positive educational environments. Overall, the study effectively achieves its aims by delineating the intricate emotional landscapes within teacher-to-principal and teacher-to-teacher relationships and proposing strategies for improvement.

Recommendations

Further and in-depth analysis of this study may be conducted by future researchers by comparing the emotions in teacher-to-teacher and teacher-to-principal interactions when grouped according to demographic profile.

Further research should be conducted to test the effectiveness of the proposed emotion-centered educational management policy and programs developed. A relationship between political and professional geographies is recommended. The positive behaviors of principals and teachers in their political geographies can shorten the professional distance between and among themselves.

Limitations

While this study offers valuable insights into the emotions in teacher-to-principal and teacher-to-teacher interactions, several limitations are worth noting in the current study.

This study deliberately concentrated on exploring the political and professional geographies in teacher-to-principal and teacher-to-teacher interactions. However, it is crucial to recognize potential limitations that arise from this focused approach. There exists the possibility that other forms of emotional geographies, such as physical, sociocultural, or moral geographies, could offer valuable insights into the intricate dynamics of these relationships. The decision to narrow the investigation to political and professional geographies raises the concern that nuanced emotional dynamics inherent in these relationships might be overlooked.

Additionally, the study's design is delimited by the specificity of the chosen context—Public Junior High Schools in Quezon City, Philippines. While the findings provide valuable insights within this particular setting, their universal applicability to diverse educational environments or levels may be limited. Variations in cultural and institutional contexts across different settings could impact the generalizability of the study's results. As such, careful consideration is warranted when extrapolating these findings to broader educational landscapes.

Moreover, the study's cross-sectional design means that it captures a snapshot of teacher-to-principal and teacher-to-teacher relationships at a specific point in time. Longitudinal research could provide a more comprehensive understanding of how these relationships evolve over time. Finally, while the study formulates an educational management policy and program, it does not deeply investigate the challenges and barriers to implementing these in educational settings. Thus, the effectiveness of such policy and program interventions should be further explored. Future research should aim to address these limitations for a more comprehensive understanding of this important area.
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