THE INFLUENCE OF HEADS OF DEPARTMENT PERSONALITIES ON THE SELECTION OF GRIEVANCE HANDLING STYLES

Zulkiflee Bin Daud (PhD)*
Assoc. Prof. Khulida Kirana Yahya (PhD)**
Mohd. Faizal Mohd. Isa***
Wan Shakizah Wan Mohd Noor****

College of Business
University Utara Malaysia
06010 Sintok, Kedah
Malaysia
E-mail: zulkiflee@uum.edu.my,* khulida@uum.edu.my**
m.faizal@uum.edu.my,*** shakizah@uum.edu.my****

Abstract

Grievance management is an important topic in the area of industrial relations. Research on grievance management is burgeoning, and yet the understanding of its antecedents and consequences remains rather unclear. This research discusses the styles in handling grievances among heads of department at a telecommunication headquarters and branches located in Peninsular Malaysia and the determinant of personalities in selecting the appropriate styles. It was conducted to achieve two main objectives which are to investigate the styles managers use in handling employee grievances and to examine influence of personalities in choosing style used by the managers in handling grievances. The result of factor analysis reveals that the grievance handling styles used by managers in this study are integrating, compromising and dominating. In general, the study reveals that extraversion is negatively and significantly influences the selection of integrating style. Conscientiousness contributes significantly to the prediction of dominating style. Finally, emotional stability is positively and significantly influences compromising style in handling grievances.

Key words: Grievance handling styles, grievance procedure, personality, extraversion, conscientiousness, emotional stability.

1. Introduction

Grievance is defined as any dissatisfaction regarding work and workplace filed by employee formally to his immediate supervisor (Rose, 2004). An organization establishes a grievance procedure to give an avenue to the employee to file his or her dissatisfactions. The establishment of grievance procedure is in line with the principle of "due process" (Mante-Meija & Enid, 1991) which guarantees the application of procedural justice and ethical decision making in an organization. Besides the establishment of grievance procedure will resolve employees' dissatisfaction fairly, behavior of personnel who handle grievance also brings effect to the employee's satisfaction on the result of grievance resolution. Managers will handle grievances referred to them base on their personality reference. Therefore, this research assumes that managers' personalities have to be investigated to determine its influence on manager's style in handling grievances.

2 Literature Review
2.1 Background of Study

Issues of grievances are normally associated with dissatisfaction among employees which related to working procedure, working facilities (Bean, 1994), confusions on provisions stated in company's policy (Ayadurai, 1996) and the violation of provisions in terms and conditions of employment stated in collective agreement (Salamon, 2000). In resolving grievances, aggrieved employees will file their dissatisfaction through grievance procedure and their immediate managers or supervisors are responsible to take action within period given. This procedure is important to deny the construction of employees' dispute (Rose, 2004). Settling grievances as near as its origin is important in order to deny the construction of employees' disputes. Therefore, immediate supervisors are responsible to settle the grievance as they are the nearest personnel that represent managerial team. The argument on the vital role played by supervisors in managing employees' grievances paralleled that of past studies. Study made by Rollinson, et.al (1996) has identified that complaints are quite common and only extends to taking-up a matter informally with a supervisor. As maintained by Catlett and Brown (1990), there are a number of decisions making points in the grievance handling process that potentially involve the supervisor.

Clark (1988) identified that correlation coefficients showed strong relationship between attitude toward the grievance procedure and attitude of the supervisors. Labig and Greer (1988) denote that a high number of grievances in a unit or subunit can be indicative of many factors, including both effective and ineffective supervisory performance. Bemmels and Reshef (1991) mentioned that in a specific work group, many grievances are in response to specific behaviors by the supervisors. Hence, this present research has targeted supervisors as unit of analysis. According to Clark (1988) and Bemmels and Reshef (1991) supervisors' behavior and personal attitudes may affect their styles in handling grievance through grievance procedure. Thus, this study tends to evaluate the effect of personality on the selection of appropriate grievance handling styles among immediate supervisors.

2.2 Definition of Grievance

Grievance is a matter raised by employee to express dissatisfaction with management behavior and is an attempt to bring out changes (D'Cruz, 1999). Grievance involves an individual's claiming that he or she has suffered or been wronged, often because of the actions or decisions made by the manager acting on behalf of the organization (Anderson & Gunderson, 1982). A substantiated grievance is a signal that a manager's behavior was in error or manager has breach worker's right (Meyer, 1994). Often in organizations, the grievance arises because of lack of clarity in the explicit company's rules (Hook, et. al, 1996). Noe, Hollenbeck, Gerhart & Wright, (2003) pointed out that too many grievances may indicate a problem but so may too few. According to them, a very low grievance rate may suggest a fear of filing a grievance, a belief that the grievance procedure is not effective or a belief that representation is not adequate.

2.3 Grievance Handling Styles

Styles in handling employee's conflicts may give an impact in industrial relation culture (Holt & Devore, 2005). A unitary organization is more centralize (Rose, 2004). As a result, avoidance and dominating styles may be utilized in resolving grievances (Green, 1987). On the other hand, a bilateral organization which is more decentralizing (Rose, 2004) may employ compromising, integrating or obliging styles when confronting with employee's grievances (Rahim, 1983). Rahim's (1983) study has constructed independent scales to measure five styles in handling conflict namely integrating, obliging, compromising, dominating and avoiding.

2.3.1 Integrating Style

Integrating styles involves high concern for self as well as the other party involved in conflict. It is concerned with collaboration between parties (for example openness, exchange of information and examination of differences) to reach an acceptable solution to both parties (Rahim & Magner, 1995). Thomas and Kilmann (1974) labeled this style as collaborating mode. Collaborating mode refers to the ability of manager to work with his or her employee to find a solution that fully satisfies the concerns of both. Collaborating between two persons might take the form of exploring a disagreement to learn from each other's insight, with the goal of resolving some condition that would otherwise have them competing for resources, or confronting and trying to find a creative solution to an interpersonal problem (Thomas & Kilmann, 1974).

2.3.2 Obliging Style

Obliging styles involves low concern for self. An obliging person attempts to emphasize commonalities to satisfy the concern of the other party (Rahim & Magner, 1995). Thomas and Kilmann (1974) named this style as accommodating mode. To Thomas and Kilmann (1974) individual performing accommodating style neglects his or her own concerns to satisfy the concerns of the other person. In accommodating style, managers might take the form of selfless generosity or charity, obeying another person's needs and prefer to yield another's point of view.

2.3.3 Compromising Style

In compromising, this style involves moderate concern for self as well as the other party involved in conflict. It is associated with give-and-take or sharing whereby both parties give up something to make a mutually acceptable decision (Rahim & Magner, 1995). Compromising style also refers to splitting the difference, exchanging concessions or seeking a quick middle-ground position (Thomas & Kilmann, 1974).

2.3.4 Dominating Style

Dominating style involves high concern for self and low concern for the other party involved in the conflict. It has been identified with a win-lose orientation or with forcing behavior to win position (Rahim & Magner, 1995). Thomas and Kilmann (1974) portrayed dominating style as power-oriented mode or competing style. A dominating manager always stands up with his or her rights, defending a position that his or her opinion is correct and simply trying to win.

2.3.5   Avoiding Style

Avoiding style is associated with low concern for self as well as for the other party involved in conflict. It has been associated with withdrawal, passing-the-buck, sidestepping or "see no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil" situations (Rahim & Magner, 1995). Avoiding might take the form of diplomatically sidestepping an issue, postponing an issue until a better time or simply withdrawing from a threatening situation (Thomas & Kilmann, 1974).

2.4 Personality

Personality can be defined as the sum total of ways in which an individual reacts and interacts with others (Robbins, 2005). To Pervin and John (2001), personality represents those characteristics of the person that account for consistent patterns of feeling, thinking and behaving. Personality may represent a person's value judgment. A person may have a good personality or bad personality according to his or her belief, culture and surrounding environment. In handling grievances, supervisors may use different styles of resolution according to their perception and understanding on grievance issues referred to them. They too may resolve grievances in a bad and good way, due to their personality. According to Blake and Mouton (1968) personality is one of the factors that influence managerial styles. As stated by Robbins (2005), individual consideration on certain issue is based on their personality which rooted by heredity (for example gender, muscle reflexes and energy level), environment (for example culture that form individual personality) and situation.

In general individual traits are manifest in his behavior (McCrae & John, 1992). Blake, Mouton, Barnes, & Greiner, (1964) showed that manager's traits play a vital role in the process of making decision. Individual's traits become fundamental in describing his personality (Pervin & John, 2001) which affects the consistency of patterns in the way individuals behave, feel and think (William, Jr. & Davis, 1996).

This research has utilized Big-Five model. Robbins (2005) stated that many researches have supported the Big-Five model as five basic dimensions encompass human personality. McCrae and John (1992) also agree that Five-factor model is the best dimension to describe personality. Five-factor model refers to five basic factors in human personality namely extraversion, neuroticism, openness, agreeableness and conscientiousness (Pervin & John, 2001). A study by John and Sanjay (1999) supported the reliability of Big-Five in measuring individual's personality. They indicated that these five dimensions have represented personality at the broadest level of abstraction. Each dimension summarized a large number of distinct and more specific defining personality characteristics. In TDA, five dimensions of personality that being measured are extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability and imagination.

2.4.1   Extraversion

Extraversion implies an energetic approach toward the social and material world and includes traits such as sociability, activity, assertiveness and positive emotionality (John & Sanjay, 1999). This dimension captures one's comfort level with relationships (Robbins, 2005). Low score in extraversion will portray an individual as quiet, task-oriented (Pervin & John, 2001) and feel too timid to engage in a problem-solving conversation with others (Antonioni, 1998). This study assumes in selecting styles in handling grievance, extravert managers will show their cooperation in grievance negotiation session, actively construct alternatives for grievance resolution and talkative in terms of conveying information. Extravert managers are more concerned to others.

2.4.2   Agreeableness

Agreeableness refers to the behavioral tendency to agree with others. Managers with high degree of agreeableness tend to have traits such as altruism, tender-mindedness, trust and modesty (John & Sanjay, 1999). In contrast, managers with low degree in this dimension have a propensity to defer with others. Highly agreeable people are cooperative (Antonioni, 1998) and warm (Robbins, 2005). Agreeableness appears to involve the more humane aspects of humanity (McCrae & John, 1992) and this dimension assesses the quality of one's interpersonal orientation (Pervin & John, 2001). Persons with high in agreeableness would recognize the importance of finding resolution satisfactory to all persons involved and would be more likely to endorse constructive resolution tactics (Jensen-Campbell, Gleason, Adams & Malcolm, 2003). Therefore managers with agreeableness personality were expected to be more concerned for others in selecting style in handling grievances.

2.4.3   Conscientiousness

Conscientiousness describes individuals who tied with task-and-goal-directed behavior. Conscientious managers tend to show behaviors such as thinking before acting, delaying gratification, following norms and rules and planning and organizing and prioritizing tasks (John & Sanjay, 1999). A highly conscientious individual is responsible and persistent (Robbins, 2005) and prepared for mutual problem solving (Antonioni, 1998).

Conscientious managers believe in good and sound facts and information in order to reach satisfactorily grievance management result. Once grievance resolution was reached, conscientious managers will plan, organize, direct and control the implementation. They will make sure that employees follow the actions that have been planned and submitting the feedback for controlling purpose. This study assumes in performing styles in handling grievances, conscientious managers may equally concern for themselves as well as their subordinates.

2.4.4   Emotional stability versus neuroticism

Neuroticism is a dimension that contrasts with emotional stability. Neuroticism related with negative emotionality, such as feeling anxious, nervous, and sad and tense (John & Sanjay, 1999). Neuroticism taps a person's ability to withstand stress (Robbins, 2005). People with neuroticism personality were prone to psychological distress, unrealistic idea and maladaptive coping responses (Pervin & John, 2001). In selecting styles in resolving grievance, managers must be relax and not in stress situation. This will help them to come up with realistic idea and good grievance resolution alternatives. Therefore, in handling grievances, managers must be emotionally stable.

2.4.5   Openness to experience (intellect)

Openness describes the breadth, depth, originality and complexity of an individual's mental and experiential life (John & Sanjay, 1999). This final dimension of personality addresses a person's range of interest and fascination with novelty (Robbins, 2005), appreciation of experience for its own sake and toleration for and exploration of the unfamiliar (Pervin & John, 2001). According to Antonioni (1998), low openness may be related to the avoidance, rigidity and resistance to new ideas. Tolerance with employees in grievance management drives managers to cooperate and hear employees' point of views in grievance negotiation. This action helps the grievance process to be managed in harmonious environment. On the other hand, low openness personality among heads of department may direct to the utilization of avoidance and dominating grievance handling styles.

3. Research Methodology

The objective of this study is to investigate the effect of independent variables understudied including procedural justice, ethical ideologies, individualism-collectivism culture, personality, training and experience on the selection of appropriate grievance handling styles. Based on the objective, this research is categorized as causal type of research and classified as correlational research. Zikmund (2003) defined causal research as research conducted to identify cause -and-effect relationships among variables when the research problem has already been narrowly defined. According to Gay and Diehl (1996), correlation research is a research to determine whether, and to what degree, a relationship exists between two or more quantifiable variables. Population of the study involved heads of department at a telecommunication company in Peninsular Malaysia who have experiences in handling their subordinates' grievances. In determining samples of the study, this study employed disproportionate stratified random sampling as sampling framework. The researcher first indicated sampling frame and followed by stratification of samples. Once the stratified samples have been determined, random sampling procedure was employed to identify the respondents. From 302 distributed questionnaires, 150 of them were collected and from these total, 67 questionnaires were usable for further analysis.

3.1 Research Instrument

This study utilized Rahim's (1983) styles in handling interpersonal conflict i.e. integrating, compromising, dominating, obliging and avoiding to measure styles in handling grievances. Rahim and Magner (1995) have constructed Rahim's Organizational Conflict Index (ROCI-II), the instrument to measure five styles in handling interpersonal conflict indicated by Rahim (1983). This instrument is considered as the best-known questionnaires that can be used to describe their perceived use of the five styles in handling interpersonal conflict (Munduate, et al., 1999). Test-retest reliability of ROCI-11 ranged between .60 and .83 at *p* <.0001 (Rahim & Magner, 1995). These values showed that internal consistency reliability of the instrument were satisfactory. In measuring personality of head of departments involved in this study, this study has adopted instrument established by Bamber and Castka (2006). Bamber and Castka (2006) have simplified the TDA instrument into 28 items which also covered 5 dimensions of personality that established by Goldberg. The Cronbach Alpha values for personality instrument developed by Bamber and Castka (2006) were extraversion (.86), emotional stability (.85), conscientiousness (.77), imagination (.61) and agreeableness (.74).

4. Data Analysis
4.1 Respondents' Profile

The respondents involved 65.7% (n=44) male and 34.3% female (n=23). Ages of respondents were ranging between 22 to 54 years of age with approximately 22.39% reporting their age to be under 30 years of age.

Table 4.28 reports that 7 respondents were between 30-33 years of age; 2 respondents were between 34-37 years of age; 17 respondents were between 38-41 years of age; 19 respondents were age ranging 42-45 and 46-49 years old respectively; and 6 respondents were between 50-54 years of age. Table 4.28 also showed that from the total of 67 respondents, 97% or 65 were Malay, 1.5% Chinese and 1.5% were Indian respectively. Majority of respondents reported that they have a degree as their highest education level. It was recorded that 39 respondents were degree graduates. In addition, 14 respondents finished their education in diploma level.

4.2 Factor Analysis

Factor analysis is performed to summarize the structure of a set of variables. This analysis is an additional means of determining whether items are tapping into the same construct (Coakes & Steed, 2003). The general purpose of factor analysis is to summarize the information contained in a large number of variables into a smaller number of factors (Zikmund, 2003). Before the factor analysis being executed, the researcher first examined anti-image correlation, KMO test and Bartlett's test of sphericity. In examining anti-image correlation, the researchers executed anti-image matrices and the result showed that all measures of sampling adequacy (MSA) values for all variables are well above the acceptable level of .5. In addition partial correlations results show all values are not exceeding .7. Hence, the variables are appropriate for factor analysis. Other tests that this study performed to ensure the appropriateness to conduct factor analysis were Bartlett test and KMO measurement. To sum up the results from factor analysis process, table 1 exhibits overall results including measurement for sampling adequacy (Bartlett and KMO tests) and reliability test (Cronbach alpha values).

4.3 Hypotheses of the Research

Results from factor analysis result showed that only three styles were reliable to be studied for further analyses. Those styles were integrating, compromising and dominating styles. In personality only four dimensions were extracted instead of five as stated by Bamber and Castka (2006). The dimensions were agreeableness, emotional stability, conscientiousness and extraversion. Therefore, the hypotheses for this research are as follow:

H1: *Extraversion personality is significantly influences grievance handling styles.*
H2: *Agreeableness personality is significantly influences grievance handling styles.*
H3: *Conscientiousness personality is significantly influences grievance handling styles.*
H4: *Emotional stability personality is significantly influences grievance handling styles.*

4.4 Styles of Handling Grievances among Heads of Department

Descriptive analyses were carried out to identify the most preferable grievance handling styles among heads of department. The mean values for the three grievance handling styles performed by respondents are shown in table 2. In general, respondents preferred some styles over others. The respondents reported that integrating style was the first preference when confronting with the aggrieved party. Compromising and dominating styles became second and third preference. This result showed that in handling grievances, besides considering their views and thought, heads of department also taking into account their subordinates views and opinion.

4.5 Relationship between Personality and Styles of Handling Grievances.

The relationships between personality dimensions and grievance handling styles are shown by table 3.

The relationships between agreeableness and integrating; and agreeableness and compromising were strong. Their *r* values were .547 and .544. These relationships were positively significant at $\rho < .05$. The relationships between agreeableness and dominating; integrating and conscientiousness; and compromising and conscientiousness were significant and highly moderated. The *r* value for these relationships were .483, .481 and .396 respectively. Other relationships were not significant and they were categorized as weak. These relationships were between integration and emotional stability; compromising and emotional stability and dominating and extraversion. The relationship between emotional stability and dominating style; and extraversion and compromising were in a form of negative relationship.

4.6 Regression Analysis

Results from regression analysis allow the researcher to accept or reject hypotheses constructed in this study.

4.6.1   Regression Analysis between Integrating Style and Personalities.

The *t* test and significance levels allow the researcher to assess each variable's unique contribution to the prediction of the dependent variable. From table 4 it was found that only extraversion was significantly predicted the selection of integrating style. The direction of prediction was negative.

4.6.2   Regression Analysis Dominating and Factors That Influence the Selection of Styles in Handling Grievances.

Through table 5 it was found that only conscientiousness was statistically significant predicting the dominating style based on significance level of $\rho < .05$ and the direction of prediction was negative.

4.6.3   Regression Analysis Compromising and Factors That Influence the Selection of Styles in Handling Grievances.

The *t* test and significance levels allow the researcher to assess each variable's unique contribution to the prediction of the dependent variable. From table 6 it was found that emotional stability was statistically significant to the prediction of compromising style based on significance level of .05. The direction of prediction was positive.

Therefore, the following hypotheses are partially supported:

H1:   *Extraversion personality is significantly influences grievance handling styles.*
H3:   *Conscientiousness personality is significantly influences grievance handling styles.*
H4:   *Emotional stability personality is significantly influences grievance handling styles.*

While hypothesis H2 that stated agreeableness personality is significantly influences grievance handling styles is rejected.

5. Discussion

5.1 Grievance Handling Styles Employed by Heads of Department

The first objective of this study was to investigate styles that heads of department performed in handling grievances. Results from factor analysis and reliability test have revealed that there were three reliable styles in handling grievances performed by heads of department. These three handling styles were integrating, compromising and dominating respectively. Integrating and compromising grievance handling styles are used to handle issues of grievance involving work and working environment. In performing these styles, both aggrieved parties can discuss and construct alternatives for grievance resolution. Hence, participation from heads of department and aggrieved employees is important to communicate arguments, views and opinions on grievance issues. This behavior was in line with culture in a unionized company which encourages cooperative approach in handling conflict. In integrating grievance handling style, heads of department emphasized unity of effort with aggrieved subordinate. Both parties will exchange information and facts in discussing grievance issues. Constructive communication becomes essential in this style. Heads of department who performed integrating style believed that grievance negotiation will promote innovation, creativity and development of new ideas which help to eliminate employees' frustration on grievance resolution result.

To resolve grievances with this particular style, both parties have to utilize their wisdom to identify grievance issue and applying relevant procedures and employment lawsuits to innovate good alternatives for resolution. Furthermore, creativity from both parties is needed to select and implement the best alternative. As a result, both parties reached mutual and satisfactorily grievance resolution result. Compromising style was the second preference in grievance resolution style among heads of department. Heads of department who performed compromising style always search for middle ground by evaluating current grievance with rules and regulations, terms and conditions of employment and result from precedent cases. In making decision with middle ground approach, compromising heads of department will make sure that grievance resolution outcomes resulted from grievance discussion with aggrieved employee were in line with statutory provisions. Compromising heads of department tended to choose middle ground in resolving grievance because they were moderately concern for self and others. Hence, they emphasized on resolving grievances without ignoring some consideration on employees.

To them, they do not work on grievance resolution for excellent in performance and do not expect ideal relationship with employees. Compromising heads of department tried to avoid behavior that might be seen to deviate from established practices, norms, traditions and rules and regulations. Therefore, in compromising style both formal and informal communications are important. Formal communication is used to convey policies and rules and regulations while informal communication is used to communicate company's norms and values in order to strengthen the relationship between heads of department and their subordinates. Formal communication is vital to get acceptable results by utilizing company's rules and regulation as well as employment practices. While informal communication is important to avoid actions that would upset the employees and exposed the managers to criticism. In resolving grievance, compromising heads of department will plan the alternatives for resolution, explain the alternatives, insure that the aggrieved employee agree with the alternatives, select the best alternative mutually with the aggrieved employee and monitor the result.

Thus, result from compromising grievance resolution was likely a result where heads of department and aggrieved subordinate were jointly decided and executed the grievance resolution together. The least preferred style in grievance handling among heads of department was dominating style. As a unionized company, the company always emphasizes on cooperative working environment among employees. Therefore, dominating style became the least preferred style in grievance resolution among heads of department. Heads of department who apply dominating style were always concerned with their position and authority. This is because dominating style was highly concern for self and low concern for others (Rahim, 1983). Normally, dominating style was only been used if there was a challenge on company's policies or employment contract (Rose, 2004) or if the managers felt that their status and authority were being challenge (Bemmels & Janice, 1996). Heads of department at the company performed dominating style especially on issues related with terms and conditions of employment and company's policies, rules and regulations. In performing dominating style, heads of department believed that subordinates' views and opinions were unnecessary and not important. They also believed that subordinates were lacked of knowledge in employment lawsuits, terms and conditions of employment and company's policies. Therefore, in grievance resolution regarding these issues, heads of department who performed dominating style used their knowledge and discretion by referring to company's policy, collective agreement and other statutory documents.

In dominating style, heads of department will decide the resolution solely and they will direct the aggrieved subordinate to implement the resolution. This research has revealed that avoiding and obliging styles were not performed by heads of department in order to handle grievances. There are two plausible explanations to describe this result. Firstly, result from factor analysis only extracted four styles including integrating, compromising, dominating and unidentified. Unfortunately, the forth style that consisted with one item of avoiding and obliging respectively was not reliable according to the value of alpha. Hence, this style was discarded from further analysis. Secondly, in grievance management, immediate supervisor cannot avoid from dealing with employee's grievances. The responsibility to handle grievance has been stated in Article 14 in collective agreement between the company and the employees' union which urged that all heads of department in the company were responsible and cannot avoid from confronting with subordinates' grievances. Hence, avoiding style was not performed by heads of department when facing with grievances.

Besides avoiding style, obliging style was also the style that heads of department not preferred to employ in handling grievances. This is because obliging style as its definition was highly concern for others and low concern for self. According to this definition, when disagreements appeared, managers and subordinate will discuss on those things until mutual resolution was reached. They will not fight on issues that do not seem to be resolvable because managers concerned with employees' feelings. Hence, a long time frame is preferred in discussion process in order to reach satisfactorily outcome. In practice, heads of department were given only seven working days to solve grievances. Therefore, obliging style is not practical in handling subordinate's grievance.

5.2 The Relationship Between Managers' Personality and The Selection of Grievance Handling Styles

The next objective examined by this present study was to investigate the influence of heads' of department personality on the selection of grievance handling style. There were four dimensions of personalities involved in this study. These personalities were conscientiousness, agreeableness, emotional stability and extraversion. From the regression analysis performed in this present study, it was found that extraversion personality was a significant predictor to integrating style. Although in correlation analysis, extraversion personality was not significantly associated with integrating grievance handling style but in regression analysis this particular personality was a significant predictor to integrating style. This result was due to the effect of other dimension's variance in regression model on the variance of extraversion dimension with integrating style. This situation is called compounding effect.

A compounding effect is basically a collection of reference to other effects. In this study when correlation analysis was performed between extraversion and integrating style no significant relationship was found because in correlation analysis, extraversion was examined singularly with integrating style. However in regression analysis when all dimensions understudied were considered, extraversion became a significant predictor to integrating style in handling grievances because the variances of other dimensions effect the prediction of extraversion on integrating grievance handling style. Unfortunately, regression analysis result showed that extraversion personality was negatively influenced integrating grievance handling style. To explain the negative prediction of extraversion personality on the integrating style in handling grievances, the researcher has referred to the character of both variables. Extrovert person concerned with sociability. To extrovert heads of department, participation from employee was vital to provide employees' point of views on issue of grievance.

In grievance discussion heads of department will exchange information with employee so that employee will know the statutory provisions underlie the grievance issue. From these facts heads of department will evaluate facts gathered in grievance discussion with aggrieved employee and information they collected from company's policy and terms and conditions of employment to produce alternatives for grievance solution. Unfortunately, Blake and Mouton (1964) has exhibited barriers in implementing this style. Blake and Mouton (1964) have coded that resolving conflicts through direct confrontation (integrating style) will constitute resistance for example creating fear situation among conflicting employee. This resistance was due to inferiority feeling towards head of department because different level of status. Moreover, getting conflict into open discussion constituted a long period of times including discussion period to gather opinions from aggrieved employee regarding grievance issue, period to collect information regarding company's policy and terms and conditions of employment, time spent to construct alternatives for grievance resolution and time needed to select the best alternative for grievance resolution. In the grievance procedure at the company, it has been stated that heads of department were obligated to resolve grievances within seven working days. If heads of department use to be extravert, they may needed more time in handling grievance with integrating style.

Hence, heads of department who have extraversion personality did not perform integrating grievance handling style. Therefore, in the regression analysis result it was revealed that the influence of extraversion personality was negative on the selection of integrating grievance handling style. The negative influence of extraversion on integrating style in handling grievance of this study has supported finding showed by Jones and White (1985) where the researchers exhibited that although confrontation strategy (integrating style) was predicted by deference personality (need to undertake activities with friends rather than alone), the relationship between these two variables was negative. According to Jones and White (1985) even though managers used confrontation (win-win) strategy in resolving conflict, not all situations they have to discuss with their subordinates. For issues involving company's profit and goals, managers will used their discretion and wisdom after gathering information from employees.

In handling grievance heads of department must be emotionally stable. Emotional stability person have an ability to withstand stress (Barrick & Mount, 1991) and rational (Robbins, 2005) when facing with employee's dissatisfaction. As depicted by table 4.46, this study has revealed that emotional stability was a significant predictor for compromising style. This table also showed that the influence of emotional stability on compromising style was positive. This positive influential has defined that to hinder from stress in handling conflict, heads of department at the company tend to choose compromising style because in pursuing this style they tended to take middle ground and took majority opinion in grievance resolution process. Rahim and Magner (1995) portrayed compromising style as a style that associated with give-and-take where both conflicting parties give up something in their attempt to make a mutually acceptable decision. Therefore, when heads of department decided to perform compromising style in handling grievance, they attempted to absorb stress that created by aggrieved subordinate in order to resolve their subordinate's grievance by using give-and-take approach and took middle ground in making decision. In compromising style of handling conflict, in order to have satisfactorily solution, open discussion was pursued between conflicting parties (Thomas, 1976).

Open discussion was conducted to communicate formal information for instance company's policy and terms and conditions of employment and informal information such as company's tradition and values. As stated by Blake and Mouton (1964) personality for managers who implementing compromising style always felt self confident in managing conflict by respecting norms and tradition and avoiding behavior that might be seen to deviate from established practices. Therefore emotional stability was proved as a significant predictor for compromising style. The prediction of emotional stability on compromising style of grievance handling has supported result revealed by DeSivilya and Yagil (2005) where the researchers found that positive emotion was significantly predicted compromising style. To Antonioni (1998) and Moberg (2001) high level of emotional stability will help to create a relaxed interaction and less vulnerable, thus it promotes the selection of compromising style.

Although in handling grievances, heads of department have to handle stress effectively and encouraged employees to participate in grievance discussion, they also must set an aim to resolve grievances satisfactorily and mutually in order to hinder employees' frustration on grievance resolution result. Heads of department have to become task-and-goal oriented, organized in grievance resolution process, following norms and practices and prepared for mutual grievance resolution. Therefore, they must have conscientiousness personality. Even though in correlation analysis it was found that conscientiousness personality was not significantly related with dominating style, however, in regression analysis of this study, conscientiousness personality was a significant predictor for dominating style.

This is due to the compounding effect where in correlation analysis, the relationship was examined between conscientiousness and dominating style. But in regression analysis when all dimensions understudied were considered as one model the variance from other dimensions effected the variance between conscientiousness and dominating style. Therefore, it was possible that conscientiousness was a significant predictor for dominating style. This study also revealed that conscientiousness personality was negatively influenced the usage of dominating style. Although the relationship as depicted in correlation analysis was positive but the strength of the relationship or correlation coefficient was low ($r = 0.037$). In regression analysis the direction of the influential between conscientiousness personality and dominating style has changed to negative because when the researcher performed regression analysis, the variances of all dimensions understudied were calculated. As maintained by Meyers, et. al (2006), positive and negative regression weight of the predictor reflect the nature of their respective correlation within the dependent variable, therefore, in this present study, the influential of conscientiousness on dominating style was negative.

Follow is the plausible explanation for the negative influential of conscientiousness personality on dominating grievance handling style. In conscientiousness personality heads of department were seeking for mutual resolution through planned and organized grievance resolution activities. Heads of department will convey facts regarding company's practices and terms and condition of employment so that aggrieved employee can be informed about company's rules and regulation and their rights in employment contract. Furthermore, heads of department conducted grievance discussion to listen views and opinions from aggrieved employees regarding grievance issue. Alternatives for grievance resolution were generated by examining issue of grievance and information gathered. The examination of information was done in order to get satisfactorily grievance resolution result that complied with company's policy and collective agreement. On the other hand in performing dominating style, heads of department will consider their views on grievance issue without considering others opinion.

In making decision in dominating style, heads of department will not tolerate with the aggrieved employee. Therefore, due to different approaches between conscientiousness personality and dominating style in handling grievance, the influential was depicted as negative. The negative prediction of conscientiousness personality on dominating style in this study has supported study conducted by Jensen-Campbell, Gleason, Adams and Malcolm (2003) where these researchers have exhibited that conscientiousness personality was significantly and negatively predicting physical force strategy in handling conflict. With the explanations regarding the influence of personality dimensions including extraversion, emotional stability and conscientiousness on grievance handling styles, hence, this study has reached its objective to examine the influence of heads of department personality on grievance handling style.

6. Conclusion

This study has revealed that extraversion was the significant predictor for the integrating grievance handling style. Even though integrating style was the best style in resolving conflict because it concentrated with win-win resolution, however, in handling grievances, extraversion personality and training result were negatively influenced the selection of this style. This result showed that extraversion heads of department will not perform integrating style when they handled grievances. In addition, heads of department were not applying their knowledge, skill and abilities to perform integrating style to increase the grievance resolution rate. In performing integrating style, heads of department will encourage participation from aggrieved employees and union representative. They also made a reference to human resource department to gather managerial information for example company's policy and employment statutory provisions. In order to evaluate information from human resource department and aggrieved employees, grievance discussions were conducted. In grievance discussion, heads of department, aggrieved employee and union representative will exchange information and produced alternatives for resolution.

These grievance resolution alternatives were then being evaluated and examined in order to decide the grievance resolution result. Grievance discussions may be conducted several times until both aggrieved parties agreed and satisfied with the grievance resolution result. Therefore, performing integrating style may need a longer period of resolution activities. In addition, heads of department who have extraversion personality were social and assertive oriented. They tended to reach satisfactorily and mutually grievance resolution result. They implemented grievance handling activities according to the procedure without put aside social obligation. When they performed participative grievance resolution in integrating grievance handling style, they will ensure that cooperative discussions were conducted to hinder frustration among aggrieved employees with decision made in grievance discussion. Unfortunately, grievance procedure has stated that heads of department were responsible to resolve any grievance referred to them within seven working days.

Hence, performing integrating style may be not practical in resolving grievances especially to heads of department who were committed with resolving grievances within seven working days. Besides integrating style, dominating style was another style employed in grievance handling among heads of department. Normally, dominating style was performed to handle issues of grievance involving company's rules and regulations and terms and conditions of employment. In dominating style, heads of department have decided the grievance resolution result without discussing with aggrieved employee or union representative. Communication between head of department and aggrieved employees only occurred to convey information and facts regarding company's policy and collective agreement. This is due to this particular style was highly concerned for self and low concerned for other. Hence, views and opinions from employees were not considered in deciding grievance resolution outcome. In the multiple regression analysis result it was also exhibited that conscientiousness personality was a significant predictor to dominating grievance handling style. Unfortunately the direction of the relationship was negative.

This implied that conscientious heads of department not performed dominating style. It was because conscientious heads of department were task-and-goal oriented, always thinking before acting and prepared for mutual problem solving. This personality encouraged good employer-employee relationship to maintain harmonious working environment. Unfortunately, in implementing dominating grievance handling style, heads of department were not considered employees' point of views. Therefore, heads of department with conscientiousness personality will not performed dominating style in order to reach better working environment and uphold organizational cooperative norms. Compromising style was another style that was utilized in resolving employees' grievances. Heads of department who performed this particular style always being tolerance with aggrieved employees and seeks for middle position because they tended to receive majority consensus. Formal and informal communications were important in implementing compromising grievance handling style.

Formal communication channel was used to convey company's rules and regulations as well as terms and conditions of employment. Informal communication was utilized to express the company's norms and traditions. Using compromising grievance handling style may reduce employees' frustration and enhanced mutual and satisfactorily grievance resolution result. By employing this style in handling grievances, heads of department considered other ethical judgment as ethical grievance resolution result. They will decide a fair and just grievance handling outcome through grievance procedure by allowing aggrieved employee to involve in grievance discussion. When the employees were satisfied with the decision making process they will not express their dissatisfaction on grievance handling process. This will encourage heads of department to make decision in calm and emotionally stable. Therefore, in handling grievances emotional stability became a predictor to compromising handling style among heads of department.

References

Anderson, J.C., & Gunderson, M. (1982). *Union-Management Relations In Canada*. Ontario, Canada: Addison-Wesley Publishers.

Antonioni, D. (1998). Relationship Between The Big Five Personality Factors And Conflict Management Styles. *International Journal of Conflict Management,* 9 (4), 336-355.

Ayadurai, D., 1996. *Industrial Relations in Malaysia: Law and Practice* 2nd edition. Kuala Lumpur: Malayan Law Journal.

Bamber, D., & Castka, P. (2006). Personality, Organizational Orientations and Self-Reported Learning Outcomes. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 18 (2), 73-92.

Barrick, M.R., & Mount, M.K. (1991). The Big Five Personality Dimensions and Job Performance: A Meta Analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, Spring 1991, 1-26.

Bean, R. (1994). Comparative Industrial Relations: An Introduction To Cross-National Perspectives. 2nd Edition. London: Routledge.

Bemmels, B., & Janice, F.R. (1996). Grievance Procedure Research: A Review and Theoretical Recommendations. *Journal of Management,* 22(3), 359-385.

Bemmels, B., & Resyef, Y. (1991). The Roles of Supervisors, Employees and Stewards in Grievance Initiation. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review,* 45 (1), 15-31.

Blake, R.R., & Mouton, J.S., 1968. *Corporate Excellent Through Grid Organization Developmen,* Houston, Texas: Gulf Publishing Company.

Blake, R.R., Mouton, J.S., Barnes, L.B., & Greiner, L.E. (1964). Breakthrough in Organizational Development. *Harvard Business Review*, Nov-Dis. 1964, 133-155.

Clark, F.C. (1988), The role of the steward in shaping union member attitudes toward the grievance procedure. *Labor Studies Journal*, Fall 1998.

Coakes, S.J., & Steed, L.G. (2003). SPSS: Analysis Without Anguish: Version 11.0 For Windows. Queensland, Australia: John Wiley & Sons.

D'Cruz, M.N. (1999). *A Practical Guide to Grievance Procedure, Misconduct and Domestic Inquiry.* Kuala Lumpur: Leeds Publication.

Desivilya, H.S., & Yagil, D. (2005). The Role of Emotions in Conflict Management: The Case of Work Team. *The International Journal of Conflict Management*, 16(1), 55-69.

Gay, L.R., & Diehl, P.L. (1996). *Research Methods for Business and Management.* Singapore: International Edition. Simon & Schruster (Asia) Pte. Ltd.

Green, G.D. (1987). *Industrial Relations.* 2nd Edition. London: Pitman Publishing.

Holt, J.L., & Devore, C.J. (2005). Culture, Gender, Organizational Role and Styles of Conflict Resolution: A Meta-Analysis. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 29(2), 165-196.

Hook, C.M., Rollinson, D.J., Foot, M., & Handley, J. (1996). Supervisor and Management Styles in Handling Discipline And Grievance (part one): Comparing Styles in Handling Discipline And Grievance. *Personnel Review*, 25(3), 20-34.

Jensen-Champbell, L.A., Gleason, K.A., Adams, R., & Malcolm, K.T. (2003). Interpersonal Conflict, Agreeableness and Personality Development. *Journal of Personality*, 71(6), 1059-1086.

John, O.P., & Sanjay, S. (1999). The Big-Five Trait Taxonomy: History, Measurement and Theoretical Perspectives. In Pervin, L. and John, O.P (eds). 1999. *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research.* 2nd edition. New York: Guilford.

Jones, R.E., & White, C.S. (1985). Relationships Among Personality, Conflict Resolution Styles and Task Effectiveness. *Group and Organization Studies*, 10(2) 152-167.

Labig, C.E., & Greer, C.R. (1988). Grievance Initiation: A Literature Survey and Suggestion for Future Research. *Journal of Labor Research*, IX(1), 1-27.

Mante-Meija, Enid, A. (1991). Designing An Instrument For Resolving Individual Conflict In "Total" Institution. *Knowledge & Policy*, 4(3), 58-73.

McCrae, R.R., & John, O.P. (1992). An Introduction to the Five-Factor Model And Its Applications. *Journal of Personality*, 60, 175-215.

Meyer, D. (1994). The Political Effects of Grievance Handling by Stewards In a Local Union. *Journal of Labor Research*. 15(1), 33-52.

Moberg, P.J. (2001). Linking Conflict Strategy to the Five-Factor Model: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations. *The International Journal of Conflict Management*, 12(1), 47-68.

Munduate, L., Ganaza, J., Peiro, J.M., & Euwema, M. (1999). Patterns of Style in Conflict Management And Effectiveness. *The International Journal of Conflict Management*, 10(1), 5-24.

Noe, R.A., Hollenbeck, J.R., Gerhart, B., & Wright, P.M. (2003). *Human Resource Management.* New York: Mc Graw Hill.

Pervin, L.A., & John, O.P. (2001). *Personality: Theory and Research.* 8th edition. New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc.

Rahim, M. A., & Magner, N.R. (1995). Confirmatory Factory Analysis of the Styles of Handling Interpersonal Conflict: First-Order Factor Model and Its Invariance Across Group. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 80(1), 122-132.

Rahim, M.A. (1983). A Measure of Styles Of Handling Interpersonal Conflict. *Academy of Management Journal,* 26(2), 368-376.

Robbins, S.P. (2005). *Organizational Behavior.* 11th Edition. New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.

Rollinson, D.J, Hook, C.M, Foot, M., & Handley, J. (1996). Supervisor and Management Styles in Handling Discipline and Grievance (part two): Approaches to Handling Discipline and Grievance. *Personnel Review*, 25(4), 38-55.

Rose, E. (2004). *Employment Relations* 2nd edition. England: Prentice Hall.

Salamon, M. (2000). *Industrial Relations: Theory And Practice.* 4th Edition. Great Britain: Prentice Hall.

Thomas, K.W. & Kilmann R.H. (1974). In Thomas, K.W and Kilmann, R.H. (2001). *Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument: Profile and Interpretive Report.* USA: Consulting Psychologists Press Inc.

Thomas, K.W. (1976). Conflict and Conflict Management. in Dunnette, M.D. (Ed). (1983). *Handbook of Industrial And Organizational Psychology.* New York: John Wiley and Sons.

William, B.W Jr., & Davis, K. (1996). *Human Resource Management* 5th Edition. USA: McGraw Hill.

Zikmund, W.G. (2003). *Business Research Methods* 7th edition. Ohio: Thomson Learning.

Exhibit 1

Table 1 : Overall Results From Factor Analysis

Variable	KMO Value	Bartlett's test of Sphericity (sig)	Reliability Test (α)
Grievance Handling Styles	.819	0.00	
Dimensions :			
a. Integrating			.926
b. Dominating			.827
c. Compromising			.858
Personality	.707	0.00	
Dimensions :			
a. Agreeableness			.905
b. Emotion Stability			.815
c. Conscientiousness			.743
d. Extraversion			.751

Table 2: Means and Standard Deviation for Integrating, Dominating and Compromising Handling Styles

	Integrating Style	Dominating Style	Compromising Style
Mean	3.4005	2.4279	3.1194
Standard deviation	0.43331	0.51559	0.62173

Table 3: Correlation Results between Personality Dimensions and Grievance Handling Styles

	Agreeableness	Emotional Stability	Conscientiousness	Extraversion
Integration Style	.555(**)	.047	.481(**)	-.109
Dominating Style	.483(**)	-.218	.037	.165
Compromising Style	.544(**)	.168	.396(**)	-.002

** Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 4: Coefficients Table for Integrating Style

	Dependent variable Usage (Standardized Beta)
Agreeableness	0.264
Emotional_Stability	0.152
Conscientiuosness	0.140
Extraversion	-0.218*

* $p < 0.05$

a Dependent Variable: Integrating_Style

Table 5: Coefficients Table for Dominating Style

	Dependent variable Usage (Standardized Beta)
Agreeableness	.025
Emotional_Stability	-.120
Conscientiuosness	-.436*
Extraversion	.145

* $p < 0.05$

a Dependent Variable: Dominating_Style

Table 6: Coefficients Table for Compromising Style

	Dependent variable Usage (Standardized Beta)
Agreeableness	.047
Emotional_Stability	.227*
Conscientiuosness	-.139
Extraversion	-.077

* $p < 0.05$

a Dependent Variable: Compromising_Style