

Position Power Management and Workplace Harmony in the Construction Sector in Rivers State

Dr Patrick Nkiinebari Nwinyokpugi, Okere, Albert Eziuche

*Department of Office and Information Management Faculty of Management Sciences, Rivers State University,
Port Harcourt, Nigeria*

*Department of Office and Information Management Faculty of Management Sciences, Rivers State University,
Port Harcourt, Nigeria*

Corresponding Author: Dr Patrick Nkiinebari Nwinyokpugi

ABSTRACT: The study examined Position Power Management and Workplace Harmony in the Construction Sector in Rivers State. Primary data were collected using questionnaire administered on randomly selected workers of some construction firms in Rivers State. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data generated. Specifically, Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient and t - test were used to test the hypotheses of the study. The study revealed that Coercion, Delegation, Responsiveness and Consultation have no significant relationship with Strike frequency and Grievance. It also reveals that Leadership and Organizational culture have moderating effects on Workplace Harmony. The study further revealed that though coercion, delegation, responsiveness and consultation have no significant effect on strike frequency and grievances but it impacts positively on workplace harmony depending on their application. In the light of the findings of the study and the conclusions reached the study recommends that managers should adopt the most suitable leadership style that will guarantee the attainment of set objectives; the leadership and organizational culture should be properly entrenched to moderate actions and policies of the organization; managers should take into consideration the rights of the workers and give them a voice in the decision making process.

KEYWORDS: Position Power, Coercion, Consultation, Responsiveness, Delegation, WorkplaceHarmony

Date of Submission: 30-12-2018

Date of acceptance: 15-01-2019

I. INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Organizations are established with predetermined aims and objectives towards which efforts and resources are channelled to attain. The drivers of such organization are the key players – the managers and the subordinates, who constitute the workforce. The relationship between these human factors in the production chain determines the extent to which these aims and objectives are met. A harmonious work environment is critical to the success of an organization, especially the construction sector. Managers of both the private and public sectors are faced with the challenge of ensuring workers' satisfaction, commitment and loyalty, increasing productivity level and most importantly, sustaining harmony and mutual trust in the workplace. According to Elangovan, A. R. & Xie, J. L. (2000), harmonious workplace that guarantees satisfaction of workers' and employer's aspiration is essential for enhanced organisational productivity and growth". A disharmonious work environment presents itself in the form of disagreement or opposition to particular ideas, interests, persons or state of things and indicates a level of incompatibility in the society, organization or group. Organisation managers are its leaders and are expected to possess the ability to influence the action of others by exercising the power conferred on them by the position they occupy in the organisation. Employees follow the prompting and directive of their leaders or managers to carry out their jobs. Ng'ethe, Mike & Namusonge (2012), is of the view that "leaders use their influence to draw people towards achieving goals and to maximize results in the organization". Leaders attract loyalty and commitment from workers by the way they relate with them. Leadership also helps to stimulate, motivate, encourage, and recognize their followers in order to get key performance results, Gill, Flasher & Shacha (2006). Conversely bad leadership de-motivates and leads to grievances and strikes and other forms of industrial disharmony. It is observed that autocratic leadership breeds conflict atmosphere, Bankole (2000) and tends to discourage innovation and lowers employees' moral in the organization, Gordon (2013). The use of autocratic leadership style, has been revealed to lead to aggression, apathy and withdrawal from the workers, while a democratic leadership style promotes harmonious working relations between leaders and the employees, Damachi (1999); Fashoyin (1979). Any leadership style that is not amenable but confrontational can only lead to conflict and the defeat of organizational goals. The construction sector is replete with cases of frequent strike actions, shutdowns, demonstrations, and grievances arising from lay-offs and most often, outright sack of workers. Workers are frequently hired and fired especially considering that their tenure on the job is not formalized and fixed because projects usually have short time life span or is

often time bound. It will only take the use of the proper power management tools and established organizational power theories and processes to manage such very unstable situation. The volatility and instability of the construction sector in Nigeria challenges the competence of project managers on how to effectively apply their position powers to create a harmonious work environment. Most projects have been observed to have failed, been abandoned or are uncompleted not because of lack of finance, materials and workers but mainly due to the incompetence of the project managers.

Most managers lack the expertise required in managing the most critical asset of any organization – the workers. Where they are expected to stamp their feet to ensure directives are carried out, they display *laissez-faire* attitude and in cases they need collaboration through workers consultation and delegation, they apply coercion and fail. The proper management of position power in an organization, especially the construction sector, is very critical to project success. The leadership and organisational culture created by organisation managers could be people-centred or task-centred and have either negative or positive implications for the organisation. A harmonious work culture that tolerates diversity and strengthens workers capacity in job delivery, signals a leap towards meeting organisational goals. Most managers are found to be at a dilemma in managing power or in applying leadership tools in the organisation. When wrong management or leadership style is adopted and non-congenial work environment is created, workers react negatively and this can be in the form of strikes, grievances and conflicts. Some of the causes of conflicts in the construction industry outlined by Ohlendorf (2001) include difference in belief, orientation, demands, prospects, views, imagination and ego. Workers with diverse ideologies, skills, backgrounds, expertise, language, sex, culture etc., converge at a construction site and share ideas to complete a project. Management practice of exclusionism, neglect of power sharing mechanism which ensures partnership amongst stakeholders in the workplace and derogation of organizational communication pattern may breed disharmony in contemporary organizations, Iheriohanma (2007).

The leadership style adopted by a manager and the relationship which organisation members adopt, are moderated by the culture of the organisation which according to Schein (2004), stems from (1) the beliefs, values, and assumptions of founders of organizations; (2) the learning experiences of group members as their organization evolves; and (3) new beliefs, values, and assumptions brought in by new members and leaders. The manager, applying the power conferred on him by the position he occupies, adopts different leadership styles to manager these beliefs, values, assumptions, experiences etc., and tries to enhance the attainment of set objectives. Some managers adopt a charismatic leadership style; some are autocratic while some are democratic. Good leadership guarantees a peaceful, productive, fulfilling and endearing work environment while bad leadership is associated with employee stress, Offerman & Hellman (1996), retaliation, Townsend, Philips & Elkins (2000), and sense of helplessness and alienation, Ashforth (1997). One of the key factors militating against the timely and qualitative delivery of projects in the construction sector in Nigeria is poor leadership. The inability or rather incompetence of the managers have led to innumerable cases of abandoned projects and sometimes, poorly executed projects. Munns & Bjeimi (1996), observed that the success or failure of project management is highly dependent on the project leaders. An effective organisation leadership should be able to create a work environment or climate for strong cooperation, team spirit, high morale, conflict-free relationship with workers based on mutual trust. The success of a construction project therefore depends on several factors, one of which is the competencies of the project leaders, their personalities, characteristics, skills and leadership styles, amongst others, Ogunlana (2011). Every organisation needs harmony in the workplace which translates to a mutual synergy and positive partnership between the workers and their subordinates. The atmosphere for a harmonious relationship in the workplace is created by its leaders and overtime, this becomes the culture of the organization. The leader is therefore constrained to leverage on practical, effective and empirically proven organisational power processes and theories to effectively manage both the human and material components of the organisation profitably and efficiently. Coercion - Hinkin & Schriesheim (1990, 1994), defined coercive power as “supervisor exhibiting the behaviour of forcing compliance from subordinates through threat, confrontation and punitive behavior”. This perception influences their job satisfaction negatively. The use of coercion or coercive power in the workplace has been found by various studies, Burke & Wilcox (2001); Zamani et al. (2012); Nadaee et al. (2012); Richmond et al. (1986); Lee & Tui (2008), to have negative implications on workers job performance and job satisfaction. A study by Burke and Wilcox (1971), confirmed the above position and indicated that there was a negative relationship between job satisfaction and coercive power. Elangovan & Xie (2000), has gone further to indicate that the use of coercive power by the supervisors lowers employee’s satisfaction with the job, the commitment level and also increases the stress level. Coercion involves the use of threat of punishment or denial of rewards by one person (manager) against another (worker), in the bid to force the later to do as desired by the former, even if it is against the wish of the later. It therefore restricts the freedom of choice of the person and in most cases is wrong and a violation of one’s rights.

Podsakoff & Schriesheim (1985) agrees that coercive power negatively influences job satisfaction and generates slightest employee satisfaction. Zamani, Enayati, Palar & Jamkhaneh (2012), found that employees are

less committed and satisfied with their job when their managers use coercive power increasingly. Frequent usage of this power would yield negative feelings such as fear, discouragement, dissatisfaction, resentment and turnover among employees, Elangovan&Xie, (2000). Coercive power may be effective in influencing subordinates who endanger the organization or threatened the authority of the leader but will later lead to resentment, Raven (2008). Studies from Afza (2005), also showed that coercive power was negatively related to job satisfaction. The major essence of coercion is to enforce compliance and this may have greater negative implications than positive outcomes. French & Raven (1959), state that "other forms of power can also be used in coercive ways, such as when reward or expertise is withheld or referent power is used to threaten social exclusion". The use of coercion has also been characterized with punitive behaviours that may be beyond a worker's normal role of expectation. It has also been associated positively with generally punitive behaviour and negatively associated to contingent reward behavior, Gioia& Sims (1983). Coercion can only be effective when there is compliance from the target worker or subordinate. The use of coercion as a management tool could be problematic especially when the subordinates put up resistance. It may cause unhealthy behaviour and dissatisfaction in the workplace. Workers may be threatened with being fired or demoted and this may lead to resentment. This source of power, especially if abused, can demean the position of the manager and lower the commitment of the workers towards the organization. Kriesberg (1982), has opined that "Coercion involves trying to make the other side yield by reason of fear or actual force." It is therefore expected of effective managers to apply coercion in the workplace only when the need arises as "the best option of the moment" to get workers comply with management's decision especially during the introduction of a change process.

Delegation is a process that involves the assigning of certain aspects of a manager's job to the subordinates. The subordinates are empowered to take decisions hitherto taken by the manager. Accordingly, the subordinate is given the authority to make decisions without seeking prior approval from the manager but is allowed to exercise his discretion. Delegation has been considered an approach that improves job satisfaction, Agarwal & Hauswald, (2009). Delegation is seen as a complex process in which managers assigns new tasks, increase the load of responsibilities and attributes authority to their subordinates to act without any authorization, Yukl and Fu, 1999). Recent studies have revealed the important component of delegation especially as a predictor of job satisfaction in the workplace, Schriesheim, Neider, & Scandura (1998); Muindi (2011), as it has improved the speed and quality of decision making, reduced the manager's overloaded job schedule, enriched and motivated subordinate's job and has provided opportunities for the development of the subordinate's leadership skills, Bozkurt & Egeneli (2012); Bass (1990). Other similar studies carried out in organisations in the Western countries have revealed some other advantages or benefits of delegation: (1) Delegation satisfies managers' need for achievement and autonomy, thereby providing a stimulus for motivation and more entrepreneurial behavior, (2) Delegation reduces work overload of upper managers, (3) Delegation provides a training ground for the more complex strategic decisions that managers are likely to encounter in senior managerial positions, and (4) Delegation places decisions at levels where there may be greater expertise about particular issues than possessed by the supervisor, providing additional information processing benefits to the organization which may result in more efficient and better quality decisions, (Galbraith 1973; Ito & Peterson 1986). By delegation, the manager's job is made easier and his competence level is enriched by leveraging on the expertise of his subordinates for decisions in critical skill-related assignments. Literature has revealed that the interpersonal relationship between a superior (manager) and his subordinate (worker) develops over time within the context of formal organization, Graen& Cashman (1975), and the subordinates enjoy such relationship based on mutual contribution, loyalty, trust and liking, Graen&Uhl-Bien (1995); Pillai, et al. (1999). Both the superior and the subordinate work hard to sustain the relationship as it is mutually beneficial and rubs off positively on the performance of the organisation. Research results have also supported a positive outcome in the relationship between superiors and subordinates across cultures. Gerdtner& Day (1997); Scandura (1999); Wang et al. (2005). Deluga (1994); Graen&Uhl-Bien (1995), have observed that managers who delegate are likely to foster the formation of high quality relationship with their subordinates characterised by mutual trust, respect and loyalty; in turn subordinates experiencing trust and respect are likely to reciprocate by strengthening and encouraging the superior. Delegation also has the potential for achieving worker's job satisfaction, hence leading to improved service delivery, higher productivity and reduced labour turn over, Muindi (2011). There is an overwhelming significance of delegation to workers satisfaction and organisational performance. There is some level of dynamism in relationship between the superior, subordinate and the situation that engenders and sustains delegation in the workplace. Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1958), suggested a continuum or rather a mix of power positioning in the decision making process and authority delegation. At one end, it depicts an autocratic decision making status by the superior, and at the other end, the subordinate seems to enjoy a free rein of authority in decision making. The mid-point in the continuum shows areas of participation, cooperation and collaboration in decision making.

Responsiveness is likened to open-mindedness, receptiveness, tolerance and understanding. In the present day volatile economic and unpredictable work environment, managers are expected to create an

effective and result-oriented working relationship with their workers. As revealed by studies, a high level of employee involvement, recognition, respect and regard are what works in modern organisations. For this reason, Department of Trade and Industry (2002), has advised that managers should have the insight that individuals are more likely to give their best if they feel valued and are given opportunity to contribute their ideas. Workers must be understood and given a voice. Unfortunately, most managers insist on one particular leadership or management style without the ability “to adjust their leadership behaviours to match each individual’s needs rather than using the same pattern of leadership style with everyone”, Nicholls (2009). Another angle to examine the effect of a leader’s responsiveness to the workers is to look at how managers respond to workers requests and how workers react with a sense of equity or inequity and how this can lead to job satisfaction. There seems to be a convergence of the Social Exchange Theory, Blau (1964) and the Equity Theory, Adams (1965) to explain the impact of the leader’s responsiveness to employee requests (one situational variable) and equity sensitivity on work attitudes and behaviours (one individual difference variable). Social exchange theory helps us understand how employees feel and behave when employers respond positively to their requests. The exchange of benefits is what is called norm of reciprocity, Gouldner (1960); Rousseau (1989). It is expected that a positive working relationship is created when the manager responds favourably to the demands of the worker. Folger & Greenberg (1985) believes that it is likely that the manager’s response to their subordinate’s requests over time will affect employees’ sense of fairness and subsequent attitudes and behaviours. On the other hand, the denial of the worker’s request, may lead to a strained and negative relationship as the worker may be considering himself not valued by the manager or the organisation.

Consultation - Despite the introduction and deployment of hi-tech tools in modern management processes, the human element still occupies a central position and with the potentials to drive its activities to optimal performance. This can only be possible if management recognises the important role of the worker, involve him in the decision making process and make him an active participant in the work process. Participation has been defined by Heller, et al. (1998:15) as “a process which allows employees to exert some influence over their work and the conditions under which they work”, and alternatively as “a process in which influence on decision making is shared between hierarchical superiors and their subordinates”, Wagner & Gooding (1987). This implies recognition of the critical and significant position and role of the worker in the organisation. Involvement of the worker here covers consultation (seeking of opinion) to participation (playing active role in the execution). A number of reasons have been adduced, as revealed in literature, as the reasons for the recent interest by corporate and non-corporate organisations to adopt the worker consultative and participatory model in their operations. It is believed strongly that the need for organisations to infuse changes in their operations to meet increasing competition in the global market in the area of product quality and line, is one major reason for consultation, Markey & Monat (1997). Change in the work process induced by the introduction of new technologies, the quest for greater share of the market, the need to adapt to changes in the global market uncertainties through flexible operation strategies and the need to increase capacity, have been and are also factors that have influenced the adoption of the tool of consultation in the workplace. Again, organisations retain only the best hands with good brains. There are usually workers in the organisation with specialised knowledge that must be consulted for their expert input in decisions affecting certain areas of their operations. Hyman & Mason (1995); noted that firms have rapidly and simultaneously reduced their work forces and radically changed their skills profile while attempting to retain scarce highly skilled personnel. Consultation or worker participation and involvement can be by individual, collective, direct or indirect forms. The older systems of production that was mechanised and centred on a hierarchical organisational structure and emphasised mass production of goods and services, did not create room for consultation of workers. Employees had to work under stringent and stereotyped conditions with no input in decision making. This led to confrontations, grievances and strikes. Considering the negative effect of conflicts to organisational performance and profitability, modern managers have adopted strategies that will attract employee cooperation and commitment to organisational goals. Conflict reduction mechanisms are now put in place to enhance smooth transactions and efficient utilisation of organisation assets. Fair Work Act - Ombudsman (2009), states that consultation may take the form of: establishment of employer/employee (and employee representative) committees, regular staff meetings and communication with employees regular performance and training reviews, regular written communications such as newsletters, encouragement of employee feedback on business and administrative decisions. They went further to suggest that these practices may be implemented through administrative structures, company policies, enterprise agreements, or - where appropriate - may be set out in employees’ contracts of employment. Consultation is recommended where an employer has made a decision to introduce major changes in production, program, organisation, structure or technology that are likely to have significant effects on employees, or where the employer proposes to change an employee’s regular roster or ordinary hours of work. Regulation by governments, management disposition, workers expectations, demands by unions and market competition, has been identified as some of the factors that have made consultation in the workplace imperative. Ramsey (1997), has however noted that organisations may choose to inform and/or

consult with their employees for different reasons, ranging from a corporate belief that certain human resources practices will lead to better performance, because of union recognition and influence, or as an attempt to get employees to accept change during times of economic turbulence. As noted earlier, the desire by management to attain efficiency, make profits, be flexible and meet hard biting competition in both local and global markets, has made the consultation and involvement of workers inevitable. Employees should have a voice in decisions affecting their welfare and according to Towers (1997), “effective employee voice addresses the imbalance of power inherent in the employment relationship”. Managerial, strategic and tactical decisions should have a blend or mix of the opinions and positions of both management and the workers (represented by their union). Employee voice is a term which refers to the processes by which employees are able to contribute to or influence managerial decisions, either directly or indirectly through their representatives, Boxall & Purcell (2003). Most organisations allow workers to form and be members of unions which represent their interests and voice at different levels of employer-employee interface. Even where no unions exist, workers’ council, Gollan (2002); Dundon&Rollinson(2004), do represent the workers. Through established effective communication channels the workers or their representatives are heard. Organisations that consult and involve workers in their planning are seen to do better and build a more harmonious working relationship in the workplace and thus reduce potentials for strikes, confrontations, resistances and grievances. Engaging workers can lead to greater productivity, lower absenteeism level and workers exit from the organisation, reduced accident cases and boost in workers moral and overall organisational performance. It has been revealed also that consultation and worker participation have positive implications on workers attitude to work, improves relationships between employer and employee and motivates workers to work more towards the attainment of organisational goals. Management’s attitude towards the workers also become more favourably influenced, Marchington (2000), as they now see the positive side of the workers better arising from the newly struck synergy or partnership.

1.2 Research Objectives

The objective of the research is to investigate how the management of Position Power directly or indirectly affects workplace Harmony in the Construction sector in Rivers State, Nigeria.

1.3 Research Methodology and Data Analysis*Data Source: World Bank*

The secondary data analysis was carried out using the Spearman rank order correlation tool at a 95% confidence interval. Specifically, the tests cover hypotheses HO₁ to HO₁₀ which were bivariate and all stated in the null form. We have relied on the Spearman Rank (*rho*) statistics to undertake the analysis. The 0.05 significance level is adopted as criterion for the probability of either accepting the null hypotheses at ($p>0.05$) or rejecting the null hypotheses at ($p<0.05$). We had proposed five research questions and ten hypotheses in chapters one and two of this study to seek explanation between position power management and workplace harmony in the construction sector in Rivers State. The Spearman Rank Order Correlation Co-efficient is calculated using the SPSS 21.0 version to establish the relationship among the empirical referents of the predictor variable and the measures of the criterion variable. We used this to answer research questions one to five. Correlation coefficient can range from -1.00 to +1.00. The value of -1.00 represents a perfect negative correlation while the value of +1.00 represents a perfect positive correlation. A value of 0.00 represents a lack of correlation. In testing hypotheses one to ten, the following rules were upheld in accepting or rejecting our alternate hypotheses: all the coefficient values that indicate levels of significance (or) as calculated using SPSS were accepted and therefore our alternate hypotheses rejected; when no significance is indicated in the coefficient *r* value, we reject our alternate hypotheses. Our confidence interval was set at the 0.05 (two tailed) level of significance to test the statistical significance of the data in this study.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Workplace Harmony

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Grievance	121	1.00	5.00	3.0358	1.37423
Strike frequency	121	1.00	5.00	3.3829	1.32404
Leadership and Organizational culture.	121	1.67	5.00	3.3333	1.12546
Valid N (listwise)	121				

SPSS 21.0 data Output, 2018.

Table 1 above illustrates the descriptive statistics for Workplace Harmony in the construction sectors in Rivers State. Grievance with a mean score of 3.0358, strike frequency with a mean score 3.3829 and leadership and organizational culture with a mean score of 3.3333 indicate that most of the respondents were on the moderate range of the measurement scale.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for the study variables

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Position power management	121	1.17	5.00	3.2225	1.29584
Workplace harmony	121	1.44	5.00	3.2507	1.22773
Valid N (listwise)	121				

Source: SPSS 21.0 data Output, 2018.

The data in table 2 illustrates the descriptive statistics summary for the study variables which are Position Power Management (Independent variable) and Workplace Harmony in the construction sectors in Rivers State (dependent variable).

1.3.1 Secondary Data Analysis

The secondary data analysis was carried out using the Spearman rank order correlation tool at a 95% confidence interval. Specifically, the tests cover hypotheses HO₁ to HO₁₀ which were bivariate and stated in the null form. We have relied on the Spearman Rank (*rho*) statistics to undertake the analysis. The 0.05 significance level is adopted as criterion for the probability of either accepting the null hypotheses at (p>0.05) or rejecting the null hypotheses at (p<0.05)

1.3.2 Presentation of Results on the Analysis of Data on Research Questions and Testing of Hypotheses.

We had proposed five research questions and ten hypotheses in chapters one of the study to seek explanation between position power management and workplace harmony in the construction sector in Rivers State. The Spearman Rank Order Correlation Co-efficient is calculated using the SPSS 20.0 version to establish the relationship among the empirical referents of the predictor variable and the measures of the criterion variable. We used this to answer research questions one to five. Correlation coefficient can range from -1.00 to +1.00. The value of -1.00 represents a perfect negative correlation while the value of +1.00 represents a perfect positive correlation. A value of 0.00 represents a lack of correlation. In testing hypotheses one to ten, the following rules were upheld in accepting or rejecting our alternate hypotheses: all the coefficient values that indicate levels of significance (or) as calculated using SPSS were accepted and therefore our alternate hypotheses rejected; when no significance is indicated in the coefficient r value, we reject our alternate hypotheses. Our confidence interval was set at the 0.05 (two tailed) level of significance to test the statistical significance of the data in this study.

Table 3: Correlation Matrix for Coercion and Measures of Workplace Harmony

			Coercion	Grievance	Strike Frequency
Spearman's rho	Coercion	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.450*	.364
		Sig. (2-tailed)		.047	.115
		N	121	121	121
	Grievance	Correlation Coefficient	.450*	1.000	.682**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.047		.001
		N	121	121	121
	Strike frequency	Correlation Coefficient	.364	.682**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.115	.001	
		N	121	121	121

SPSS 20.0 data Output, 2018

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The table 3 above shows the correlation in hypotheses one and two. The correlation for hypothesis one shows a low correlation at rho = .450** where P-value = .000 (P<0.001). This implies a low relationship between both variables at 95% level of confidence. We therefore accept the null-hypothesis (Ho:1), and restated that, there is a weak significance relationship between coercion and grievance. The correlation for hypothesis two shows a weak correlation at rho = .364 where P-value = .000 (P<0.001). This implies a very weak relationship between both variables at 95% level of confidence. We therefore accept the null-hypothesis (Ho:2), and restated that, there is a very weak significance relationship between coercion strike frequency.

Table 4. Correlation Matrix for Delegation and Measures of Workplace Harmony

			Delegation	Grievance	Strike frequency
Spearman's rho	Delegation	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.577**	.880**
		Sig. (2-tailed)		.008	.000
		N	121	121	121
	Grievance	Correlation Coefficient	.577**	1.000	.682**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.008		.001
		N	121	121	121

	Sig. (2-tailed)	.008	.	.001
	N	121	121	121
Strike frequency	Correlation Coefficient	.880**	.682**	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.001	.
	N	121	121	121

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The table 4 illustrates the correlation in hypotheses three and four. The correlation for hypothesis three shows a significant correlation at $\rho = .577^{**}$ where P-value = .000 ($P < 0.001$). This implies a strong and significant relationship between both variables at 95% level of confidence. We therefore reject the non-hypothesis ($H_{0:3}$), and upheld the alternate hypothesis, thus, there is a significance relationship between delegation and grievance. The correlation for hypothesis four shows a significant correlation at $\rho = .880^{**}$ where P-value = .000 ($P < 0.001$). This implies a strong and significant relationship between both variables at 95% level of confidence. We therefore reject the null-hypothesis ($H_{0:4}$), and upheld the alternate hypothesis, thus, there is a significance relationship between delegation and strike frequency.

Table 5: Correlation Matrix for Consultation and Measures of Workplace Harmony

		Consultation	Grievance	Strike frequency
Responsiveness	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.549*	.705**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.001
	N	121	121	121
Spearman's rho Grievance	Correlation Coefficient	.549*	1.000	.682**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.001
	N	121	121	121
Strike	Correlation Coefficient	.705**	.682**	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.001	.
	N	121	121	121

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

In table 5 above, the correlation for hypothesis five shows a correlation at $\rho = .549^{**}$ where P-value = .000 ($P < 0.001$). This implies a significant correlation relationship between both variables at 95% level of confidence. We therefore reject the non-hypothesis ($H_{0:5}$), and upheld the alternate hypothesis, thus, there is a significance relationship between responsiveness and grievance. The correlation for hypothesis six shows a significant correlation at $\rho = .705^{**}$ where P-value = .000 ($P < 0.001$). This implies a strong and significant relationship between both variables at 95% level of confidence. We therefore reject the non-hypothesis ($H_{0:6}$), and upheld the alternate hypothesis, thus, there is a significance relationship between responsiveness and strike frequency.

Table 6: Correlation Matrix for Responsiveness and Measures of Workplace Harmony

		Responsiveness	Grievance	Strike frequency
Responsiveness	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.528*	.770**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000
	N	121	121	121
Spearman's rho Grievance	Correlation Coefficient	.528*	1.000	.682**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.001
	N	121	121	121
Strike frequency	Correlation Coefficient	.770**	.682**	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.001	.
	N	121	121	121

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The table 6 above illustrates the correlation in hypotheses seven and eight. The correlation for hypothesis seven shows correlation at $\rho = .528^{**}$ where P-value = .000 ($P < 0.001$). This implies a moderate significant relationship between both variables at 95% level of confidence. We therefore reject the null-hypothesis ($H_{0:7}$), and restated that, there is a significance relationship between responsiveness and grievance. The correlation for hypothesis eight shows a significant correlation at $\rho = .770^{**}$ where P-value = .000 ($P < 0.001$). This implies a strong significant relationship between both variables at 95% level of confidence. We

therefore reject the non-hypothesis (Ho:s), and restated that, there is strong significance relationship between responsiveness and strike frequency.

Table 7: Partial Correlation for the Moderating Role of Leadership

Control Variables			Position Power Management	Workplace Harmony	Leadership
none- ^a	Position Power Management	Correlation	1.000	.870	.757
		Significance (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000
		Df	0	119	119
	Workplace Harmony	Correlation	.870	1.000	.689
		Significance (2-tailed)	.000	.	.001
		Df	119	0	119
	Leadership	Correlation	.757	.689	1.000
		Significance (2-tailed)	.000	.001	.
		Df	119	119	0
Leadership	Position power management	Correlation	1.000	.736	
		Significance (2-tailed)	.	.000	
		Df	0	118	
	Workplace Harmony	Correlation	.736	1.000	
		Significance (2-tailed)	.000	.	
		Df	118	0	

a. Cells contain zero-order (Pearson) correlations.

In table 7 above, the zero-order partial correlation between position power management and workplace harmony shows the correlation coefficient where leadership is not moderating the relationship; and this is, indeed, both very high (0.870) and statistically significant (P-value(= 0.000) < 0.05). The partial correlation controlling for leadership however is (.736) and statistically significant (P-value (= 0.000) < 0.05). The observed positive ‘relationship’ between position power management is due to underlying relationships between each of those variables and leadership. Looking at the zero correlation, we find that position power management are highly positively correlated with leadership, the control variable. Removing the effect this control variable reduces the correlation between the other two variables to be (.736) and it is significant at $\alpha = 0.05$, therefore, we reject the null hypotheses and conclude that: leadership significantly moderates the relationship between position power management and workplace harmony of selected construction companies in Rivers State.

Table 8: Partial Correlation For The Moderating Role Of Organizational Culture

Control Variables			Position Power Management	Workplace Harmony	Organizational Culture
none- ^a	Position Power Management	Correlation	1.000	.870	.821
		Significance (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000
		Df	0	119	119
	Workplace Harmony	Correlation	.870	1.000	.791
		Significance (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000
		Df	119	0	119
	Organizational Culture	Correlation	.821	.791	1.000
		Significance (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.
		Df	119	119	0
Orgnl Culture	Position Power Management	Correlation	1.000	.632	
		Significance (2-tailed)	.	.004	
		Df	0	118	
	Workplace Harmony	Correlation	.632	1.000	
		Significance (2-tailed)	.004	.	
		Df	118	0	

a. Cells contain zero-order (Pearson) correlations.

In table 8 above, the zero-order partial correlation between position power management and workplace harmony shows the correlation coefficient where organizational culture is not moderating the relationship; and

this is, indeed, both very high (0.870) and statistically significant ($P\text{-value} = 0.000 < 0.05$). The partial correlation controlling for organizational culture however is (.632) and statistically significant ($P\text{-value} = 0.000 < 0.05$). The observed positive 'relationship' between position power management is due to underlying relationships between each of those variables and organizational culture. Looking at the zero correlation, we find that position power management are highly positively correlated with organizational culture, Removing the effect this control variable, reduces the correlation between the other two variables to be (.632) and it is significant at $\alpha = 0.05$, therefore, we reject the null hypotheses and conclude that: organizational culture significantly moderates the relationship between position power management and workplace harmony of selected construction companies in Rivers State.

1.4 Findings and Interpretation

From the analysis and interpretation of responses from the respondents, a low response is indicated. This goes to illustrate the fact that coercion as a leadership tool portends negative implications and could fuel organizational disharmony in form of frequent strikes and high grievance frequency. That a great percentage of the respondents agree to some of the side effects of coercion implies rejection and it is instructive to managers who apply it even when situations disallow its use. Scoring a low level of response on the measurement scale reminds managers the effects of coercion, as it will not add value to the effective management of workers and guarantees workplace harmony. This finding support Podsakoff&Schriesheim (1985), who agrees that coercive power negatively influences job satisfaction and generates slightest employee satisfaction. Zamani, Enayati, Palar&Jamkhaneh (2012), found that employees are less committed and satisfied with their job when their managers use coercive power increasingly. Frequent usage of this power would yield negative feelings such as fear, discouragement, dissatisfaction, resentment and turnover among employees, Elangovan&Xie, (2000). Coercive power may be effective in influencing subordinates who endanger the organization or threatened the authority of the leader but will later lead to resentment, Raven (2008). Studies from Afza (2005), also showed that coercive power was negatively related to job satisfaction. The major essence of coercion is to enforce compliance and this may have greater negative implications than positive outcomes.

Delegation, on its face value in managing the workers, indicates positive implications only in an organization's operation. However, in view of the moderate response it attracted in the measurement scale it imposes certain responsibility on the managers or leaders applying in ensuring that it is not abused but optimally utilized by those to whom power is delegated. The findings show that workers accept delegation as a factor in creating and sustaining workplace harmony and with great potency to avert grievances and strikes. It is for this reason that Schriesheim, Neider&Scandura (1998) and Muindi (2011) have held that it "improves the speed and quality of decision making, reduced the manager's overload job schedule, enriched and motivated subordinate's job".

The data analysis and measurement of responses for consultation showed a high response on the measurement scale. Most of the workers are of the opinion that consultation can deflect the breeding of grievances in the workplace which often results in strike actions by the workers. Though Heller, Eugene &Wilpet (1998) see it as "a process which allows employees exert some influence over their work and the conditions under which they work", and according to Wagner & Gooding (1987) as "a process in which influence on decision making is shared between hierarchical superiors and their subordinates", workers' interest should not be allowed to override the interest of the shareholders, which forms the primary interest of the organization. The application of consultation in an organization by managers should be in a manner that there is healthy, reasonable and acceptable balance between the two competing interests of shareholders' profit and workers welfare. Again, there should be conscious effort by managers to obviate a disharmonious work environment that can engender grievances and strike actions.

The findings for responsiveness as a dimension of position power management indicates high response on the measurement scale. The finding shows that there is a significant relationship between responsiveness and grievance, and strike frequency in the workplace. The implication of this finding therefore is that responsiveness being the show of empathy and assumption of responsibility by managers on issues concerning workers welfare (salary increase, bonus, new tools, regular training, good and quality healthcare policy) cannot lead to grievance and strike action but can rather assuage it. It also indicates that its application in workplace can guarantee harmony, leading to job satisfaction and the attainment of set goals.

The partial correlation coefficient result indicated that the leadership of organizations significantly moderate the relationship between position power management and workplace harmony. This current finding supports the arguments by Collins (2009) that the most important position power management reference point is an employee's direct supervisor or manager. How a manager acts in response to position power management issue has more influence on employee performance in the workplace than any stated policy or words of encouragement. The manager's words and actions must be aligned with the organization's targets. Immediate executives must take responsibility for position power management actions they display for their subordinates to

emulate and create healthy working relationship. This current finding is in line with Brown et al. (2005) who proposed that power is an essential element for effective leadership looking at the leadership role in the process of relationship that exist between management and employee in the workplace.

The leadership of an organization can influence employee's behavior either negatively or positively. This is supported by Lord and Brown (2001) who agreed that leaders in organizations can influence subordinates' behaviour through some motivational/enticing strategies used to control behaviour. This implies that leaders who abuse of power can influence his subordinates and even the company as a whole, negatively, creating frequent strike and grievances in the organization. The partial correlation coefficient result indicated that organizational culture significantly moderates the relationship between position power management and workplace harmony. This finding supports previous arguments in literature by Thoms (2008) who described moral culture as entirely organizational and 'cross generational behaviour' formed by a group of directors, their workforces, and other stakeholders identifying clearly and differentiating between their established guidelines for right and wrong behaviour. Whether or not there is a culture in an organization, is identified by its characteristics, pattern of behaviour, values and behavioural norms shared by its group members..

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1]. Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 2, 267–299.
- [2]. Afza, M. (2005). Supervisor-Subordinate Relationships and Satisfaction in Indian Small Business Enterprises. *VIKALPA*, 30(3), 11-19.
- [3]. Agarwal, S., & Hauswald, R. (2009). Authority and Information. Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, Federal Reserve Board.
- [4]. Argyris, C. (1964). Integrating the Individual and the Organization, New York: J. Wiley and Sons.
- [5]. Asforth, B. E. (1997). Petty Tyranny in Organizations: A Preliminary Examination of Antecedents and Consequences. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences* 14(2), 126-140.
- [6]. Bankole, A.R. (2000). Principles of Personnel Management. Lagos: Fadec Publishers
- [7]. Blau, P. M. (1964). Exchange and power in social life. New York: Wiley.
- [8]. Boxall, P. & Purcell, J. (2003). Strategy and HRM, New York. Palgrave Macmillan, NY.
- [9]. Damachi, U. (1999). Introduction: Industrial Relations in Africa. Lagos: Development Press Ltd.
- [10]. Deluga, R. J. (1994). Supervisor Trust Building, Leader-Member Exchange and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 67, 315-326
- [11]. Dundon, T. & Rollinson, D. (2004). Employment Relations in Non-Union Firms. London, Routledge.
- [12]. Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 500–507.
- [13]. Elangovan, A. R. & Xie, J. L. (2000). Effects of Perceived Power of Supervisor on Subordinate Work Attitudes. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 21(6), 319-328.
- [14]. Fair Works Act (2009). The Australian Government. www.fairwork.gov.au
- [15]. Fashoyin, T. (1979). Industrial Relations in Nigeria: Development and Practice. Ibadan; Longman.
- [16]. Gill, A.R., Flascher, A.B. & Shacha, M. (2006). Mitigating Stress and Burnout by Implementing Transformational Leadership. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 18 (6), 469-481.
- [17]. Gioia, D. A., & Sims, H. P., Jr. (1983). Perceptions of managerial power as a consequence of Managerial behavior and reputation. *Journal of Management*, 9(1), 7-26.
- [18]. Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 161–178.
- [19]. Gordon, J. R. (2013). Autocratic Leadership Style. (On-line: [http://www.action wheel.com/autocraticleadership-style.html](http://www.actionwheel.com/autocraticleadership-style.html)). Retrieved March 5, 2015.
- [20]. Graen, G. & Cashman, J. (1975). A role making model of leadership in formal organizations: A developmental approach, in J. Hunt and L. Larson (Eds.) *Leadership Frontiers*, 143-165. Kent OH: Kent State University Press.
- [21]. Graen, G. & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective, *Leadership Quarterly*, 6, 219-247.
- [22]. Heller, F. P., Eugene, S. G. & Wilpert, B. (1998). Organizational Participation: Myth and Reality, Oxford University Press, USA
- [23]. Hinkin, T. R. & Schriesheim, C. A. (1994). An Examination of Subordinate-perceived Relationships between Leader Reward and Punishment Behaviour and Leader Bases of Power. *Human Relations*, 47(7), 779-800.
- [24]. Hyman, J. & Mason, B. (1995). Managing Employee Involvement and Participation, Sage Publications, London.
- [25]. Iheriohanma, E.B. J (2007). The Socio-Economic Issues Challenging Workers Participation in Management and Productivity in Nigeria. *IKOGHO: A Multi-Disciplinary Journal*, 4(4), 1-11.
- [26]. Kotter, J. P. (1979). Power in Management. New York: Amacom.
- [27]. Kriesberg, L. (1982). Social Conflicts. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- [28]. Lee, K. L. & Tui L. G. (2008). The Consequences of Supervisory Power- the Contingent Effect of Age and Length of Service. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 3(7), 40-54.
- [29]. Markey, R. & Monat, J. (1997). Introduction, in Raymond Markey and Jacques Monat (eds), Innovation and Employee Participation Through Works Councils: International Case Studies, Avebury, Aldershot, U.K. 1-25.
- [30]. Marchington, M. (2000). Team-working and employee involvement: terminology, evaluation and context, in S. Procter & F. Mueller (eds) Team-working. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- [31]. Meyer, D. (1994). The Political Effects of Grievance Handling by Stewards In a Local Union. *Journal of Labor Research*. 15(1), 33-52.
- [32]. Muindi, F. (2011). The Relationship between Participation in Decision Making and Job Satisfaction among Academic Staff in the School of Business, University of Nairobi. *Journal of Human Resources Management Research*, 1-34.
- [33]. Nedace, T., Alavi, K. & Ramezani, Z.N. (2012). Employees' Effectiveness. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 18(10), 1400-1411.
- [34]. Ng'ethe, J. M., Mike, E. I. & Namusonge, G. S. (2012). Determinants of Academic Staff Relation in Public Universities in Kenya: Empirical Review. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(21), 205-212.
- [35]. Nicholls, A. (2009). Social Entrepreneurship: The Need For A Kuhnian Paradigm?, International Social Innovation Conference (ISIRC), UK. Oxford.

- [36]. Offerman, L. R. & Hellman, P. S. (1996). Leadership Behaviour and Subordinate Stress: a 360 Degree View. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*: 1,(4), 382-390.
- [37]. Ogunlana, S. (2011). Factors and procedures in large construction projects in Vietnam, *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 11(6).
- [38]. Podsakoff, P. M., & Schriesheim, C. A. (1985). Field studies of French and Raven's bases of power: Critique, reanalysis, and suggestions for future research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 97, 387-413. Ramsay, H. (1977). Cycles of control, *Sociology*, 11(3), 481-506.
- [39]. Richmond, V. P.; McCroskey, J. C. & Davis, L. M. (1986). The Relationship of Supervisor Use of Power and Affinity-Seeking Strategies with Subordinate Satisfaction, *Communication Quarterly* . 34(2) 178-193.
- [40]. Schriesheim, C. A., Neider, L. L., & Scandura, T. A. (1998).
- [41]. Delegation and leader-member exchange: Main effects, moderators, and measurement issues. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 298-318.
- [42]. Tannenbaum, R. & Schmidt, W. (1958). How to choose a leadership pattern. *Harvard Business Review*, 36, 95-101
- [43]. Towers, B. (1997). *The Representation Gap: Change and Reform in the British and American University Press*.
- [44]. Uhl-Bien, M., Graen, G. B., & Scandura, T. A. (2000). Implications of leader-member exchange (LMX) for strategic human resource management systems: Relationships as social capital for competitive advantage. *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management*, 18, 137-185.
- [45]. Wagner III, J. A. & Gooding, R. Z. (1987). Effects of Societal Trends on Participation Research. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 32(2) 241-262.
- [46]. Wang, H., Saw, K., Hackett, R., Wang, D. & Chen, Z. (2005). Leader-member exchange as a mediator of the relationship between transformational leadership and followers' performance and organizational citizenship behaviour, *Academy of Management Journal*, 48/3, 420-432. W
- [47]. Yukl, G., & Fu, P. P. (1999). Determinants of delegation and consultation by managers. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 219-232.
- [48]. Zamani, F., Enayati, T., Palar, H. & Jamkhaneh, R. Z. (2012). The Analysis of the Relationship between the Manager's Power Resources and Organizational Commitment: A Case Study of Employees of Education Organization of Mazandaran Province. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 2(11), 11596-1160.

Dr Patrick Nkiinebari Nwinyokpugi" Position Power Management and Workplace Harmony in the Construction Sector in Rivers State" *International Journal of Business and Management Invention (IJBMI)*, vol. 08, no. 01, 2019, pp 34-44