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The Impact of Authority, Power, Trust and Conflict on Organizational Performance

Nadwa Badran

ABSTRACT

Myriad are the factors that can lead to either high or low organizational performance. Variables that have shown in literature to impact company performance include power, conflict, trust and authority. This study’s aim is twofold: 1) explore the relationships between power, conflict, trust and authority and organizational performance, and 2) detect whether these variables are interrelated. In order to achieve our research objectives, we pursued a quantitative data methodology where a structured questionnaire was distributed on a random sample of 213 managers and employees in diverse organizations in Lebanon between May and June 2022. The study used correlational and multiple regression tests in order to test the aforementioned relationships. Whilst authority, power and trust affect performance consecutively from the most effective to the least, conflict has surprisingly shown no effect. Therefore, further research is required to unveil the nature of the relationship between conflict and performance and its consequences in Lebanon.
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Chapter One

Introduction

In today's business world, the role of a manager is assertively a challenging one. S/he is the one responsible for getting people to work together and achieve organizational goals. When individuals with different backgrounds, opinions and characteristics work together, conflicts occur. Moreover, the current volatile business environments, recurring crises of various types (health, social, economic and political), and the increasingly competitive business ecosystems, all constitute difficult barriers for making decisions, achieving organizational goals and managing the workforce. To surpass the aforementioned barriers, resolve potential conflicts and effectively manage organizations and achieve their goals, managers and leaders alike have to equip themselves with a toolkit of well-organized authority and power that would assist in boosting organizations’ performance and productivity. Moreover, a positive work environment remains indispensable for a satisfying organizational performance. A positive work environment is defined as “a workplace environment where employees feel happy, at ease fulfilling their work duties, in their element, engaged, and motivated.” Such positive work environment should be provided to assure the wellbeing of employees, and guarantee that they meet their goals and responsibilities (Seppala & Cameron, 2015).

There exist various variables that could affect an organizational performance. These include, but are not limited to, organizational culture, leadership, conflict, and
work ethics (Ferine et al., 2021). Similarly, authority, power and their relationship to organizational performance have been mentioned in detail in various scholars’ studies (Ebhote, & Monday, 2015; Eze, & Umar, 2014; Aboudon, 2014; Hotepo et al., 2010). Although conflict, authority and power have been perceived as being negative in relation to organizational performance (Awan & Saeed, 2015; Mwangi & Ragui, 2013), some other scholars view it as an opportunity to create healthy competition among employees and hence foster group diversity and creativity (John-Eke & Akintokunbo, 2020). Therefore, research on the topic of organizational performance need to examine the nature of the relationships that lie between conflict, power and authority in a specified organizational context (Howard et al., 2007; Magee et al., 2007; Van Kleef et al., 2006; De Dreu, 1995; Mannix, 1994). One major gap in literature is the need to study the relationships amid authority; power and organizational performance amid organizational change of structures across diverse organizational cultures (Benoit-Barnë & Fox, 2017). Furthermore, with so little research being done on the nature of the relationship between powers and conflict, further research is required to investigate the effect of power, whether mediating or moderating, in managing conflicts within organizations (Coleman et al., 2013). In the country of Lebanon, scarce are the studies that have tackled the issue of power, authority and conflict in an organizational setting and their effect on performance in both the public and private sectors. Therefore, there is a dire need for such studies that could provide an insight into ways of handling authority, power and conflict in a high context culture.

1.1 Purpose and significance of the study

The present thesis aims at a) exploring the practical correlation between authority, power and conflict in an organizational context, b) examining the nature of
their relationships – whether positive or negative, and consequently c) understanding the consequences of each of the relationships as they are reflected in organizational growth and productivity. The results of this thesis are expected to be of great contributions to organizational performance in the context of Lebanon. In specific, the findings shall offer a framework to leaders, managers, policymakers and practitioners alike, for effective organizational performance in a country where business is a savior of a staggering economy and a devastatingly devalued currency.

1.2 Thesis structure

In chapter 2, existing literature on the topic is reviewed, the different variables of research are theoretically explored from which a conceptual model is built and hypotheses are derived. In chapter 3, the research hypotheses are then tested via a quantitative method (a structured questionnaire that is both valid and reliable). The questionnaire will be distributed on a sample of managers and employees in different units of a medium sized private hospital in Beirut and different institutions. In chapter 4, the findings of the survey will be sorted, filtered, and interpreted using various statistical methods including regression analyses and structural equation modelling. Finally, conclusions are drawn, implications and contributions of research are presented and recommendations are set for future research.
Chapter Two

Literature Review

Nowadays, organizations are operating in a dynamic, rapidly evolving and turbulent environment. They are seeking tools that might boost organizational performance, competitiveness, profitability and organizational effectiveness (Dodd, 2003). Therefore, responding and adapting to change is not an option but rather a must for the sustainability, growth, competitiveness, profitability and most importantly the performance of organizations (Rao, 2015).

2.1 Organizational Performance

Organizational performance is viewed as a process determined by the effort of the management to coordinate and direct employees while using the best managerial techniques in order to meet organizational strategic goals. This management process is ongoing and adaptable (Armstrong & Taylor, 2020). Additionally, organizational performance is the outcome of a series of consecutive procedures that entails acquiring the resources to sharpen the human capital’s knowledge, skills, and abilities (“KSA”) and utilizing managerial tools to enable employees to fulfill targeted outcomes (Al-Matari et al., 2014). Consequently, organizational performance is considered as the final outcome of the managerial actions of the firm and operational procedures (Bititci, 2011). According to Al-Matari et al. (2014), the heart of the organizational performance resides in its relation to workers, and clients’ satisfaction and fulfillment, worker productivity and the profits generated for the firm. In this regard, organizational performance depends on
its employee’s performance (Agwu, 2013). Therefore, and as the relationship between both employee and organizational performance is interlinked, employees should be well guided and motivated to improve their performance, increase their productivity, efficiency and effectiveness (Lazarus, 2014). Employee performance refers to the involvement of an employee towards the achievement of the organization’s objectives (Parmenter, 2015). Evaluating performance of an employee necessitates assigning him/her specific duties and objectives, in addition to encouraging him/her and sharpening his/her KSA’s through providing him/her valuable feedback (Williams, 2012). If workers’ efforts are well managed, this will result in better committed, engaged and productive workforce, aiming to improve organizational outcomes and building up competent talent (Ndulue & Ekechukwu, 2016). Moreover, in order to enhance and maximize employee performance, thoughtful actions should be performed by management to support the factors that will boost employee’s performance while avoiding factors that will negatively affect workers’ performance (Zafar et al., 2016).

As aforementioned, the human capital represents the most valuable asset in any corporation and is responsible through its performance for achieving the organization’s overall strategic goals and objectives. Individuals are complex and unique in nature. In addition to the human factor, several other variables might affect organizational performance. These include but are not limited to authority and power (Altaf, 2011). In fact, the main role of power and authority in organizations is to foster harmony and effective behavior towards achieving organizational goals. Nevertheless, dealing, interacting with, and managing individuals in organizations is considered a challenging endeavor that could lead to conflicts which could impact negatively or positively organizational performance (Tjosvold et al., 2014).
2.2 Authority

Authority is best known as “accepted power” or any other form of domination of individuals inside an organization. Authority is defined as “the formal right to take decisions and to impact employees’ behavior to apply those decisions according to organizational relationship” (Eze & Umar, 2014, p. 181). According to Lazarus (2014), organizations need a combination of power and authority to manage effectively the workers’ behaviors to implement decisions (Hubert Blalock, 1989). Hawley (1963) states that, “every social act is an exercise of power, every social relationship is a power equation, and every social group or system is an organization of power” (p. 422). Perhaps one of the most influential authors who wrote about authority till the present is the German sociologist Max Weber. In his writings in sociology, Weber referred to authority as a mode of structuring human relationships in a setting where interaction and coordination between employees and departments is essential for achieving the organization’s goals and objectives (Weber, 2009). In this regard, Weber (1969), classifies authority into three major types. These are traditional, charismatic and legal or rational authority.

2.2.1 Traditional Authority

Authority as a term encompasses different forms and is highly dependent on the acceptance or willingness of the followers. Based on the studies of Weber (1922), the first type of authority is the “traditional” one which stems from cultural or norms respected in a certain authority. In this sense, the leader is dominant by a pre-established custom or tradition and his/her dominance is unquestionable or should not be questioned by the followers. The followers would follow or obey their leader because this has been always the norm. Examples extend from royal regimes, hereditary monarchies and any other similar empire or civilization.
2.2.2 Charismatic Authority

Charisma has always constituted a debate in terms of its effect whether positive or negative. Authority that stems from charisma is powerful and it is mostly driven by inspiration, admiration or fascination by a leader who possesses extraordinary qualities or unusual personal abilities. Max Weber stressed both importance and dilemma of succession while studying charismatic authority. Interestingly, during his studies, Weber as well figured out that charisma alone is not enough for authority to persist. It rather requires a transformation to more legitimate form of authority such as the aforementioned traditional authority. This result has been also confirmed by Hoffmann (2009).

In today’s internet dependent businesses, charismatic authority emerge as a powerful tool. The social media users or followers are named by Weber (1978) a “charismatic community” who would follow their leaders/ influencers given the personalities of the latter and seeking a certain new “identity” (Cocker, & Cronin, 2017).

2.2.3 Legal/rational Authority

The third type of authority provided by Weber (1922; 1978) is one that relies on the obedience of a ruler or a leader by a certain formal rule or law, hence, the name “legal or rational”. As stated by Guzmán (2007), one major difference between this type of authority and the former two lies in the impersonal quality of this authority; it doesn’t rely on a certain person or persona but rather on a particular law or order.

It is worth mentioning that the Weberian types of authority should not be viewed as independent variables but rather interrelated ones, although one might show more dominance than the others (Petersson, 2017).
2.2.4 Authority and Organizational Performance

Historically, various research (Etzioni, 1959) asserted the relationship between authority and organizational performance in the sense that authority structures inside organizations are essential to achieve the organizational goals and objectives. As affirmed by the study of Bourgoin and Bencherki (2013), the relationships in a hierarchal organization between managers and their subordinates is usually mandated by an authority structure that not only regulates the relationship among a company’s workforce but also affects the outcomes of the organizations in terms of efficiency, effectiveness and thus performance. Furthermore, as per Griffin (2021), leaders and their subordinates are accountable for the outcomes of their decisions. Therefore, authority and accountability go hand in hand, in upward or downward position to contribute to achieving a company’s goals and objectives.

2.3 Power

Power is defined as “a capacity that A has to influence the behavior of B so B acts in accordance with A’s wishes” (Robbin et al., 2019, p. 412). According to the same authors, power emerges as an omnipotent instrument that leaders use to influence their subordinates and lead them to achieve organizational goals. Moreover, power refers to the aptitude of a manager to affect the conduct of employees based on informal correlation (Eze et al., 2014). Power can take many forms. It can be coercive as in exerting influence on followers using negative methods including physical and psychological threats, restrictions or even sanctions in case of noncompliance. In a nutshell, coercive power is control by force. In contrast, reward power attempts to drive subordinates towards achieving goals by offering desirable outcomes or benefits such as pay raise, promotions and recognition. Although, coercive and reward power at a glance seem to be total
opposites, they both drive employees to achieve the company’s goals. Other types of power include the legitimate type that is more applicable in formal organizations where the authority scheme is formal as well. In the case of such legitimate authority, obedience and compliance are bounded by a hierarchal concept; managers on top of the pyramid have more formal authority and therefore, should be obeyed and followed. Whilst coercive power is considered as the “harsh” type, legitimate power could be referred to as the “soft” one (Tyler et al., 2010). The last two types of power are more personal and include the expert and referent power. Robbins and Judge (2013) explain the expert power as “influence wielded as a result of expertise, special skill, or knowledge.” (p. 415). People who possess expertise in a particular domain are perceived by their colleagues and peers as more knowledgeable and, therefore, they tend to follow their advice, especially at the time of achieving goals and objectives. In this case power is a natural outcome of expertise. Finally, referent power is a power possessed by a person who has desirable traits or personality. They are often respected, liked and admired by their peers thanks to their attractive resources. In today’s social media dominated business world, referent power is more practiced than ever. Examples of this practice include the use of celebrities and influencers to market, sponsor, endorse or act as ambassadors of brands on social media (Craig & Douglas, 2006). Research clearly shows a relationship between power exerted in organizations and the latter’s performance (Lunenburg, 2012).

Based on the research by Faiz (2013), there exist no specific rules as what type of power should be used in companies. The choice of power highly depends on the type of organization (whether public or private), the type of work and many other variables.
The result of the influence of authority and power on workers’ behaviors can be either positive or negative on their performance, and consequently the organization’s performance will be impacted either negatively or positively (Awan & Saeed, 2015). The Relationship between authority and power is best described as close cousins in the sense that both are essential for managing human resources and achieving organizational objectives. Although similarities might exist between the two concepts, there lies a myriad of differences in the context of an organization’s behavior.

2.4 Conflict

The human capital is the organization’s greatest asset. Employees’ knowledge, skills, competencies and abilities, if well managed, will allow an organization to achieve its goals, cope with change and adversity and improve organizational performance (Rumawas, 2018). In an era of globalization, crises, uncertainty and unstable environments, organizations are equipping themselves with diverse workforces that would be able to face these challenges, survive and even grow. However, due to the variability of employees’ backgrounds and stakeholders’ different goals, conflict is omnipotent in organizations and most of the time inevitable (Obasan Kehinde, 2011; Messman et al., 2009; Gerami, 2009). In the process of directing and influencing workers, conflicts can occur. Thus, they are a part of an organization’s life and could derive from the scarcity of freedom, positions, resources, challenges (such as the lack of communication and leadership complications), as well as alterations in the personality, attitudes, feelings, needs and perceptions between and/or among the staff (Saranya & Latha, 2006).

Conflict is considered as a natural phenomenon in all life perspectives and is usually viewed as a disaccord in relation to opinions, perceptions, interests and ideas
(Esquivel & Kleiner, 1997). Workplace conflict is thus pervasive in most of the modern corporations and exhibits in numerous forms including rivalries, fights for power and favor, jealousy, personal conflicts or in more serious forms such as staff strikes and legal actions (Mughal & Khan, 2013). Consequently, many corporations have modified their strategies in order to manage and cope better with conflicts. Conflict is a constant state of life in any corporation due to the fact that individuals compete for work, resources, influence, acknowledgment, and security. Moreover, managing and coping with conflicts represents a major challenge to managers in organizations (Adomi & Anie, 2005).

Ferine et al. (2021) implies that conflict in the workplace has an adverse effect on both the communication process between employees and the overall organization’s performance. Furthermore, the same authors found that the negative effect of an unresolved conflict might impact employees’ performance. On a similar note, Henry (2009) states that conflict is not only negative to organizational performance but also in terms of loss of organizational resources. Contrary to common misconceptions regarding the necessity of suppressing or deleting conflict in organizations, if managed wisely and effectively, it may lead to organizational effectiveness (Rahim, 2017). De Reuver (2006) adds that “a constructive conflict handling by managers may aid the implementation of human resource policies” (p.19)

2.5 Power and Conflict

Power, just like conflict, has been found in research to be positive or negative depending on the situation where it is being exerted. To be specific, power for individuals is great. However, when detected in a team, it might be of huge negative influence. As implied by (Greer et al., 2017), power struggles constitute notable threats
between individuals in a team and therefore, create conflict. In other words, power that is practiced among teams where dominance of a certain member is clear or there is wide dispersion of power among the team itself, conflicts may occur that would have dire effects on the team’s performance outcomes. Of note, conflicts are usually caused in a team where resources are limited.

2.6 Trust

Studies that investigated the secret recipe of success of a company, whose performance is high and its stakeholders are satisfied, showed that these companies have one thing in common which is collective felt trust. Most importantly, trust doesn’t only affect performance but also affect the perception of the employees being trusted which boosts their sense of responsibility and consequently, their performance (Salamon & Robinson, 2008). In other studies, trust was shown to be predictive of employee loyalty and organizational commitment. Consequently, for organizations to thrive and have remarkable performance, leaders of organizations should create and sustain a culture of trust based on values, employee engagement in the company’s decision making and problem solving (Paliszkiewicz et al., 2014).

2.6 Hypothetical Model and Hypotheses
Based on the constructed theoretical model, the following hypotheses are proposed.

$H_1$: There is a positive relationship between authority and organizational performance.

$H_2$: There is a relationship between authority and power in organizations.

$H_3$: There is a positive relationship between power and organizational performance.

$H_4$: There is a negative relationship between conflict and organizational performance.

$H_5$: There is a relationship between power and conflict.

$H_6$: There is a positive relationship between Trust and Organizational Performance.
Chapter Three

Methodology

The present thesis aims at exploring the underlying relationships between conflict, power and authority and their respective relationship with organizational performance. The present causal study adopts a positivist paradigm by pursuing a deductive approach. In this regard, both secondary and primary data have been collected. In specific, the secondary data is derived from trusted sources in literature and primary data is accumulated via quantitative research methods. The aim is to confirm or reject the model’s hypotheses.

3.1 Research Instrument

In order to get primary quantitative data, a structured questionnaire was designed using Google Forms and distributed electronically due to various considerations, the most important of which, the current COVID-19 pandemic widespread in Lebanon during the time of the study. In addition, the questionnaire’s items were formulated based on existing literature on the topic in an attempt to test the conceptual model that was included at the end of chapter 2. Furthermore, the nature of variables and constructs was taken into consideration at the time of writing the questionnaire. The questionnaire consists of 44 items that measure the different independent and dependent variables of the study (see Appendix A). The first part of the questionnaire consists of demographic questions. These are age, gender, educational level, management level, department, and number of years of work experience. The second part encompasses various items that measure the variables of the study. These include the Organizational Performance as the dependent variable, in addition to Authority, Power and Conflict as the independent variables.

3.2 Participants and Locale of the study

As aforementioned, a 44-item structured questionnaire was constructed and presented to employees and managers in different companies across Lebanon including hospitals, schools, universities, food and beverage, and telecommunication
companies. The chosen sample is a random one which could lead to some degree of
generalization from a diverse body of participants. Due to the COVID-19
restrictions in Beirut during the time of the study, the questionnaire was distributed
electronically (via Google Forms email system). A total of 217 participants were
selected randomly for the study, which is considered an adequate sample size for the
intended analysis including a confirmatory factor analysis, and multiple regressions.

3.3 Construct Measurement

3.3.1 Organizational Performance

Items that measure the dependent variable (Organizational performance), are
adapted from Obiijiako (2019) and these include 10 items (see Table 1). The items
used to measure organizational performance such as profitability and customer
satisfaction are also used in the research of Rehman et. al (2019). These criteria were
also used in the work of Muhammad & Abdullah (2016) to measure the dependent
construct organizational performance. The 10 items were measured by using the 5
points Likert scale where 5 is strongly agree and 1 strongly disagree.

Table 1 - Items that measure Organizational Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My organization possesses tangible and intangible assets that have enhanced its profitability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There is a timely achievement of set goals by the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In my organization, new product development has improved over the last three years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. There is an increased level of successful and innovative products and services provided by my organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. There has been improved effectiveness in the organization’s operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. In my organization, there has been an increase in our customer base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. We have been able to meet and surpass our revenue target in the past two years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. There has been improved profitability over the past two or three years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My organization has increased its market share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The revenues of my organization have improved significantly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.2 Conflict

Various empirical research studies have investigated conflict, its types and their respective effects on organizational performance, effectiveness, and efficiency (Flink, 2015; Hotepo et al., 2010; Henry, 2009). Since conflict can be multidimensional, in this study we chose to focus on two types of intragroup conflict which were previously investigated by Jehn (1997). These are a) affective or relationship conflict which is the conflict related to relationships and emotions that might occur at the workplace, and b) the cognitive conflict which aims at exploring conflicts occurring as a result of disagreement between coworkers on issues or task related “differences of opinion.” The intragroup conflict variables are measured by adapting the conflict scale developed by Jehn (1995). The different types of the conflict construct were rated based on a 5 Likert scale where 1 is “none” and 5 is “a lot”. The same scale was also applied by Jehn et al. (1999) to measure relationship and task conflicts. As for the remaining dimensions related to “conflict intensity,” the scale was adopted from the study of Ayoko & Pekerti (2008) and was similarly measured on a 5 point Likert scale. The different items used to measure the “conflict” construct are listed in Table 2.

Table 2 - Items used to measure the construct "Conflict"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship conflict</td>
<td>1. How much tension is there among members in your work unit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. How much are personality conflicts evident in your work unit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. How much jealousy or rivalry is there among the members of your team?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. How often do people get angry while working in your team?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task conflict</td>
<td>1. To what extent are there differences of opinion in your team?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. How often do the members of your team disagree about how things should be done?

3. To what extent are the arguments in your team task-related?

4. How often do the members of your team disagree about which procedure should be used to do your work?

### Process Conflict

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The technology, required skills, and information needed by the team are constantly changing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>During a normal work week, exceptions frequently arise that require substantially different methods or procedures for the team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Frequent interaction between team members is needed to do our work effectively</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Task communication

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>My supervisor clearly explains policy changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>My supervisor lets me know what work needs to be done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>My supervisor discusses with me how to handle problems in my work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Conflict intensity

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>There are a lot of disagreements in my workgroup</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3.4 Trust

A further vital dimension that explores the role of trust has been adopted from the studies of Porter & Lilly (1996) and Jarvenpaa and Leidner’s (1999) trust scale and are equally measured on a 5 points Likert scale where 1 is “strongly disagree” and 5 is “Strongly agree”.

This relationship is studied using the following items (see Table 3 below).

#### Table 3 - Items used to measure the construct “Trust”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>1. If I were absent from a group meeting, I would be confident in the other group members' ability to make decisions without my involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. I could rely on those with who I worked on the team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Overall, team members are very trustworthy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.5 Authority

In this research, the construct “Authority” is measured using 5 items which were adapted from Kennedy & Keino (2017). The items were reduced to 5 phrases to fit into our study. These include a) “Delegating authority to make and amend rules enhances the performance of the company”, b) “Delegating authority to solve disputes positively affects the performance of the company”, c) “Being monitored by someone else apart from your boss affects performance”, d) “When agenda setting authority is delegated, it reduces organizational performance” and e) “Agenda setting authority should not be delegated since it is directly connected to performance” (see Table 3). The “Authority” items were then rated based on a 5 Likert scale where 1 is “Strongly disagree” and 5 is “Strongly agree”.

Table 4 - Items used to measure the Construct Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Authority | 1. Delegating authority to make and amend rules enhances the performance of the company.  
2. Delegating authority to solve disputes positively affects the performance of the company.  
3. Being monitored by someone else apart from your boss affects performance.  
4. When agenda setting authority is delegated, it reduces organizational performance.  
5. Agenda setting authority should not be delegated since it is directly connected to performance. |

3.3.5 Power

Several research studies attempted to measure the multidimensional construct of power. In this research, the Hinkin and Schriesheim’s (1989) power scales were relied upon to measure the different inter-correlated power types (Reward, Coercive, Legitimate, Expert and Referent). The “charismatic” Power was disregarded for contradictions in literature regarding its relation with organizational performance. For example, “my supervisor can increase my pay level” item was used to measure
the reward power, “my supervisor gives me undesirable job assignments to measure coercive power” and “my supervisor makes me feel that I have commitments to meet” to measure the legitimate power (see table 4). The items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale where 1 is “Strongly disagree” and 5 is “Strongly agree”.

Table 5 - Power construct measurement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reward Power</td>
<td>My supervisor can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. increase my pay level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. influence my getting a pay raise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. provide me with special benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. influence my getting a promotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercive Power</td>
<td>1. give me undesirable job assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. make my work difficult for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. make things unpleasant in the work environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. make being at work distasteful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate Power</td>
<td>1. make me feel that I have commitments to meet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert Power</td>
<td>1. give me good technical suggestions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. share with me his/her considerable experience and/or training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. provide me with sound job-related advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. provide me with needed technical knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referent Power</td>
<td>1. make me feel valued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. make me feel like he/she approves of me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. make me feel personally accepted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. make me feel important.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Reliability and Validity

To ensure that the measurement scales of the study variables are reliable and internally consistent, the items have to score a Cronbach Alpha Value that is equal or greater than 0.6 (Nunnally, 1978). The Cronbach Alpha has been widely used by research to test the internal consistency of the questionnaire’s items.

As Table 6 below shows, the items used to measure the Organizational Performance (coded as OP), are highly reliable scoring a Cronbach alpha value of 0.93. Similarly, the items measuring the independent variables (Power, conflict, Authority and Trust) have showed internal consistency as per the table below as well.
Table 6 - Reliability Analysis of the study's items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N of items</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter Four

Findings

In this study, we are trying to explore the relationships that exist between four different constructs, Power, Authority, Conflict and Trust and the independent variable “Organizational Performance.” For that purpose, analysis was conducted using SPSS, version 25, via a variety of analytical tools. First, we will start with describing the characteristics of the study’s sample (see Table 7 below).

Table 7 - Sample characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 40</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 15</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Level</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Level</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Level</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Total size</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of the 215 copies of the survey distributed, 213 were considered valid scoring a satisfactory response rate of %99. As per the sample characteristics table above, the study’s random sample consisted of 213 respondents, 113 of which were females and 100 were males. The majority of the respondents were between the ages
of 18 and 20 years and between 21 and 30 years old. As for education, 113 respondents have a postgraduate degree (Master’s) and very few (only 10 respondents) have a PhD degree. Most of the respondents (108 out of 213), work at a middle management level and only 33 of the sample are top managers.

4.1 Correlations

Next, correlational statistics were conducted to explore the relationships between the study’s variables. As Table 8 below shows, the Pearson correlation values were computed for the dependent variables of the study (Power, Trust, Authority and Conflict) in relation to the study’s main variable “Organizational Performance”. The Pearson correlation is known as an inferential statistic that is primarily used to detect whether significant relationships existent between two variables (Benesty et al., 2009). Therefore, it seems adequate to use this correlation to examine the study’s objectives and test the pre-formulated hypotheses.

Table 8 - Correlations between the study variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OP</th>
<th>Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Performance</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.335**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(OP)</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.335**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Performance</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.414**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(OP)</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the correlational statistics table above, the relationship between the two variables Power and Organizational Performance is significant. Likewise, the relationship between Trust and Organizational Performance and between Authority and Organizational Performance are also significant. Nevertheless, the Pearson correlation values for the construct “conflict” show no significance in terms of its relationship with the dependent variable “organizational performance”.

4.2 Regression

To further examine the effects of the study’s main independent variables on the dependent variable, the means of regression analysis have been applied. As per Draper & Smith (1998), the regression analysis is a statistical tool used to estimate
the effect of the independent variables on other dependent variable. A P-value of less than 0.05 was considered significant in this study.

Nevertheless, if we take a deeper look at the regression table (Table 9 below), the regression coefficient for the variables Authority and Power are both positive and significant indicating a positive relationship between Authority and Organizational Performance on one side and between Power and Organizational Performance on the other. Equally, the coefficients of Trust show a positive relationship. On the other hand, Conflict shows a negative relationship that is insignificant.

**Table 9 - Correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>OP</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OP</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>-.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>-.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>-.282</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sig. (1-tailed)</th>
<th>OP</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OP</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 indicates that the strongest correlation exists between Authority and Organizational Performance. As per Table 9 as well, Conflict shows no significant relation with Performance. Interestingly, we can see as well associations between the independent variable themselves. For example, the results showcase an association between Authority and Power. On the contrary, the authority appears to have no relation with either Trust or Conflict. Trust is linked to both Power and Conflict. Power is as well, as per the results, linked to Authority and Trust.
Table 10 - Multiple Regression Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Adjusted R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.81052</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>43.639</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.78728</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>4.277</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Authority
b. Predictors: (Constant), Authority, Power
c. Predictors: (Constant), Authority, Power, Conflict

It is noteworthy to mention that a multiple regression model has been used instead of a linear one so that we can detect the strength of the relationships occurring between variables. For instance, Table 11 below proves our model to be significant and valid with the exception of the conflict as a variable as it showed insignificance to the organizational performance.

Table 11 - ANOVA results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>28.668</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.668</td>
<td>43.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>138.614</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167.282</td>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>35.092</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.546</td>
<td>27.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>132.190</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167.282</td>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>37.743</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.581</td>
<td>20.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>129.539</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>.620</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167.282</td>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: OP
b. Predictors: (Constant), Authority
c. Predictors: (Constant), Authority, Power
d. Predictors: (Constant), Authority, Power, Conflict

4.3 Discussion
In an attempt to explore effective strategies to boost the performance of organizations, this study has investigated the relationships between conflict, authority, trust, power and organizational performance. Based on the findings of the study using Pearson correlation and multiple regression models, the following research model has been constructed.

*Table 12 - Final research model*

In line with the existing research on the role of authority delegation in strengthening the organization performance, our results are confirmatory. In the absence of authority, delegation can be a major obstacle to the improvement of organizational performance. Therefore, hypothesis 1 claiming a positive relationship between authority and organizational performance is confirmed. Various authors (Ilyas et al., 2020; Su et al., 2020; Guinot & Chiva, 2019) asserted the association, whether direct or indirect, between trust and performance of organizations. In this regard, our study has provided empirical evidence that trust
could promote an increase in organizational performance. Moreover, the regression results revealed some insights regarding the relationships between the independent variables. For instance, there exists an association between Authority and Power. This was confirmed various times in literature, and it seems logical that authority delegation and power are interrelated in many ways. It is even argued that authority per se is a kind of power such as “when authority is a supervisor’s power to initiate projects and direct subordinates to take certain actions” (Bolton & Dewatripont, 2013, p.343). This leads to the confirmation of hypothesis 3 regarding the relationship between authority and power. Trust has shown a relation with both power and conflict. This finding seems logical given that trust plays a crucial role in fostering a positive team behavior and thus leading to less conflicts (Elgoibar et al., 2016). Moreover, both trust and power, when combined, constitute a major force in organizational relationships (Bachmann, 2001).

Regarding the variable that has the strongest effect on organizational performance, the results demonstrate that Authority is the most potent. Myriad studies (Ahmed Iqbal et al., 2021; Dharejo et al., 2021) investigated authoritative leadership and the role of authority delegation and hinted to its positive effect on employee relations leading to better performance. Applying to the Lebanese context, authority, when applied fairly and correctly, could yield to a favorable organizational performance. Furthermore, authority, when delegated in a carefully planned method, can boost employee motivation, morale and self-confidence. Employees might even feel more valued as not just members of an organization, and therefore, increasing their sense of citizenship towards their organizations. The multiple regression model values have also shown that authority is followed by power as a highly influencing factor in organizational performance and thus confirming our third hypothesis which hypothesized a positive relationship between power and organizational performance.

Surprisingly and in contrast to studies on conflict and performance (Abugre, 2020; Flink, 2015; Longe, 2015; Henry, 2009) who found a positive effect of managing conflict on organizational performance, in our study, the degree of conflict management has an insignificant relationship with the Lebanese companies’ performance. Despite this finding, we can still assume that conflicts do exist in Lebanese companies however having an unimportant role in performance according to the study. Based on these results hypothesis 4 will be rejected.
Lastly, hypothesis 5 which assumes a relationship between power and conflict is rejected given that there was no significant relationship between both variables.
Chapter Five

Conclusions, Implications, Limitations and Recommendations

Organizational performance has always been a twofold topic; one that is of utter importance to companies’ survival, profitability, sustainability and growth, yet, one that is rather complex and debatable among researchers, academics and practitioners alike. The current research aimed at exploring different variables’ effect on organizational performance. Based on secondary sources of data, the most important factors are power, authority, trust, and conflict. Undoubtedly, in a specific organization, there is no one recipe of success. However, the effect of these variables has been assertive in literature. Additionally, these variables can be interrelated as our study discovered.

Once again, the findings of this study have enriched the already existing repertoire of organizational performance research and its associated factors. One major finding is the insignificant relationship that conflict management had with organizational performance in our study. Add to that, the significance of the study as a major contributor to the existing literature on the relationships between authority and power and the one between trust and conflict. These findings shall constitute a major step forward in exploring effective strategies in increasing the Lebanese companies’ performance at a time where the country is in dire economic, political and social quagmires. In this regard, a worthy to mention contribution of this research is that it provides insights into a surprisingly understudied topic in the Lebanese context.

The study was pursued during challenging times in Lebanon. The country is still witnessing the aftermath of one of the biggest explosions in history, the Beirut port blast, all while facing one of the hardest economic crises in history and still dealing with the repercussions of the COVID-19 pandemic. As a result, the Lebanese population’s morale, engagement, motivation and satisfaction suffered and deteriorated due to all the above-mentioned barriers facing the Lebanese companies’ organizational context.
Therefore, for better results, it is recommended to repeat this study post pandemic and other crises in an attempt to determine the effect of macro-environmental factors on organizational performance. One more limitation worth to mention is the time limitation, and sample size. Should the researcher have more time, the study would have collected a larger number of responses, from different sectors, in the aim of generalization. In addition to that, the cross-sectional nature of this research decreases the validity of the findings. In this sense, constructs like power, authority, trust and conflict are unstable and can change over time and consequently, the data needs to be collected more than once over a period of time to obtain more valid findings.

Based on the aforementioned limitations, the study could be replicated in non-governmental and charity organizations which would offer a different point of view and analysis of constructs such as power, authority, trust, and conflict. For a better apprehension of the effects of conflict on organizational performance, a similar study to ours but in different contexts, can be redone to understand conflict from more than one dimension. In third world countries like Lebanon, many variables could be of mediating effect. For example, culture might play an indispensable role in forming individuals’ values and beliefs, and therefore, it could shape the way they perceive and practice authority, power, trust, and conflict. Further research is recommended in that regard for a wider perspective. The Lebanese culture is highly complex to understand due to the variety of subcultures existing in the Lebanese society. These subcultures have a crucial role to play in shaping the existing Lebanese dominant culture. In the Lebanese context, the findings of the research demonstrated that the following variables: authority, which proved to be the most potent and had the most significant relationship with the dependent variable organizational performance, followed by power and trust had significant relationships with the dependent variable organizational performance. Surprisingly, the independent variable conflict had an insignificant relationship with a negative Pearson correlation value with the dependent variable organizational performance in
the Lebanese context. Conflict was perceived according to the questionnaire/survey distributed in this research to be a rather taboo and avoided subject to be discussed in the Lebanese society. Some participants didn’t want to respond and answer this survey. This could be explained by the general perspective of the Lebanese members of the society who negatively associate conflicts to organizational performance and perceive conflicts as a source of anarchy, inefficiency, waste of time, efforts, productivity and hence organizational performance which was demonstrated in the results of the research. Whereas, in Western cultures, organizational conflict is perceived differently due to cultural differences and perceptions of conflict which could be associated to a source of innovation, creativity, productivity, sharing of ideas, debates and discussions, business decision, empowerment, and allowing organizational members to have a voice, clearly and freely state their opinions according to the existing literature.

Trust, one of the independent variables, had a significant relationship with the dependent variable organizational performance. Trust is a core component in enhancing organizational performance. Human Resource Management’s role is to nourish, protect and incorporate trust in all its HR functions and strategic plans such as Recruitment and Selection, Performance Management, Compensation and Benefits, Employee Relations, Talents Management and Retention, Training and Development and so on… Trust fosters open communication, and healthy relationships between employees, staff and management, which will support conflict management techniques, and hence will result in a more sustainable, long term oriented and significant increase of organizational performance.

For HR managers, the study provides a solid framework where the foundation of trust and balanced blend of authority and power, can be adapted and tailored for the specific Lebanese organizations’ context. In other terms, HR managers’ role is to ensure that trust, which is a crucial and fundamental independent variable, if accompanied by a well delegated combination of authority and power can be essential for the improvement of the organizational performance, lead to better management of conflicts in organizations which will lead to more positive organizational outcomes in the future.

Lastly, the outcomes of this research have postulated the network of relationships of variables that might help Lebanese organizations apprehend how performance can be fostered forward in different settings. Although there might not
be a “one size fits all” approach to excellent organizational performance, the study has presented a framework, where the built of trust and balanced blend of authority and power, can be adapted and tailored for the specific Lebanese organizations’ context.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A: Informed Consent

Informed Consent

Thesis Title: Power and Conflict and Their Effect on Organizational Performance

I would like to invite you to participate in a research project by completing the following questionnaire/survey. (I am a student at the Lebanese American University and I am completing this thesis as part of my Master’s in Human Resource Management Requirements). The purpose of this questionnaire/survey aims to analyze how power and conflict may have an effect on organizational performance of companies in Lebanon.

There are no known risks, harms or discomforts associated with this study beyond those encountered in normal daily life. The information you provide will be used to enhance and improve the survey results. I will not directly benefit from participation in this study. The study will involve a total of 200 participants. Completing the survey will take 10 minutes of your time.

By continuing with the questionnaire, I agree with the following statements:

1. I have been given sufficient information about this research project.

2. I understand that my answers will not be released to anyone and my identity will remain anonymous. My name will not be written on the questionnaire nor be kept in any other records.

3. When the results of the study are reported, I will not be identified by name or any other information that could be used to infer my identity. Only researchers will have access to view any data collected during this research however data cannot be linked to me.

4. I understand that I may withdraw from this research any time I wish and that I have the right to skip any question I don’t want to answer.

5. I understand that my refusal to participate will not result in any penalty or loss of benefits to which I otherwise am entitled to.

6. I have been informed that the research abides by all commonly
acknowledged ethical codes and that the research project has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board at the Lebanese American University.

7. I understand that if I have any additional questions, I can ask the research team listed below.

8. I have read and understood all statements on this form.

9. I voluntarily agree to take part in this research project by completing the following survey/Questionnaire.

10. If you have any questions, you may contact:

Name (PI): Nadwa Badran
Phone number: +96171255425
Email address: nadwa.badran@lau.edu

If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this study, or you want to talk to someone outside the research, please contact the:
Institutional Review Board Office, Lebanese American University
3rd floor, Dorm A, Byblos Campus
Tel: 009611786 456 ext. (2546)
irb@lau.edu.lb

This study has been reviewed and approved by the LAU IRB. LAU.SOB.WT4.24/Jun/20
Appendix B: Questionnaire

Questionnaire
Please tick (✓) in the boxes provided for the most appropriate answers.

*Obligatoire
Informed Consent
Thesis Title: Power and Conflict and Their Effect on Organizational Performance

I would like to invite you to participate in a research project by completing the following questionnaire/survey. (I am a student at the Lebanese American University and I am completing this thesis as part of my Master's in Human Resource Management Requirements). The purpose of this questionnaire/survey aims to analyze how power and conflict may have an effect on organizational performance of companies in Lebanon.

There are no known risks, harms or discomforts associated with this study beyond those encountered in normal daily life.

The information you provide will be used to enhance and improve the survey results. I will not directly benefit from participation in this study. The study will involve a total of 200 participants. Completing the survey will take 10 minutes of your time.

By continuing with the questionnaire, I agree with the following statements:
1. I have been given sufficient information about this research project.
2. I understand that my answers will not be released to anyone and my identity will remain anonymous. My name will not be written on the questionnaire nor be kept in any other records.
3. When the results of the study are reported, I will not be identified by name or any other information that could be used to infer my identity. Only researchers will have access to view any data collected during this research however data cannot be linked to me.
4. I understand that I may withdraw from this research any time I wish and that I have the right to skip any question I don't want to answer.
5. I understand that my refusal to participate will not result in any penalty or loss of benefits to which I otherwise am entitled to.
6. I have been informed that the research abides by all commonly acknowledged ethical codes and that the research project has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board at the Lebanese American University.
7. I understand that if I have any additional questions, I can ask the research team listed below.
8. I have read and understood all statements on this form.
9. I voluntarily agree to take part in this research project by completing the following survey/questionnaire.

If you have any questions, you may contact:
Name (PI): Nadwa Badran
Phone number: +96171255425
Email address: nadwa.badran@lau.edu
L.A.U.

If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this study, or you want to talk to someone outside the research, please contact:
Institutional Review Board Office,
Lebanese American University
3rd Floor, Dorm A, Byblos Campus
Tel: 00961 1786456 ext. (2546)
irb@lau.edu.lb
This study has been reviewed and approved by the LAU IRB.
L.A.U.SOB.WT4.24/Jan/2022
I wish to participate, *
Une seule réponse possible.
Yes
Passer à la question 2
No
Passer à la section 9 (Participation Declined).
Part 1: Demographic section
2.
Gender
Une seule réponse possible.
Female
Male
3.
Age
Plusieurs réponses possibles.
18-20
21-30
31-40
Above 40
4.
Level of Education
Une seule réponse possible.
BA/BS
Masters/MBA
PhD
Autre :
5.
Working Experience
Une seule réponse possible.
Less than 1 year
1-5 years
6-10 years
11-15 years
Above 15 years
6.
Management level
Une seule réponse possible.
Top level
Middle level
working level
Autre :
Organization performance
To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your organization performance
7.
My organization possesses tangible and intangible assets that has enhanced its profitability
Une seule réponse possible.
Strongly Disagree
1
2
3
4
5
Strongly Agree
8.
There is a timely achievement of set goals by the organization
Une seule réponse possible.
Strongly Disagree
1
2
3
4
5
Strongly Agree
9.
In my organization, new product development has improved over the last three years
Une seule réponse possible.
Strongly Disagree
1
2
3
4
5
Strongly Agree
10.
There is an increased level of successful and innovative products and services provided by my organization
Une seule réponse possible.
Strongly Disagree
1
2
3
4
5
Strongly Agree
11.
There has been improved effectiveness in the organization's operations
Une seule réponse possible.
Strongly Disagree
1
2
3
4
5
Strongly Agree
12.
In my organization, there has been increase in our customer base
Une seule réponse possible.
Strongly Disagree
1
2
3
4
5
Strongly Agree
13. We have been able to meet and surpass our revenue target in the last two years
Une seule réponse possible.
Strongly Disagree
1
2
3
4
5
Strongly Agree
14. There has been improved profitability over the last two or three years
Une seule réponse possible.
Strongly Disagree
1
2
3
4
5
Strongly Agree
15. In my organization, there has been increased growth in market share
Une seule réponse possible.
Strongly Disagree
1
2
3
4
5
Strongly Agree
16. Our revenue has improved significantly in the last year
Une seule réponse possible.
Strongly Disagree
1
2
3
4
5
Strongly Agree
Authority
To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding Authority at your organization?
17. Delegating authority to make and amend rules enhances the performance of the company
Une seule réponse possible.
Strongly Disagree
1
2
3
4
5
Strongly Agree
18.
Delegating authority to solve disputes positively affects the performance of the company
Une seule réponse possible.
Strongly Disagree

1
2
3
4
5

Strongly Agree

19.
Being monitored by someone else apart from your boss affects performance,
Une seule réponse possible.
Strongly Disagree

1
2
3
4
5

Strongly Agree

20.
When agenda setting authority is delegated, it reduces organizational performance
Une seule réponse possible.
Strongly Disagree

1
2
3
4
5

Strongly Agree

21.
Agenda setting authority should not be delegated since it is directly connected to performance.
Une seule réponse possible.
Strongly Disagree

1
2
3
4
5

Strongly Agree

Trust in the workplace
To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding trust at your organization?

22.
If I were absent from a group meeting, I would be confident in the other group members’ ability to make decisions without my involvement *
Une seule réponse possible.
Strongly agree
Agree
Neutral
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

23.
I could rely on those with whom I worked on the team *

46
24. Overall, team members are very trustworthy. *
   Une seule réponse possible.
   Strongly agree
   Agree
   Neutral
   Disagree
   Strongly Disagree

25. My supervisor can increase my pay level *
   Une seule réponse possible.
   Strongly agree
   agree
   Neutral
   Disagree
   Strongly disagree

26. My supervisor can influence my getting a pay raise *
   Une seule réponse possible.
   Strongly agree
   agree
   Neutral
   Disagree
   Strongly disagree

27. My supervisor can provide me with special benefits *
   Une seule réponse possible.
   Strongly agree
   Agree
   Neutral
   Disagree
   Strongly disagree

28. My supervisor influences my getting a promotion *
   Une seule réponse possible.
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Neutral
   disagree
   Strongly disagree

29. My supervisor gives me undesirable job assignments *
   Une seule réponse possible.
   Strongly Agree
Agree
Neutral
disagree
Strongly disagree
30.
My supervisor makes my work difficult for me *
Une seule réponse possible.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neutral
disagree
Strongly disagree
31.
My supervisor makes things unpleasant in the work environment *
Une seule réponse possible.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neutral
disagree
Strongly disagree
32.
My supervisor makes being at work distasteful *
Une seule réponse possible.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neutral
disagree
Strongly disagree
33.
My supervisor makes me feel that I have commitments to meet *
Une seule réponse possible.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neutral
disagree
Strongly disagree
34.
My supervisor gives me good technical suggestions *
Une seule réponse possible.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neutral
disagree
Strongly disagree
35.
My supervisor shares with me his/her considerable experience and/or training *
Une seule réponse possible.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neutral
49

My supervisor provides me with sound job-related advice *
Une seule réponse possible.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neutral
disagree
Strongly disagree
37.
My supervisor provides me with needed technical knowledge *
Une seule réponse possible.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neutral
disagree
Strongly disagree
38.
My supervisor makes me feel valued *
Une seule réponse possible.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neutral
disagree
Strongly disagree
39.
My supervisor makes me feel like he/she approves of me *
Une seule réponse possible.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neutral
disagree
Strongly disagree
40.
My supervisor makes me feel personally accepted *
Une seule réponse possible.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neutral
disagree
Strongly disagree
41.
My supervisor makes me feel important *
Une seule réponse possible.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neutral
disagree
Strongly disagree
Conflict

Answer the following questions on a scale from 1 to 5, 1 being "none" and 5 being "a lot".

42. **How much tension is there among members in your work unit?** *

Une seule réponse possible.

None
1
2
3
4
5
A lot

43. **How much are personality conflicts evident in your work unit?** *

Une seule réponse possible.

None
1
2
3
4
5
A lot

44. **How much jealousy or rivalry is there among the members of your team?** *

Une seule réponse possible.

None
1
2
3
4
5
A lot

45. **How often do people get angry while working in your team?** *

Une seule réponse possible.

None
1
2
3
4
5
A lot

46. **To what extent are there differences of opinion in your team?** *

Une seule réponse possible.

None
1
2
3
4
5
A lot

47.
How often do the members of your team disagree about how things should be done? *
Use seule réponse possible.
None
1
2
3
4
5
A lot

48. To what extent are the arguments in your team task-related? *
Use seule réponse possible.
None
1
2
3
4
5
A lot

49. How often do the members of your team disagree about which procedure should be used to do your work? *
Use seule réponse possible.
None
1
2
3
4
5
A lot

50. The technology, required skills, and information needed by the team are constantly changing *
Use seule réponse possible.
None
1
2
3
4
5
A lot

51. During a normal work week, exceptions frequently arise that require substantially different methods or procedures for the team. *
Use seule réponse possible.
None
1
2
3
4
5
A lot

52. Frequent interaction between team members is needed to do our work effectively *
Une seule réponse possible.

None
1
2
3
4
5

A lot

Participation Accepted
Thank you for your valuable participation.

Participation Declined
You have chosen not to participate, you can click submit or simply close your browser.

Ce contenu n’est ni rédigé, ni cautionné par Google.

Google Forms