
The Influence of Leader Power on Interpersonal Conflict in the Workplace

Rozilah Abdul Aziz, Shereen Noranee, Narehan Hassan, Rohaya Hussein,
Gouri A. Domnic Jacob

Faculty of Business and Management, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Puncak Alam, Selangor, MALAYSIA

Corresponding author email: rozilah@uitm.edu.my

Abstract - Interpersonal conflict partly depends on the magnitude of power exercised by superiors in the workplace. The need to investigate how manager's power affects subordinates' interpersonal conflict is crucial so that managers can change or maintain their power to achieve optimum results in organizations. Hence, the purpose of this study is to examine the influence of leader power towards interpersonal conflict at Government Linked Companies (GLCs), Malaysia. A total of 388 questionnaires were distributed to employees of GLCs, Malaysia. A Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) analysis revealed that twenty-two percent of the variation in interpersonal conflict can be explained by the power possessed by managers. It also revealed there is a strong positive, linear and significant relationship between leader power and interpersonal conflict. Therefore, management should be concerned with the authority given to managers as power could lead to a devastating interpersonal conflict.

Key Words: *Leader Power, Interpersonal Conflict, Workplace*

ARTICLE INFO

Received 30 March 2021

Received in revised form 1 May 2021

Accepted 15 June 2021

Published 22 June 2021

I. Introduction

Power is known as a key mechanism that influences decision and organizational outcomes in organizations. It is also believed to be one of the prime sources of workplace conflict that lies in the relationship between subordinates and supervisors (Bell, 2018) and proven as an energy to dominate conflict (Yeung, Fung and Chan 2020). In a complex and fast changing business environment, everyday Human Relations Managers are called upon and spend approximately 45% to 50% of their workday life dealing and resolving conflict or differences in priorities and preferences of employees working in organizations (Bell, 2018). In a more recent research, Ram (2019), revealed that Malaysian employees are overworked, and sleep deprived, with 51 per cent suffering from at least one dimension of conflict and further endorsed that 78% of employees at the workplace experiencing conflict to some degree and 22% facing it on a frequent basis. Avruch (2013) raised the issue of human needs

perspective in the *practice* of conflict resolution and Friedman (2019) further emphasized that human needs are necessarily organized in hierarchies, such that lower-ranked needs must be satisfied before higher-ranked needs can assert themselves to circumvent conflict.

Despite the numerous literature in organization studies confirming that organizational conflict is disastrous to an organization and should be avoided, modern scholars affirmed that conflict must not be eliminated, but should be reduced and managed effectively Jeong (2017). Previously, Richmond and McCroskey (2015) once reported that effective conflict management depended on the strategies used by leaders in organizations. This is supported by Kay and Skarlicki (2020) who argued that the way managers interact their power to subordinates has a significant implication and strong impact on the implementation of the strategies, policies, and decision-making in the organizations. According to Jabbar and Selvaratnam (2017) improving in the skill formation and raising the ability of individuals to be productive at work was an investment in human capital. Therefore, in managing conflict, a wise and reasonable choice of the conflict strategies were deemed important as the strategies taken would directly influence the relationship between group members and the performance of an individual (Yeung et al., 2010).

A key issue for managers now is in which fashion the conflict faced by the subordinates can be managed constructively in a way that it minimizes harm and maximizes benefit for the subordinates and the organization? The human relations view argues that conflict is a natural occurrence in all groups and, as such, it should be managed and not eliminated. The interactionist view proposes that conflict can be a positive force in a group and explicitly argues that some conflict is necessary for a group to perform effectively. Therefore, the power possessed and exercised by managers in the organization was deemed important because it has the ability to change or control the behavior, attitudes, opinions, objectives, needs and values of their subordinates to achieve optimum. Hence, the main objective of the study was to examine the extent of leader power (reward, coercive, expert, legitimate, and referent) explains interpersonal conflict (task and relationship conflict) among the employees of GLCs, Malaysia.

II. Literature Review

The earliest theorist, Dahl (1957), the concept of power is defined as A has power over B to the extent that A can get B to do something that B would not otherwise do. Erchul, Raven and Whichard (2001) define power “as the possibility of imposing one's will depend upon the behaviour of another person” (p. 323). The theories of power offered by Dahl (1957) and Erchul et al., (2001) are cited in this study because they provide an overview of power in organizations that documents the evolution of thought about the linkages between power and conflict. This approach of power is focused on identifying observable power in leadership behaviour that, in turn, involves conflict, which in this view conflict is assumed to be decisive in providing an experimental test of power attributions.

Even though several classifications of leader or supervisory power have been set forth, the bases of power taxonomy suggested by French and Raven (1968) include reward, coercive, legitimate, expert and referent was adapted in this study as it is still appears to be fairly representative and popular in application (Rahim, 2011). This study also adapted the bureaucratic model of conflict as the model focuses on the analysis of superior-subordinate conflicts along the vertical dimension of hierarchy that is conflicts among the parties to an authority relation (Rahim, 2011). Hence, this may lead to not only relatively predictable behavior which is rigid and largely immune to personal persuasion but also provide the potential for conflict as the organization must adapt to human incompatibility (Nash & Hann, 2020).

Interpersonal conflict can theoretically be represented in different ways across levels of analysis (Kay & Skarlicki 2020). It emphasizes the interactions of human factors in an organization setting (Bell, 2018). The theory of interpersonal conflict stems from past work of Guetzkow & Gyr (1954), Jehn (1995) and Amason (1997), who distinguished two forms of interpersonal conflict: relationship conflict (RC) and task conflict (TC). According to Freedman (2019) interpersonal conflict existed whenever superiors attempted to act against the subordinates' wants, desires, needs or preferences.

The Relationship between Leader Power and Interpersonal Conflict

Research examining power within organizations has predominantly focused on power at the individual level, including examining different sources of power and types of influence tactics (Adams, Zanzi, Charlotte, Anastasi, Andler, Bens, & Poulfelt, 2017). Bal, Arikan and Çalışkan (2016) claimed that besides other organizational outcomes such as job satisfaction, the end result of misusing power was conflict. It is supported by Coleman (2018) who affirmed that when each party wished to maintain or maximize the amount of influence or power upon

other members, conflict transpired. According to Koslowsky, Baharav, and Schwarzwald (2011) power strategies by the management and mediators helped to shape the desires and opinions of subordinates. Furthermore, London, Bear, Cushenbery and Sherman (2019) appealed that leaders strategized the use of power to shape the behaviours of their subordinates. In addition, London et al., (2019) also found that power has an association with conflict. This is supported by a study done by Coccia, (2019) found that the authority or power given to managers significantly influences conflict and shapes conflict as well.

In addition, Koslowsky, et al., (2011) highlighted that managers who used different kinds of power to gain compliance from subordinates and attempted to change the attitudes and behaviors of subordinates would end up in a conflict situation. This is supported by Coccia (2019) who also reported that the attempt to control and change the subordinates could lead to conflict because of the feeling of resistance among subordinates being controlled. Koslowsky et al., (2011) further affirmed that the use of power could determine conflict behaviour, affect the perception of behaviour and dictate the achievement and efficacy of dispute outcomes among people as the potential of misusing power to subordinates was greater. It is supported by Schaerer, Foulk, du Plessis, Tu, and Krishnan (2021) affirmed that in any situation in which more than one individual strived to have power over others, conflict was likely to transpire. When managers wished to maximize the amount of power upon other members, conflict transpired (Adams et al., 2017). Based on the discussions above, the following conceptual framework and hypotheses were developed to reflect the relationship between leader power and interpersonal conflict. Therefore, this study aimed to investigate the influence of leader power on interpersonal conflict at GLCs in Malaysia.

Research Framework




Fig.1: Model adapted from Lusch (1976)

The following hypothesis has been postulated

H1: There is a positive, liner, and significant relationship between leader power and interpersonal conflict.

III. Research Methodology

The study embarked on a quantitative approach to identify the correlations between leader power and interpersonal conflict. The purpose of using correlation research design was to measure the degree of relationship between variables and to what extent one variable explains another variable under study (Sekaran & Bougie, 2016).

In this study, the population was the employees working directly under Human Resource Manager (HR Manager) regardless of the positions held at the time the survey was conducted. Overall there were 708 employees selected from 985 GLCs in Malaysia. The choice of the subject is most appropriate and the researchers found that these employees were in the best position to provide the information required. The sampling frame was obtained from the Ministry of Finance, Putrajaya, Wilayah Persekutuan. Then, the process of selecting the respondents randomly was done using the random.org (Randomness and Integrity Services Ltd.) system. Only numbers generated from the random integer generator were selected and treated in the analysis process. The respondents were identified and were included in the data for analysis.

SEM requires sample size to be adequate as covariance and correlations are less stable when estimated from small sample sizes (Sekaran & Bougie, 2016)). A total sample of 400 and over is considered as undesirable because the methods become very sensitive and goodness-of-fit measures will indicate a poor fit (Hair, Black, Babin & Anderson, 2010). Since the population for GLCs in Malaysia is 708, the sample size needed is only 248 (Krjelic and Morgan, 1970). A simple random technique was applied so that every element in the population has a known and equal chance of being selected as a subject (Sekaran 2010). The research instruments in this study were adapted from Raven, Schwarzwald & Koslowsky, (1998) for Interpersonal Power Inventory (Cronbach Alpha ranging from 0.815-0.901) and Intragroup Conflict Scale (ICS) from Jehn (1995) and Organizational Conflict Scale (OCS) from Cox (1998 (Cronbach Alpha ranging from 0.924 -0.939). Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was conducted on the data and results met the basic assumptions of normality and linearity. The 6-point Likert scale was used ranging from strongly agree (1) to strongly agree (6) (Lissitz and Green, 1975).

A total of 400 questionnaires were self-administered to the respective HR Managers in GLCs. The HR Managers then distributed the questionnaires to the selected employees. Eventually, a total of 392 participants answered and returned the questionnaire, however, due to incomplete responses (excessive missing values = 1) and straight lining (no variation in the answers throughout the questionnaire = 3) 4 of the questionnaire were not used at all, leaving 388 usable questionnaires. As the minimal amount of sample size by Krejcie and Morgan (1970) was 248, a total of 388 were deemed usable for further analysis and it met the minimum requirement of 200 to 400 cases for a typical SEM analysis (Hair et al, 2010).

IV. DATA ANALYSES AND FINDINGS

The fit indices reported in this study were the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), GFI goodness-of-fit index, (CFI) for incremental fit index, and the Normed Chi-Square (NC) for model parsimony (Byrne, 2016; Hair et al., 2010; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). To indicate that the model is adequately fit, the cutoff values are 0.90 or higher for CFI and GFI (Byrne 2016; Hair et al., 2010), 0.08 or lower for RMSEA. The acceptable range for normed chi-square was 1 to 5 (Schumacker & Lomax, 2004). As illustrated in Table 1, the model fit criteria and acceptable fit interpretation based on Byrne (2016) and Kline and Boyd (2005).

Figure 2 shows a hypothesized structural equation model for Leader Power (each measured by five indicators: reward, coercive, legitimate, expert, and referent) and one endogenous interpersonal conflict (relationship conflict and task conflict). The hypothesized model of constructs achieved a comparatively acceptable fit as indicated by the goodness of fit indices. The chi-square/degrees of freedom ratio (CMIN/df ratio) was within the recommended level (<2.00), p-value (<0.05), GFI (0.911>0.90), CFI (0.978>0.90) and TLI (> 0.90>0.90), and RMSEA (0.36) value between 0.03 to 0.08. For the structural model, overall model Chi Square (χ^2) was 510.480 with 342 degrees of freedom, $p < 0.05$ and CMIN/DF=1.493. This indicates that the model fits the data well since CMIN/DF value was less than five. The RMSEA for the model was 0.036 indicating that the model fits the data well since the value of RMSEA is less than 0.08. These results indicate the model has a good fit and the model fit is acceptable. In summary, it has been empirically and theoretically examined that the best fit model has been achieved after the paths have been confirmed. The Structural Model has been accepted as the final model.




Figure 2: Hypothesized Structural Model (Standardized Estimates)

Figure 2 also depicts that the model explained a substantial portion of the variance in endogenous variables (squared multiple correlations). It indicates that the exogenous variables leader power (referent, coercive, legitimate, expert, and referent) explained 22 percent of the variance in interpersonal conflict (R-squared of 0.221). It also revealed that the F-statistics (510.480) and the corresponding p-value is highly significant (0.0001) or lower than the alpha value of 0.05. This indicates the slope of the estimated linear regression model is not equal to zero confirming that there is a strong positive, linear and significant relationship between leader power and

interpersonal conflict ($r=0.67$). This shows that the more power being exercised to subordinates, the higher the subordinates will experience interpersonal conflict.

Table 1 : Direct impact of the hypothesized structural model

Hypothesis	Relationship between leader power and interpersonal conflict	Std. Estimate	S.E.	C.R	p.value	Result
H1	Leader Power \rightarrow Interpersonal Conflict	1.947	0.346	5.620	0.000	Supported

Table 1 demonstrates that hypothesis H1 was supported i.e. leader power has a positive and direct impact on interpersonal development ($\beta=1.947$; $CR=5.62$; $p<0.05$). The result indicates a direct positive significant relationship between leader power and interpersonal conflict (coefficient 0.1947, $t=5.620$, $p=0.000$). The table also depicts that the CR of H1 is more than 1.96 for a regression weight, that the path is significant at the 0.05 level (that is, estimated path parameter is significant (Byrne, 2010).

V. Discussion

The finding suggests that leader power has a strong impact on interpersonal conflict. Correspondingly, the literature suggests that when managers wished to maximize the amount of power upon other members, conflict transpired (Kay & Skarlicki 2020). The result confirmed that power has a strong positive relationship with interpersonal conflict. This finding is supported by Coccia (2019) who found that power also has an association with conflict. According to Mili and Hashim (2020) in minimizing the agency conflict need a voluntary human capital disclosure in utilizing the power given by the authorities, increases the financial lucidity of a business, and hence, could satisfy employees' and other stakeholders' of the business

This result indicates that the more power imposed to subordinates, the higher the interpersonal conflict occurs. This is similar to the findings of Griffin and Moorhead (2011) who reported that conflict increased among subordinates when leaders inappropriately exerted more power on them. Griffin and Moorhead (2011) further explained that when leaders misuse their power, they developed strong feelings of distrust among subordinates. The results of distrust in several possible outcomes could lead to conflict (Rahim, 2011).

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to extend and support prior research by examining the influence of leader power on interpersonal conflict. The current study validates the notion forwarded by de Griffin and Coccia (2019) and Pierro (2012), indicating that power has a significant relationship with interpersonal conflict. For that matter, generally leaders depend upon power strategies to shape the behaviors of their subordinate (Meyer, Becker, & Vandenberghe, 2014) and their desires and opinions (Koslowsky, et al., 2011). The contents of the journal are peer-reviewed and archival. The Journal of International Business, Economics and Entrepreneurship publishes scholarly articles of archival value and critical reviews of classical subjects and topics of current interest.

VI. Implications of Study

This study has contributed several practical implications based on the research results, specifically in terms of human resource management practices in GLCs and other organizational contexts. The research model incorporated the boundary conditions under which the interpersonal conflict would be affected. The study provides empirical evidence to support the recent theoretical contributions about the importance of leader power on effectiveness of conflict. Understanding the role of leader will be useful to the practicing managers.

The study introduces the notion that power possessed by managers in the organizations play a critical and significant role in conflict. It serves a guideline for Human Resources Management of the organizations especially in changing the ideas and opinions of subordinates through different kinds of power. The reasons for its significance become clear when managers consider the consequences of failing to resolve conflicts. It would help managers to sense, mark, and deal with problems before they get out of control. When managers understand the cause of power-conflict in their organizations, they will at least, be equipped to take intelligent, educated, calculated risks with no probabilities attached to the success or failure of their supervisions and decision-making (Sekaran & Bougie, 2016)

The majority of research on conflict has often studied the effects of conflict towards job satisfaction, organizational outcomes, but was scarcely researched on what could influence the interpersonal conflict. Besides, this study has given some additional implication in terms of methodological aspects, particularly the source of

rating method and statistical using structural equation model (SEM). The current study findings provided a starting point for researchers to expand upon this association and develop a causal link between power and conflict beyond the limited scope of the current study at GLCs, Malaysia.

Further, researchers may also want to include trust and communication style as mediators to provide a richer understanding as to the actual reasons of interpersonal conflict among employees at the workplace. Future studies should also incorporate other predictors of interpersonal conflict because this behavioral outcome is attributed to many factors, not limited to leader power only. This study also analyzed the data based on the second order measurements of all the variables involved. Hence this study was not able to measure each and individual dimensions of the latent variables that could bring different results in adding new knowledge to the literature. Therefore, it is recommended to analyze the data by using a first order measurement that could possibly give better findings to the study.

References

- Abdul Jabbar, N., & Selvaratnam, D. P. (2017). Analysis of the determinants of education expenditures in Malaysia. *Journal of International Business, Economics and Entrepreneurship (JIBE)*, 2(1), 1-10.
- Adams, S., Zanzi, A., Charlotte, N., Anastasi, S., Andler, N., Bens, I., ... & Poulfelt, F. (2017). Literature on Management Consulting. *Management Consulting Today and Tomorrow: Perspectives and Advice from Leading Experts*, 437.
- Amason, A. C., & Sapienza, H. J. (1997). The effects of top management team size and interaction norms cognitive and affective conflict. *Journal of management*, 23(4), 495-516.
- Avruch, K. (2013). Basic human needs and the dilemma of power in conflict resolution. *Conflict Resolution and Human Needs*, 58-76.
- Bal, E. A., Arikan, S. Ç., & Çalışkan, S. C. (2016). Personality, values and career concerns as individual antecedents of workplace influence tactics. *Global Media Journal: Turkish Edition*, 7(13), 63-85.
- Bell, C. (2018). Power-sharing, conflict resolution, and women: A global reappraisal. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 24(1), 13-32.
- Byrne, B. (2016). "Structural equation modelling using amos." Basic concepts, applications, and programming.
- Coccia, M. (2019). The role of superpowers in conflict development and resolutions. *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance*, Springer Nature Switzerland AG, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5_3709-1.
- Coleman, P. T. (2018). Conflict intelligence and systemic wisdom: Meta-competencies for engaging conflict in a complex, dynamic world. *Negotiation Journal*, 34(1), 7-35.
- Cox, K. R. (1998). Spaces of dependence, spaces of engagement and the politics of scale, or: looking for local politics. *Political geography*, 17(1), 1-24.
- Dahl, R. A. (1957). "The concept of power." *Behavioral science* 2(3): 201-215.
- Erchul, W. P., B. H. Raven, S. M. Whichard (2001). "School psychologist and teacher perceptions of social power in consultation" *Journal of School Psychology* 39(6): 483-497.
- Freedman, B. D. (2019). Risk factors and causes of interpersonal conflict in nursing workplaces: Understandings from neuroscience. *Collegian*, 26(5), 594-604.
- French Jr, J. R. P. and B. H. Raven (1968). *The bases of social power in D.* Cartwright and A. Zander (Eds.) in *Group Dynamics*. New York, Harper and Row.
- French, J. R. P. and B. Raven, (2001). "The bases of social power." The negotiation sourcebook:
- Guetzkow, H. and J. Gyr (1954). "An analysis of conflict in decision-making groups." *Human relations*.
- Hair, J., B. Black, B. Babin, and R. Anderson, (2010). "Multivariate Data Analysis 7th Pearson Prentice Hall." Up. Saddle River NJ: 752-753.
- Jehn, K. A. (1995) "A multimethod examination of the benefits and detriments of intragroup conflict." *Administrative science quarterly*: 256-282.
- Jeong, H. W. (2017). *Peace and conflict studies: An introduction*. Taylor & Francis.
- Katz, N. H., Sosa, K. J., & Kovack, L. N. (2018). Ombuds and conflict resolution specialists: Navigating workplace challenges in higher education. *Journal of the International Ombudsman Association*, 14, 1.
- Kay, A. A., & Skarlicki, D. P. (2020). Cultivating a conflict-positive workplace: How mindfulness facilitates constructive conflict management. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 159, 8-20.
- Kline, M. A. and R. Boyd, (2020). "Population size predicts technological complexity in Oceania." *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences* 277(1693): 2559-2564, 2010.
- Koslowsky, M., H. Baharav, et al. (2011). "Management style as a mediator of the power distance-influence tactics relationship." *International Journal of Conflict Management* 22(3): 264-277.
-

- Krejcie, R. V. and D. W. Morgan, (1970). "Determining sample size for research activities." *Educ Psychol Meas*, 1970.
- Lissitz, R. W. and S. B. Green (1975). "Effect of the number of scale points on reliability: A Monte Carlo approach." *Journal of Applied Psychology* **60**(1): 10.
- London, M., Bear, J. B., Cushenbery, L., & Sherman, G. D. (2019). Leader support for gender equity: Understanding prosocial goal orientation, leadership motivation, and power sharing. *Human Resource Management Review*, 29(3), 418-427.
- Mili, S. A., & Hashim, F. (2020). Voluntary human capital disclosure and firm value relationship in the listed companies of Bangladesh: a conceptual overview. *Journal of International Business, Economics and Entrepreneurship*, 5(2), 39-45.
- Nash, D., & Hann, D. (2020). Strategic conflict management? A study of workplace dispute resolution in Wales. *ILR Review*, 73(2), 411-430.
- Ram (2019, November 15) Survey: Malaysia employees are Overworked, Sleep Deprived, Unhealthy. The New Straits Times, p.25.
- Rahim, M. A. (2011). *Managing conflict in organizations*, Transaction Publishers
- Raven, B. H., J. Schwarzwald, & M. H. Koslowsky, (1998). "Conceptualizing and Measuring a Power/Interaction Model of Interpersonal Influence1." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* **28**(4): 307-332.
- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2016). *Research methods for business: A skill building approach*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Schaerer, M., Foulk, T., du Plessis, C., Tu, M. H., & Krishnan, S. (2021). Just because you're powerless doesn't mean they aren't out to get you: Low power, paranoia, and aggression. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 165, 1-20.
- Schumacker, R. E. and R. G. Lomax (2004). "A beginner's guide to structural equation modelling," Psychology Press, 2004.
- Sekaran, U. *Research methods for business: A skill building approach*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc. (2010)
- Tabachnick, B. G. and L. S. Fidell (2007). *Experimental designs using ANOVA*, Thomson/Brooks/Cole, 2007.
- Yeung, D. Y., Fung, H. H., & Chan, D. K. S. (2020). Roles of age and future time perspective of the work relationship in conflict management: A daily diary study. *International Journal of Stress Management*.
-