IMPACT OF SOCIAL CONFLICT ON EMPLOYEES PERFORMANCE

Syeda Rizwana Hussain Tirmizi & Muhammad Yasir

Hazara University, Mansehra, Pakistan

ABSTRACT

The present study was conducted to see the impact of social conflict on the performance of the employees in the public sector's organization. For this purpose, three public sector universities were included in the population. Sixty respondents' i.e. administrative cadres and teaching staff were the sample of study. A questionnaire consisting twenty six items was developed to get the opinion of the respondents. The data were collected through personal visits in sampled universities. The data were analyzed by applying correlation and regression. The study concluded that status, power and ethnicity negative influence the individuals working in any organization being the important part of society. The conclusions of this study shows overall negative influences.

Keywords: *Social Status, Social Power, Social Ethnicity & Employees Performance*

INTRODUCTION

Social conflict is an important and crucial variable that has very strong relationship with the performance of employees yet there is an insignificant work in Pakistan and there is a huge gap, which needs to be completed up by the present and future researches related to the current topic. Social conflict is said to be a struggle for agency or power in the society. It occurs when two or more actors oppose each other in social interaction, reciprocally exerting power in an effort to attain scarce or incompatible goals (Aronson, Wilson & Akert, 2005). It is a social relationship among its inhabitants, whereas the actions taken by the inhabitants to achieve their wills and goals are totally conscious and planned. They react against the opposed party whom they suppose to be are hurdles in the achievement of their goals.

The idea of social conflict was emerges from the conflict theory. There were two main approaches regarding conflict theory. One of the approaches was proposed by Karl Marx and the other was proposed by Max Weber. The social psychology literature suggest that good communication, helping, information sharing and other forms of cooperation are found to be more common under interdependent tasks instead of under individualistic one (Johnson & Johnson, 1989). Performance is considered to be a function of ability and motivation and motivation is thus a mean to reduce gap between employee actual and desired state. Every member of group has different reasons for working in organization. We all work because we obtain something that we need from work. Something obtained from work effects morale, employee motivation, skills, experiences and the quality of

life. To develop positive employee motivation, behave employees as if they matter, because employees matter.

Motivation is employee's intrinsic enthusiasm about and drives to accomplish activities at work. Every employee has activities, events, people, skills, objectives and goals in his or her life that he or she finds motivating. So, motivation about some aspect of life exists in each person. This study purpose to investigate the impact of social conflict on employee performance. Now days, especially in the Pakistani perspective the element of conflict is so integrated in society that it is badly affecting the performance of employees in many aspects. At one side, it is increasing competition among different sets of society and on the other side it is also causing a disgusting situation in the society and in different organizations working in the society.

Research objectives
 Following were the objectives of the research:

- ➢ To examine the relationship of social status and employee performance.
- ➢ To investigate the relationship of power and employee performance.
- ➢ To identify the relationship of ethnicity and employee performance.

Research Hypotheses
The hypotheses of the study comprised as following:

H_1: There is positive relationship between social status and employee   performance.
H_2: The power of individual in an organization substantially influences negatively the Organizational performance.
H_3: There is negative impact of ethnicity on the employee performance.

LITERATURE REVIEW
In the social strike the main differences emerges over values or acquire a distinguish position to wield power and resources to achieve these limited goals even at the cost of eliminating their rivals (Coser, 1957). It is said to be a struggle for agency or power in the society. It occurs when two or more actors oppose each other in social interaction, reciprocally exerting power in an effort to attain scarce or incompatible goals (weber, 1976)**.** Aguinis (2009) described that the definition of performance does not include the results of an employee's behavior, but only the behaviors themselves. Perceived employee performance represents the general belief of the employee about his behavior and contributions in the success of organization. Employee performance may be taken in perspective of three factors which makes possible to perform better than others,

determinants of performance maybe like declarative knowledge, procedural knowledge and motivation (McCloy ,1994).

Social status

Social status may be related to the one aspect of the society. Social status is set of different classes. These classes can include variations in cultural, economic environment, educational background (Maguire, 2002). Different classes could play an important role in one's social status (Patfoort, 1995). When individual compete in the organization to achieve goals which is related to status, there are many cases where there is competition of status in society because of lack of resources (Kerbo, 1983)**.** Different groups were under pressure to sustain or proceed their social status (Sidaneus & Pratto, 1994). The position of power and respect at high level of authority entails greater autonomy no routine work and attractive pay packages etc. Such higher positions are of higher responsibility. Status conflict is an assessment of one's or group's "integrity" or "social values. Thus, the social system itself is not altered as people struggle for social status (Maiese, 2004).

The position of power and respect at higher level & authority entails greater autonomy no routine work and attractive pay packages etc. Such higher positions are of higher responsibility since it is the individual's duties having direct relation with the success of that organization (Roos & Reskin 1992). The motivation for a status conflict is related to position as a social resource rather than relational. People involve in position conflicts to maintain their positions regardless of the quality of their personal relationship with the other group (Glynn, 2000)**.** Benefits of position, including greater effects, credit for contributing more to the group than others, rewards such as information and assets that give to employees performance (Ridgeway & Correl, 2006), and more positive estimations than those with low position in groups (Berger, Rosenholtz & Zelditch 1980), it seems rational that individuals would compete for position and try to manipulate the social building of status relations (Zhou, 2005).

Social Power

The beliefs of upper-echelon of the society while holding an upper position (executive position) in the organization may substantially influence the organizational performance. Results suggested that social influence reproduce the beliefs of executives through interaction (Prithviraj, Glick & Huber, 1999). Weick (1976) has argued that structural complexity contributes to conflict either, through the deleterious effects of underlying professional or competitive differences across subunits or through the difficulties of coordinating autonomy-seeking faculty in complex enterprises. Drawing upon ideas from

the "differential vulnerability" thesis, which states that one's social circumstances can condition the impact of stressors.

Conversely, a less conventional view, which we label the intrusion on job status/rewards hypothesis, asserts that jobs with high autonomy, low routinization, and low noxiousness tend to indicate positions that confer greater rewards and status. Autonomous jobs allow individuals to make more decisions on their own, control the speed of their work, and have more freedom (Schwalbe, 1985). Schwalbe (1985) further asserts that, in many workplace cultures, having a job that is autonomous "is a badge of status, an indicator of a job's skill and responsibility demands, and, perhaps most important, a reward for reliable and competent performance". The performance of important duties, have greater impact on efficiency of organization (Kohn & Slomczynski, 1990). Members in such work levels may feel a particularly strong sense of promise and individuality with their work.

Social Ethnicity

There are negative differentials impacts of diversity ethnicity on conflict over time. Also, this relationship conflict negatively predicts overall performance of the group members individually but it is not related to the objective performance. This conflict may not influence the work as a whole but it causes dissatisfaction within a person who is suffering emotional conflict (Mohammad & Angell, 2004). Consistent with Lawrence's argument, is the observation that the communication frequency and social integration descriptions only belong in the case of negative performance and turnover causing from diversity. These descriptions can account for diversity impairing group performance and collective turnover by proposing that it reduces communication frequency and social integration, but they cannot account for positive performance resulting from diversity.

Secord & Backman (1974) advanced the idea that various educational levels may support such conflict when they reasoned that individual's capability annoyance and anger when working with those of lesser ability. This research paper discusses also about the impact of diversity on employee performance that varies according to scenarios. In social organizations it is also resumed that individuals minimize the state of uncertainty promote self-efficacy for asking this good and they divides their colleagues they creates groups as perceived different from the existing group (Tajfel 1974, 1981).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study was designed to examine the impact of social conflict on the employees' performance in the public sector organizations. Social status, social power and social ethnicity are facets of social conflict. Employee's performance can be measured through

interpersonal relations and employee motivation. Social conflict has been used as independent variable while employee performance was used as dependent variable. One hundred employees of public sector organizations of KP Pakistan including Hazara University, Peshawar University were the sample of the study. For the data collection, likert scale questionnaire was developed by combining the items of four questionnaires regarding social status, social power, social ethnicity and employee performance.

Measures

The intact items used a five point Likert scale through anchor from (1) =Strongly Disagree (SD), (2) =Disagree (D), (3) =Neutral (N), (4) =Agree (A), to (5) =Strongly Agree (SA), moreover, high variable scores signify high level of the construct into question. Social status developed by Cheng, Tracy & Henrich, (2010). Pride, personality, and the evolutionary foundations of human social status. Social power developed by Anderson, John & Keltner, (2012). The personal sense of power. Social ethnicity developed by Phinney. (1992), "The Multi- group ethnic identity measure; A new scale for use with diverse groups". Employee performance measures developed by "workplace group C", Fifth Judicial Department of Correctional Services.

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Table 1 The Distinctiveness of Sampling Respondents

Objects	Explanation	Computation	Percentage
Gender	Male	43	71.66
	Female	17	28.33
Age Groups (years)	18-25	09	15
	25-30	10	16.66
	30-35	22	36.666
	35-40	11	18.33
	40-45	05	8.333
	45-50	03	5
Employment Status	Permanent	49	81.666
	Contractual	11	18.333
Tenure	Up to 2 Year	10	16.666
	3-5 Years	12	20
	6-9 Years	25	41.666
	More than 10 year	13	21.666

Table – indicates that sample comprised of 72% male and 28% female respondents. Among these respondents 15% were with age 18-25 years, 17% with age 25-30 years, 37% with age 30-35 years, 18% with age 35-40 years,8% with age 40-45 years, and 5% with age 45-45 years. Furthermore, 82% of the respondents were with permanent status of employment while other 18% were working on contractual basis. The employment

tenure for 17% respondents was up to 2 years, for 20% respondents it was 3-5 years, for 42 % respondents it was 6-9 years, and for 22% respondents, the service tenure was more than 10 years.

Table 2 Regression Analysis of Social Conflict and Employee Performance

Predictors	B	Std.Error	Beta	t-values	p-values
Constant	15.303	5.112		2.994	.004
Social Status	-.004	.129	-.004	-.029	.977
Social Power	-.216	.098	-.279	-2.217	.032
Social Ethnicity	.184	.103	.227	1.789	.079
F= 2.402		R2= -.114		Adjusted R2= - .067	

Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Table 2 shows that social status as a factor of social conflict is not a significant contributor (p>0.05) for employee performance. On the other hand, the statistical values (B= -.0.216, P<0.05) indicate that social power as a factor of social conflict has a significant negative contribution for employee performance. While social ethnicity as a factor of social conflict is a significant positive contributor (B=0.184, p<0.05) for employee performance.

In regression table coefficients of social status and social power are negative where R2=-.114 and adjusted R2=.067 (p<0.05) and F=2.402 shows negative significant relationship with employee performance. Coefficient of social ethnicity is insignificant which shows no relationship with performance.

Table 3 Bivariate Correlation among the study Variables

	1	2	3	4
Social Status	1			
Social Power	-.021	1		
Social Ethnicity	.057	-.121	1	
Employee Performance	.003	.252	.193	1

Note: * Correlation is significant at level of 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 3 shows the correlation between SS, SP & SE. Correlation analysis revealed that SS had a significant negative relationship with EP(*R*=.003, *p*<0.05).SP had a significant negative relationship with EP (*R*=.252, *p*>0.05). SE had a insignificant relationship with EP(R=.057,p<0.05). It means that EP increases with decrease in SS & SP and there is no relationship between SE and EP. The bivariate correlations revealed in the correlation results shows overall negative relationship between variables.

The results signifies that social conflict(SS) and social power (SP) has significant negative effects on the Employee Performance (EP) of the employees working in the public sector universities of Pakistan generally and specifically in IIU, Islamabad, Hazara University, Mansehra, and AIOU, Islamabad. These results further imply that in literature social status had a positive impact but in results it shows negative impact on employee performance. So social status and social power has negative effects which decrease employee performance in the organization. But social ethnicity found no impact on the employee performance. So overall results shows social conflict has a negative impact on the employee performance.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This study integrates three facets of social conflict and investigate the impact of status, power and ethnic conflict on the performance of employees. The research shows that the factors under umbrella of social conflict such as status, power and ethnicity negatively influences the individuals working in any organization as they are also the part of society. The conflicts such as status, power and ethnicity are inevitable in the society since centuries and so as their effects in the organizations. This study helps to understand university management that how the social conflict and social powers lead to poor performance of its employees. And how the performance of university employees is being influenced by starve for status and power. It is recommended that the university's administration of the public sector universities may take remedial actions to minimize negative effect of the social status and social powers of the employees on their respective jobs.

For this purpose various strategies can be derived after understanding the real situation and to make sure that the employees' performance required substantial positive change by addressing these negative variables. This study was conducted to realize the character of social status, social power and social ethnicity on employee performance. Principally, it is restricted to a limited number of public owned universities in Pakistan, which one at a time may possibly limit the capability of this study to generalize its conclusion. The responses were cross-sectional in its character. It is reasonable to consider that situational issues on a given day and time can affect the responses of the employees. Subsequently, advance study may as well present different incentives to encourage the respondents. The future research studies may also pay attention on effect of social status, social power and social ethnicity which can improve employee performance.

References

Aguinis, H. (2009). Performance Management, *2ⁿᵈ edition, Person education, Inc., publishing as Prentice Hall*

Aronson, E., Wilson, T. D., & Akert, A. M. (2005). Social psychology, Upper Saddle River, NJ: *Prentice Hall*

Berger, J., Rosenholtz, S. J., & Zelditch, M. (1980). Status organizing processes. *Annual Review of Sociology,* 6, 479–508.

Coser, A. L. (1957). Social conflict and the theory of social change. *Journal of British Sociology*, 8, 197-207.

Gylenn, M. N. (2000). When cymbols become symbols: conflict over organizational identity within a symphony orchestra. *Organization science,* 11, 285_289.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1989). Cooperation and competition: Theory and research. *Edina, MN: Interaction.*

Kerbo, R. H. (1983). Social stratification and inequality: class conflict in the United States. *McGraw-Hill Higher Publications*, ISBN_13:9780070341760,

Kohn, M. L., & Slomczynski, K. M. (1990). With the collaboration of Carrie Schoenbach.Social Structure and Self-Direction: A Comparative Analysis of the United States and Poland. *Oxford: Blackwell.*

Maiese, M. (2004). Social status. Retrieved November 23, *2011* http://www. Beyondintra ctability.org/essay/social_status.

Maguire, M. (2002). Crime statistics: the data explosion and its implications. *Maguire Publications.*

McCloy, R. A. (1994). A confirmatory test of a model performance determinants. *Journal of Applied Psychology.* 79, 493-854.

Mohammed, S., & Angell, L. C. (2004). Surface and deep level diversity in workgroups: Examining the moderating effects of team orientation and team process on relationship conflict”, *Journal of Organizational Behavior.* 25, 1015 - 1039.

Patfoort, P. (1995). Uprooting violence, free port. ME: *Cobble smith Press.*

Prithviraj, C., Glick, W., Miller, C., & Huber, G. P. (1999). Determinants of Executive Beliefs:Comparing Functional Conditioning and Social Influence. *Journal of Strategic Management,* 20, 763-789.

Ridgeway, C. L., & Correll, S. J. (2006). Consensus and the creation of status beliefs. *Social Forces:* 85, 431-453.

Roos, P. A., & Reskin, T. (1970). Occupational Desegregation: Integration and Economic Equity*? Sociological Perspectives,* 35, 69-91.

Schwalbe, M. L. (1985). Autonomy in work and self-esteem. *Sociological Quarterly,* 26, 519-535.

Secord, P. F., & Backman, C. W. (1974). Social Psychology, New York: *McGraw-Hill.*

Sindanius. J., & Pratto, F. (1994). The dominance theory. *Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press*

Tajfel, H. (1981). Human groups and social categories: Studies in Social psychology. *Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.*

Tajfel, H. (1974). Intergroup behavior, social comparison and social change. *University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.*

Weber, M. (1976). The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism", trans. T. Parsons, 2nd ed., London: Allen and Unwin.

Weick, K. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 21, 1-18.

Zhou, X. G. (2005). The institutional logic of occupational prestige ranking: Reconceptualization and Reanalyses. *Journal of Sociology,* 111, 90-140.