

Power and Status Inconsistency and Conflict in Teams

Jin Park

Zayed University, Abu Dhabi, UAE

Jin.park.s@gmail.com

Abstract: Power and status, two forms of social hierarchy, are fundamental feature of social relations, and they have two functions that are especially important for teams that lack formal hierarchy: 1) to establish order and coordination, and 2) to motivate employees to strive for promotion. Hierarchy provides clear social governance in groups by allowing leaders to assign tasks or allocate resources, and it provides incentives for individuals to climb the organizational ladder to obtain greater compensation and comfort. Individuals with high power and/or high status are more likely to perform leadership behaviors in teams. However, they may also cause conflict by activating threat and distrust when other team members perceive that aspirants' leadership behaviors are misaligned with their power and/or status. This misalignment can be complex because social hierarchy has multiple forms such as status and power and multiple levels such as team and organizational levels. The current study investigates (1) how the inconsistency between power and status of a team member affect conflict with other team members and (2) how team member's needs for power and needs for status moderate the power-status inconsistency and conflict relationship. Data was collected from a sample of MBA student teams at a large mid-western university in the United States. In the results the study found no evidence of the power-status inconsistency and conflict relationship, yet found the moderating effect of needs for power on that relationship.

Keywords: Power, Status, Leadership, Conflict, Teams

1. Introduction

Social hierarchy, the implicit or explicit rank order of individuals with respect to a valued social dimension, is a fundamental feature of social relations (Magee & Galinsky, 2008). Social hierarchy has two functions in organizations: 1) to establish order and coordination, and 2) to motivate employees to strive for promotion (Magee & Galinsky, 2008). Hierarchy provides clear social governance in groups by allowing leaders to assign tasks or allocate resources (Durkheim, 1997; Magee & Galinsky, 2008), and it provides incentives for individuals to climb the organizational ladder to obtain greater compensation and comfort (Magee & Galinsky, 2008; Tannenbaum, Kavcic, Rosner, Vianello, & Wieser, 1974).

The focus of the current study is status and power - the two most important bases of informal social hierarchy (Magee & Galinsky, 2008). Social status is defined as the extent to which an individual is respected or admired by others (Magee & Galinsky, 2008). People tend to gather information about a target individual's ability and expertise from direct interactions or interpersonal observations, and they tend to respect and admire those perceived to be highly competent (Ridgeway, Boyle, Kuipers, & Robinson, 1998). Social power is defined as control over valued resources in social relations (Magee & Galinsky, 2008). Individuals depend on more powerful individuals to obtain resources. Power and status are related but distinct constructs (Magee & Galinsky, 2008). Both social power and social status significantly affect employee behaviors, but empirical evidence has indicated that status and power levels have unique qualities and effects on employee behaviors (e.g., Blader & Chen, 2012; Hays & Bendersky, 2015). For example, high status individuals may show more helping and cooperative behaviors (Cheng, Tracy, Henrich, 2010; Willer, 2009) and willingness to take the perspective of others (Blader & Chen, 2012). In contrast, holders of power tend to act according to their own goals and interests (Hirsh, Galinski, & Zhong, 2011).

The two functions of social hierarchy, coordination and motivation, are especially important in groups where roles or formal positions are ambiguous, where group tasks are confusing, or where work is poorly coordinated (Greer & Caruso, 2007). Teams that lack formal hierarchy provide an especially interesting context for studying status and power. Contemporary organizations are increasingly adopting self-managing teams as working units (Gerard, 1995). Consequently, status and power may be critical in coordinating tasks and motivating team members. Successful teams have clear hierarchical roles, while those lacking structure perform more poorly (Hackman, 1987). Well-designed team structure has a positive influence on a team's engagement in learning and continuous improvement (Bunderson & Boumgarden, 2010). Yet, self-managing teams often have limited formal hierarchical differentiation, formal order, or imposed coordination, so that status and power may critically affect how team members interact and manage tasks.

However, the function of social hierarchy - motivating individuals - may also cause conflict among team members in self-managing teams because social hierarchies are critical sources of perceived inequalities and conflicts (Muller, 1985). People in an organization have come to an agreement about each other's ranks in status

hierarchies and in power hierarchies (Anderson, Srivastava, Beer, Spataro, & Chatman, 2006; Magee & Galinsky, 2008). As a result of this consensus, individuals in an organization get a sense of who is high in status or power in social relations. Lower ranking individuals are generally motivated to gain greater material and psychological rewards by achieving higher status and power (Magee & Galinsky, 2008; Tannenbaum, Kavcic, Rosner, Vianello, & Wieser, 1974), but efforts to achieve status and power potentially create conflict among competing team members. Conflicts regarding tasks, relationships, processes, and status are common and costly in teams, and negatively affect trust, cohesion, job satisfaction, commitment, and team performance (De Drue & Weingart 2003; de Wit, Greer, & Jehn, 2012). Recently, structural, role-based conflict studies show that hierarchical positions can generate conflict among team members (e.g., Anicich, Fast, Halevy, & Galinsky, 2015).

The structural approach goes beyond investigating within-team processes to explore how social interactions outside teams affect within-team conflict. A structural approach broadens our understandings of the emergence of team conflict because the approach is based on social interactions among team and other organizational members, according to organizational roles. Conflict between team members may emerge when one member tries to assume leadership, but other members do not comply. The current study examines social hierarchy as it impacts conflict in self-managing teams. Previous studies have focused on individual characteristics related to team conflict, but the person-based approach limits investigation into effects of social interactions outside teams. Going beyond an individual perspective and taking a structural perspective, I explore important and yet unanswered questions: How do status-power inconsistency affect process and relationship conflict between team members? I argue that individual structural positions in various social networks are the basis of the social hierarchy, status and power, and these two forms of social hierarchy determine whether conflict will rise in self-managing teams.

2. Hierarchy Inconsistency and Conflict between Team Members

Recall that individuals try to achieve higher levels of status and power to gain the material and psychological rewards enjoyed by those who occupy higher social ranks (Tannenbaum, Kavcic, Rosner, Vianello, & Wieser, 1974). Competing motivations to achieve status and power may create conflict among team members as they go through claiming and granting processes (DeRue & Ashford, 2010). This leadership emergence process can cause conflict in teams. Typically, not all leadership claims can be granted by others, and denying or not granting can be a source of conflict in teams. Status and power both have positive functions of motivating individuals, but social hierarchies can be critical sources of perceived inequalities and conflicts, and thus conflict may arise in self-managing teams (Muller, 1985). A typology study of three types of diversity indicated that status and power are associated with group competition (Harrison & Klein, 2007). Ultimately, team members may refuse to grant leadership and conflict may arise.

I argue that members might refuse to grant leadership because they perceive that aspirants act in ways that are inappropriate and unaligned with expectations regarding their power or status. If team members perceive that an aspirant's claim is legitimate and well-aligned with the expected behaviors according to the aspirant's power/status rank, they will grant the leadership claim. In contrast, if members perceive that the claim is illegitimate and unaligned with expectations based on the aspirant's power/status rank, team members will refuse the claim. Instead, they will feel conflict as they perceive that the aspirant's claim threatens their own desires to achieve higher power/status. Therefore, in an answer to calls for more studies of conflict from a structural perspective (e.g., Mannix & Sauer, 2006), I will examine how perceptions of hierarchical inconsistency cause team conflict.

The predominant approaches to studying status and power involve investigating their effects separately or treating them as a single variable (Bunderson & Reagans, 2011). The possibility that status and power are two distinct variables acting separately or even interacting to shape social interactions has not been widely considered (Blader & Chen, 2012). However, people can be valued according to multiple dimensions (Magee & Galinsky, 2008), and hierarchical ranks across the dimensions may be inconsistent in organizations. To explain the impact of misfits among hierarchies, we must consider possible "status inconsistency"; that is, individuals often have high social hierarchical ranking on one valued dimension but low social hierarchical ranking on another dimension (Stryker & Macke, 1978; Weber, 1946).

Status inconsistency theory (Weber, 1946) predicts that people who have inconsistent multiple forms/levels of social hierarchy will be frustrated and dissatisfied because their higher rank is salient to themselves but not to others (Lenski, 1954). Cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957) explains that individuals tend to seek consistency among their cognitions (i.e., beliefs, opinions) and try to eliminate the dissonance caused by

inconsistencies. Therefore, they try to balance multiple social hierarchies by increasing the lower form(s) of hierarchy to be equal to the higher form(s) (Segal & Knoke, 1968). For example, one study showed that job applicants chose to join local low-status firms where they expected to more easily obtain promotions (Phillips, 2001). That is, they could rise in the hierarchy by choosing opportunities in a lower-ranked area. An executive who has high power in controlling budgetary resources but low status in being disrespected by subordinates might try to assuage the dissatisfaction caused by hierarchical inconsistency by trying to increase status, such as by spending more time with subordinates. Similarly, a research fellow who has high status in being respected by colleagues but low power in being unable to set project budgets will be frustrated with the inconsistency and will try to increase power by submitting research fund proposals.

Hierarchy inconsistency may cause interpersonal conflict in self-managing teams where, in the absence of formal leaders, members tend to compete for informal leadership (DeRue & Ashford, 2010), motivated by their desires to acquire the rewards accorded to leaders (Day et al., 2009). Recall that leadership positions bring instrumental rewards such as promotions, interpersonal rewards such as recognition or admiration, or image-based rewards such as positive reputations (DeRue & Ashford, 2010). Those who have had high status and power in previous positions are motivated to maintain their status and power in new situations (Magee & Galinsky, 2008) because the positions become a part of the holder's identity (DeRue & Ashford, 2010), and are essential for maintaining a positive self-image (Greer, 2014). Team members in competitive environments feel threats to their social positions when other members challenge their identity or roles (Greer, 2014) by acting in ways that might bring power and status in team activities (De Cremer & van Dijk, 2005). In other words, inconsistent status and power social hierarchies—when the aspirant's status and power are misaligned with members' perceptions of the aspirant's status and power—can cause team members to hold conflicting expectations about behaviors (Bacharach, Bamberger, & Mundell, 1993; Magee & Galinsky, 2008) and activate feelings of threat and distrust (Greer, 2014). For example, team members will reject the behaviors of lower ranked members who try to act in ways expected for higher ranked individuals (Anderson et al., 2008; Rudman, 1998). Members will then try to rectify the inconsistency by competing for positions. Conflict arises as one member tries to occupy the space of another. Eventually, members experience conflict with the aspirant who is acting inconsistently with expectations based on power and status rankings (Magee & Galinsky, 2008).

To achieve a more consistent instrumental versus expressive discussion (e.g., task- and relations-focused leadership behaviors), I focus on process and relationship conflicts, as proposed by Jehn and Mannix (2001). Team relationship conflict occurs when team members have interpersonal differences or personality clashes resulting in dislike, annoyance, frustration, and irritation among members (Jehn, 1995; Jehn & Mannix, 2001) and causing tension, friction (Amason, 1996; Pinkley, 1990), interpersonal animosity, and annoyance (Jehn, 1995, 1997). Process conflict occurs when team members disagree about how tasks should proceed (Jehn & Bendersky, 2003) and how to most effectively organize and utilize group resources to accomplish tasks (Behfar et al., 2010). Thus, process conflict is likely when teams lack clear action plans for goals, resource allocations, or timelines for task completion.

Although process conflict is theoretically distinct from task or relationship conflict, the two types of conflict have not been empirically differentiated (Mannix, Griffith, & Neale, 2002) although both have been highly correlated with relationship conflict (Behfar, Mannix, Peterson, & Trochim, 2010). Thus, I examine process conflict more closely to determine how it relates to task and relationship conflict. Behfar et al. (2010) showed that process conflict includes both logistical and contribution aspects. They generated seven clusters of conflict types and matched four clusters with task, relationship, and process typology from Jehn et al. (2008). However, they encountered difficulty in the remaining three clusters in trying to distinguish process conflict from task or relationship conflict. Specifically, the cluster of "different approach in methodology and solving issues" and the cluster of "difference of ideas and difference in opinions" (Behfar et al., 2010, pp.11, 12) are in the grey areas between process and task conflict. Regarding distinction between process conflict and relationship conflict, the cluster of "quality of workload distribution/equality of effort" and the cluster of "lack of communication in a respectful or effective manner" (pp. 10, 11) do not show meaningful differences.

Both process and relationship conflict are problematic. Both are negatively related to team outcomes (e.g., performance, satisfaction, trust, cohesion, commitment, identification, innovation, potency, and organizational citizenship behavior) and individual outcomes (e.g., performance and interpersonal trust) (e.g. de Wit, Greer, & Jehn, 2012; O'Neill, Allen & Hastings, 2013; Shah, Park, & Jones, working paper). In the short run, relationship conflict should be more problematic because it is associated with ego-threatening behaviors. In the long term, all conflict types can damage individuals and teams because conflict escalates if it is inadequately managed. In fact, any type of conflict triggers other types of conflict (e.g., Simons & Peterson, 2000).

One form of hierarchy inconsistency that may cause conflict is mismatch between status and power dimensions of social hierarchy. Power begets status and status generates power, but the process takes time (Magee & Galinsky, 2008). Thus, sometimes individuals have a great deal of status (power) but little power (status), which leads to an inconsistency of power and status ranking. For example, a senior manager might have high power through control over financial resources but low status because of a lack interpersonal skills and respect.

Self-managing teams need order and coordination. Thus, team members are likely to vie for leadership, power, and status roles. While members are motivated to put effort and commitment into raising their power and status, they are also motivated to evaluate other team members' power and status. If they observe that team members are acting inconsistently with their status or power, doubt may arise (Greer, 2014). A key factor for evaluating a fellow member becomes the perceived legitimacy or the degree to which power and status seem to be fair and justified. Legitimacy facilitates cooperation, stabilizes the power structure, and decreases conflict and friction between team members (Halevy et al., 2011). However, each team member may have different standards for evaluating the legitimacy of social positions, which can then lead to inconsistencies regarding the granting of legitimacy.

3. High Power–low Status Inconsistency and Relationship Conflict

I argue that individuals who have high power but low status will provoke more relationship conflict with team members than will individuals who have any other combinations of status and power (high status–high power, low status–low power, or low status–high power). Power liberates its holders to pursue their own goals and interests (Galinsky et al. 2003), to express their true feelings and attitudes (Anderson & Berdahl, 2002; Magee & Galinsky, 2008), and to deal with others authentically (Kifer et al., 2013; Kraus et al., 2011). Powerful people tend to be action-oriented, especially when actions are goal-directed (Galinsky et al., 2003).

In contrast, low status individuals are less likely to be helpful and cooperative or to give advice (Cheng et al., 2010; Willer, 2009). Their focus is generally not on relationships or others' needs (Blader et al., 2013; Galinsky et al., 2006). Instead, high power–low status team members may facilitate actions, indicating high power, but fail to showing caring, indicating low status. If they then try to assume leadership, team members are unlikely to provide support (Anicich et al., 2015). Thus, the low status–high power combination is most likely to cause interpersonal relationship conflict including animosity, tension, or annoyance.

High power–low status individuals who focus on task-focused behaviors will be acting in alignment with their power. Despite the low status inconsistency, the high power is a salient, clearly observable quality persuading team members to evaluate leadership according to whether task-focused behaviors align with power rankings. If they do, team members would grant the claims to leadership, feel no need to compete, and be unlikely to have process conflict:

H1. High power–low status individuals have more relationship conflict with team members than individuals who have any other combination of status and power (high status–high power, low status–low power, or low status–high power).

4. High Status – low Power Inconsistency in Process Conflict

I also argue that high status–low power individuals will instigate more process conflict than will individuals with any other combination of status and power. Being more attentive to others' views and perspectives (Blader & Chen, 2012), high status individuals are better able to encourage participation in team discussions, which may become overly lively as members freely voice their ideas and opinions. High power individuals are usually best able to clearly set agendas, norms for discussion, rules for behavior, and standards for thought and opinion (Magee & Galinsky, 2008). Unfortunately, unregulated team discussions without discussion agendas or norms may lead to meaningless arguments that inhibit team progress. Without the leadership often ascribed to power, teams will lack an authority to monitor work progress and quality or evaluate performance. Therefore, the high status–low power individual may be unable to regulate team discussions or arguments. Ideas and opinions are likely to float around discussions, and clear action plans are unlikely to surface. In sum, high status and low power interact to produce disagreements about assignments of duties and resources. Therefore, high status–low power individuals will instigate process conflict.

Although high status–low power individuals have inconsistent power and status, their relations-focused behaviors are clearly aligned with their status. When team members evaluate relations-focused behaviors, they consider whether they align with the status hierarchy. If so, the behaviors are perceived to be appropriate and

members will willingly grant the claims to relation-related leadership, without competition. Therefore, the high status individual will experience no power–status inconsistency relationship conflict with team members. Therefore, I hypothesize:

H2: High status–low power individuals have more process conflict with team members than individuals with any other combination of status and power (high status–high power, low status–low power, or low status–high power).

5. Needs for Power (Status) as Moderating Inconsistency–Conflict Relationships

My model assumes that team members compete for informal team leadership. Basically, in self-managing teams lacking formal leaders, members tend to compete for informal leadership (DeRue & Ashford, 2010). In competitive environments, team members are aware of the identity or role threats posed other team members (Greer, 2014; Tetlock, 2002). Members may feel threats to their social positions of power and status when they observe that aspirants are trying to lead team activities (De Cremer & van Dijk, 2005; Greer, 2014). Eventually, members and aspirants experience conflict if the behaviors are inconsistent with expectations based on power and status rankings (Magee & Galinsky, 2008).

Individuals who have high needs for power and status are especially driven to become informal leaders and will be most critical when evaluating the power and status of fellow aspirants in relation to leadership behaviors. Therefore, team members who have high needs for power are more likely to be sensitive in evaluating other team members' behaviors, and will thus instigate more conflict if behaviors are misaligned. In contrast, if members have low needs for power or status, they will not see others as competitors in the social hierarchy and will be more generous in evaluating others' power and status, even if they try to lead in ways that are inconsistent with the social hierarchy. Thus, conflict is unlikely for individuals who have low need for power or status. Therefore, I predict that needs for power and status play a moderating role:

H3: Team member's needs for status strengthen the relationship between (a) aspirants' power–status inconsistency and relationship conflict.

H4: Team member's needs for power strengthen the relationship between aspirants' status–power inconsistency and process conflict.

6. Methods

I collected data from a sample of 104 first-year, fulltime, residential MBA students enrolled in a leadership course at a large mid-western U.S. university. Students were assigned to five-person self-managing teams to work together on case exercise projects, constituting 40% of their course grade. They completed cases as a group during each class and summarized their findings in a brief professional report format to present to the instructor. Team members met weekly in and outside the classroom to discuss their work.

Data was collected at three time points. At Time 1, before the spring semester A-term began, I used an online survey to measure personality traits, leadership style, needs for power and status, GMAT score, communication and respect networks, and perceptions of team members' power and status. At Time 2, the midpoint of the A-term course, I sent students a second email survey including items about self-confidence, leadership behaviors, and conflict with team members during team activities. At Time 3, after the final exam and before they received grades for the team project, I conducted the third online data collection including items about leadership emergence, and conflict with team members during team activities. The final sample included 104 (Time 1 response rate = 98%; Time 2 = 89%; Time 3 = 88%).

7. Measures

Informal social power. Informal social power was measured with betweenness centrality using a social network questionnaire. I provided an alphabetized list of all students' names in the cohort, with the instructions: "Please check the names of your classmates in the MBA program with whom you communicate for class-, school-, or job search information."

Informal social status. I measured informal social status according to in-degree centrality in the respect network. I asked respondents to identify their respect relationships. Again, I provided an alphabetized list of all the classmates and requested: "Please check the names of your classmates in this MBA program whom you *respect*, *admire*, or *look up to*."

Needs for status/power. I used three items modified from the SPF-IL Scale (Nieboer, Lindenberg, Boomsma, & Van Bruggen, 2005), to measure needs for status: “(1) I want people to look up to me; (2) I want to have good reputation with people; and (3) I want people to regard me as an important person.” For needs for power “(1) I want to control resources or other people; (2) I want people to think I am influential; and (3) I want to take a high position in a group or organization” following Stahl, Grigsby, and Gulati (1985).

Relationship and process conflict. I measured relationship conflict and process conflict at the dyadic level using a single-item measure. For relationship conflict, I used an item developed by Shah, Park, and Jones (working paper): “At times [team member A] and I have difficulty getting along (i.e., our personalities clash or our interactions result in friction or emotional conflict).” For process conflict, the item was: “At times [team member A] and I disagree about how to assign duties and resources (i.e., how much time to spend on teamwork and in meetings, and who should do what).”

Control variables. age, gender, race, general mental ability (e.g., GMAT score), big 5 personality traits, gender homophily, race homophily, and age difference between the dyad.

8. Analytic Strategy

To calculate betweenness and in-degree centralities as measures of informal power and status, I used the social network software ORA-LITE (Carley, Pfeffer, Reminga, Storricks, & Columbus, 2012). To gather data about team-level informal power and status, I calculated the betweenness and in-degree centralities within the team network.

I applied a multilevel mixed-effects linear regression to analyze the data. The data structure is nested (e.g., individuals are nested in dyads, dyads are nested in teams) and crossed (e.g., one team member interacts with four team members). The multilevel mixed-effects linear regression can account for the sources of non-independence. I included random coefficients for actor, observer, and team. These random coefficients were used to estimate the covariance across observations of the same actor and observer in the dyad as well as in the same team. To avoid reverse causality, I used the independent variables (power and status) from Time 1 data collection, and dependent variables (conflict) from Time 2 and Time 3 data collection. I assumed missing at random (MAR) and used full-information maximum likelihood estimator (FIML) in the analysis. All model estimations were conducted with “mixed” command in the software STATA 13 (StataCorp, 2013).

9. Results

Table 1 shows the results of regression analysis for the effects of status–power inconsistency on relationship conflict. Table 2 shows the results of regression analysis for the effects of status–power inconsistency on process conflict. I found nonsignificant results for the effect of status–power inconsistency on relationship conflict ($\beta = -49.81$, $p > .05$ in Model 6 of the Table 1) or on process conflict ($\beta = 61.44$, $p > .05$ in Model 6 of the Table 2). Therefore, Hypotheses 1 and 2 were not supported.

Table 3 shows the results of regression analysis for the moderation effects of needs for power on status–power inconsistency and process conflict. I found a significant result for the moderation effect of needs for power on the relationship between aspirants’ power–status inconsistency and relationship conflict ($\beta = 180.94$, $p < .01$ in Model 6 of the Table 3). But I found nonsignificant results for the other moderation effects, needs for status. Therefore, only Hypotheses 4 was supported.

10. Discussion and Conclusions

The current study shows that aspirants’ needs for power may be associated with team members’ expectations about aspirants’ leadership role. Team members’ high needs for power may exacerbate process conflict. This imply that individuals in teams and organizations are advised to know one’s own power and status and to behave accordingly, and moreover, to try to adjust one’s own power and status matched to each other. Theoretically, this study contributes to the leadership, conflict, social hierarchy literature by taking structural perspective and broadening the scope of team and organization as well as exploring the more mechanism of conflict in teams. Further studies are required to overcome the limitation of this study, lack of dynamics – changes of power and status over time, and its interactions with other possible causes of team conflict.

References

- Anderson, C., Srivastava, S., Beer, J. S., Spataro, S. E. & Chatman, J. A. (2006). Knowing your place: Self-perceptions of status in face-to-face groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91(6), 1094-1110.
- Anicich, E.M., Fast, N.J., Halevy, N., Galinsky, A.D. (2015). When the Bases of Social Hierarchy Collide: Power Without Status Drives Interpersonal Conflict. *Organization Science*, in press.
- Bacharach, S. B., Bamberger, P., & Mundell, B. (1993). Status inconsistency in organizations: From social hierarchy to stress. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14(1), 21-36.
- Behfar, K. J., Mannix, E. A., Peterson, R. S., & Trochim, W. M. (2010). Conflict in Small Groups: The Meaning and Consequences of Process Conflict. *Small Group Research*, 42: 127-176.
- Blader, S. L., & Chen, Y. (2012). Differentiating the effects of status and power: A justice perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 102(5), 994–1014.
- Bunderson, J. S., & Boumgarden, P. (2010). Structure and Learning in Self-Managed Teams: Why “Bureaucratic” Teams Can Be Better Learners. *Organization Science*. 21(3):609-624.
- Bunderson, J. S., & Reagans, R. E. (2011). Power, status, and learning in organizations. *Organization Science*. 22(5):1182–1194.
- Carley, K. M., Pfeffer, J., Reminga, J., Storrick, J., & Columbus, D. (2012). ORA User's Guide 2012. No. CMU-ISR-12-105. Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA. Institution of Software Research Internat.
- Cheng, J. T., Tracy, J. L., & Henrich, J. (2010). Pride, personality, and the evolutionary foundations of human social status. *Evolution of Human Behavior*. 31(5):334–347.
- Day, C., Sammons, P., Hopkins, D., Harris, A., Leithwood, K., Gu, Q., Brown, E., Ahtaridou, E. & Kington, A. (2009). The Impact of School Leadership on Pupil Outcomes. Final Report, UK Department for Children, Schools and Families Research.
- De Cremer, D., and Van Dijk, E. (2005). When and why leaders put themselves first: Leader behavior in resource allocations as a function of feeling entitled. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 35, 553–63.
- De Dreu, C. K. W., & Weingart, L. R. (2003). Task versus relationship conflict, team performance and team member satisfaction: A metaanalysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 88(4):741–749.
- de Wit, F. R. C., Greer, L. L., & Jehn, K. A. (2012). The Paradox of intragroup conflict: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(2):360–390.
- DeRue, D. S., & Ashford, S. (2010). Who will lead and who will follow? A social process of leadership identity construction in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 35, 627–647.
- Durkheim, E. (1997). *The division of labor in society*. New York: Free Press.
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. California, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Gerard, R. J. (1995). Teaming up: Making the transition to self-directed, team-based organizations. *Academy of Management Executive*, 9: 91–93.
- Greer, L., & Caruso, H. (2007). Are high power teams really high performers? The roles of trust and status congruency in high power team performance. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Philadelphia, PA.
- Hackman JR. The design of work teams. In: Lorsch J Handbook of organizational behavior. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall ; 1987.
- Harrison, D. A., & Klein, K. J. (2007). What's the difference? Diversity constructs as separation, variety, or disparity in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(4): 1199-1228.
- Hays, N. A., & Bendersky, C. (2015). Not at all inequity is created equal: Effects of status versus power hierarchies on competition for upward mobility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 108(6), 867-882.
- Hiller, N. J., Day, D. V., & Vance, R. J. (2006). Collective enactment of leadership roles and team effectiveness: A field study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17: 387–397.
- Hirsh, J. B., Galinsky, A. D., & Zhong, C. B. (2011). Drunk, powerful, and in the dark: How general processes of disinhibition produce both prosocial and antisocial behavior. *Perspectives in Psychological Science*. 6(5):415–427.
- Jehn, K. A. (1995). A multimethod examination of the benefits and detriments of intragroup conflict. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40: 256-282.
- Jehn, K. A., & Mannix, E. A. (2001). The dynamic nature of conflict: A longitudinal study of intragroup conflict and group performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(2), 238–251.
- Magee, J. C., & Galinsky, A. (2008). Social hierarchy: The self-reinforcing nature of power and status. *Academy of Management Annals*, 2, 351–398.
- Mannix, E. A., & Sauer, S. J. (2006). Status and power in organizational group research: Acknowledging the pervasiveness of hierarchy. In S. R. Thye & E. J. Lawler (Eds.), *Advances in group process* (Vol.23, pp. 149-182). New York: Elsevier.
- Muller, E. N. (1985). Income Inequality, Regime Repressiveness, and Political Violence. *American Sociological Review*, 50: 47-67.
- Nieboer, A., Lindenberg, S., Boomsma, A., Van Bruggen, A. C. & Bruggen, A. C. V. (2005). Dimensions of well-being and their measurement: The SPF-IL Scale. *Social Indicators Research*, 73(3): 313-353
- O'Neill, T. A., Allen, N. J., & Hastings, S. E. (2013). Examining the “pros” and “cons” of team conflict: A team-level meta-analysis of task, relationship, and process conflict. *Human Performance*, 26, 236-260.

- Phillips, D. J. (2001). The promotion paradox: Organizational mortality and employee promotion chances in Silicon Valley law firms, 1946-1996. *American Journal of Sociology*, 106(4), 1058-1098.
- Ridgeway, C. L., Boyle, E. H., Kuipers, K. J., & Robinson, D. T. (1998). How Do Status Beliefs Develop? The Role of Resources and Interactional Experience. *American Sociological Review*, 63(3), 331-350.
- Rudman, L. A. (1998). Self-promotion as a risk factor for women: The cost and benefits of counter-stereotypical impression management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(3), 629-645.
- Segal, D. R. & Knoke, D. (1968). Social Mobility, Status Inconsistency and Partisan Realignment in the United States. *Social Forces*, 47(2), 154-157
- Shah, P. P., Park, J. S., & Jones, S. Team, Dyad, or Both? The cross-level impact of task and relationship conflict on interpersonal trust. (Working paper).
- Simons, T. L., & Peterson, R. S. (2000). Task conflict and relationship conflict in top management teams: the pivotal role of intragroup trust. *Journal of applied psychology*, 85(1), 102.
- Stahl, M. J., Grigsby, D. W., & Gulati, A. (1985). Comparing the Job Choice Exercise and the Multiple Choice Version of the Miner Sentence Completion Scale. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 70(1): 228-232.
- StataCorp. (2013). *Stata Statistical Software: Release 13*. College Station, TX: StataCorp LP.
- Stryker, S. & Macke, A. (1978). Status Inconsistency and Role Conflict. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 4:57-90
- Tannenbaum, A. S., Kavcic, B., Rosner, M., Vianello, M., & Wieser, G. (1974). *Hierarchy in organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Weber, M. (1946). *From Max Weber: Essay in sociology* (H. H. Gerth, & C. W. Mills, Trans). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Willer, R. (2009). A status theory of collective action. In Thye, S.R., & Lawler, E.J. (Eds.) *Advances in Group Processes*, Vol. 26. London, UK: Emerald.

Table 1

<i>Results of Regression Analysis for the Effects of Status-Power inconsistency on Relationship conflict</i>						
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
Power	6.49	6.67	13.49	12.44	2.29	1.00
Status	0.33	0.48	0.17	0.21	0.13	0.12
Power X Status	-45.16	-49.70	-43.14	-36.72	-38.13	-49.81
Age		0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.01
Gender		0.27*	0.32**	0.29*	0.18	0.11
Ethnicity		-0.32*	-0.33**	-0.33**	-0.20*	-0.13
General mental ability		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Extraversion			-0.03	-0.04	0.06	0.04
Agreeableness			-0.11	-0.12	-0.05	-0.02
Conscientiousness			-0.11	-0.10	-0.01	0.00
Neuroticism			-0.07	-0.06	-0.06	-0.02
Openness to experience			-0.15	-0.16	-0.13*	(0.07)
Gender homophily				-0.06	-0.06	-0.07
Race homophily				0.02	0.06	0.06
Age difference				-0.01	0.00	0.00
Process conflict					0.06*	0.06*
Task conflict					0.13**	0.12**
Status conflict					0.47**	0.42**
Constant	1.12**	0.49	2.65*	2.33	0.62	-0.02
Observations	365	298	298	287	287	287
Log likelihood	-191.47	-147.47	-143.88	-128.01	-79.93	-74.29
Note. * p<0.05, ** p<0.01						

Table 2

<i>Results of Regression Analysis for the Effects of Status-Power inconsistency on Process conflict</i>						
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
Power	1.87	9.11	24.66	not converged	6.916	2.28
Status	-0.26	-0.25	0.70		(0.04)	0.04
Power X Status	14.16	11.75	0.78		(24.39)	61.44
Age		0.00	-0.01		-0.02	-0.03
Gender		0.15	0.30		0.08	0.18
Ethnicity		-0.55	-0.39		0.01	0.02
General mental ability		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00
Extraversion			-0.55**		-0.40*	-0.27
Agreeableness			-0.21		-0.15	-0.11
Conscientiousness			-0.07		0.03	-0.06
Neuroticism			0.00		0.08	-0.09
Openness to experience			-0.05		0.06	-0.05
Gender homophily					-0.03	-0.03
Race homophily					0.00	0.01
Age difference					-0.01	-0.01
relationship conflict					0.40**	0.40**
Task conflict					0.21**	0.21**
Status conflict					0.24	0.40**
Constant	2.28**	1.59	4.20		2.47	3.45
Observations	365	298	298		287	287
Log likelihood	-437.12	-351.68	-345.11		-317.27	-310.03
Note. * p<0.05, ** p<0.01						

Table 3

<i>Results of Regression Analysis for the Moderation Effects of Needs for power on the Relationship between Status-Power inconsistency and Process conflict</i>						
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
Power	3.10	7.80	23.69	23.43	10.21	5.15
Status	-0.18	-0.07	0.99	1.05	0.22	0.20
Needs for power	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.01
Power X Status	52.23	70.35	50.97	46.69	27.24	104.22
Power X Needs for power	-4.34	-7.69	-8.86	-9.71	-8.64	-9.52
Status X Needs for power	1.70**	1.77**	1.81**	1.92**	1.57**	1.54**
Power X Status X Needs for power	165.43**	217.73**	219.04**	221.80**	189.92**	180.94**
Age		0.00	-0.01	0.01	-0.02	-0.02
Gender		0.14	0.29	0.29	0.09	0.20
Ethnicity		-0.56	-0.40	-0.40	-0.04	-0.04
General mental ability		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Extraversion			-0.57**	-0.57**	-0.45**	-0.32*
Agreeableness			-0.21	-0.25	-0.18	-0.15
Conscientiousness			-0.12	-0.13	-0.04	-0.11
Neuroticism			0.00	-0.01	0.08	-0.08
Openness to experience			0.01	0.03	0.11	-0.02
Gender homophily				-0.07	-0.06	-0.06
Race homophily				-0.04	-0.01	-0.01
Age difference				-0.02	-0.01	-0.01
Relationship conflict					0.37**	0.38**
Task conflict					0.18*	0.19*
Status conflict					0.16	0.32*
Constant	2.17**	1.89	4.70	4.11	2.99	3.86
Observations	353	289	289	278	278	278
Log likelihood	-415.79	-334.92	-327.7	-315.38	-303.07	-296.62
Note. * p<0.05, ** p<0.01						