Running Head: Power and Leadership

The Use and Abuse of Power in Leadership

Aoife Brennan, Patricia Ferris,

Stephanie Paquet, and Theresa Kline

University of Calgary

Contact Information: Aoife Brennan
Dept. of Psychology
University of Calgary
2500 University Dr. NW
Calgary, AB, T2N 1N4
Phone (403) 220-2485
Fax (403) 282-8249
E-mail: ambrenna@ucalgary.ca

Table of Contents

Section I: Introduction …….. 4

The role of power in leadership ……..... 6

Section II: Overview of concepts …….. 7

Taxonomies of power ……..... 7

French and Raven's taxonomy of power …….. 7

Bass' Taxonomy of power ……..… 13

McClelland's taxonomy of power ……..… 15

Kipnis' model of the effects of power …… 17

Evaluation of the research on power ……...… 18

Taxonomies of influence ……. 18

Kipnis' taxonomy of influence tactics …… 19

Yukl's taxonomy of influence tactics ……....… 21

The relationship between power and influence ……...…...… 25

Section III: The role of power in leadership models ……..……..… 27

Trait-based approach ……...…… 28

Leader-member exchange theory ……...……. 29

Charismatic leadership ……...……. 32

Transactional leadership ……...…….. 34

Transformational leadership ……..……...……... 36

Section IV: The misuse of power and the unintended consequences ……..……... 39

The dark side of power ……...…...……..… 39

Groupthink ……..……..…….. 41

Abuse of power ……..…….. 43

Leadership personality contributions to dark side behavior ……...…… 48

Type-A behavior ……. 48

Negative affectivity ……..… 49

Dysfunctional leader profiles …….……. 49

Section V: The relationship between leader power and leadership effectiveness ……..…… 52

Effectiveness of the different bases of power ……..…… 52

Coercive power …….…..… 52

Reward power ……..... 55

Legitimate power …….…… 56

Expert power …….….. 56

Referent power ……..... 57

Informational power ……..... 59

Transformational versus transactional leadership ……...… 60

Section VI: The role of leadership in follower socialization ……..…… 63

Transmission of cultural norms and values during training and throughout the Organization ……..…….…… 63

Socialization in military/paramilitary work contexts ……..……..... 69

Section VII: Integration of literature review and application to the Canadian Forces ...…… 73

Recommendations …….…..… 76

References …….…….. 80

The Use and Abuse of Power in Leadership

I. Introduction

Power has been defined in several different ways. It can be defined as potential influence or as enacted influence. Power may be viewed as influence over the attitudes and behavior of people or as influence over events. It has been described as the probable rate and amount of influence of a person or a position occupant (Bass, 1981). Similarly, power can be measured in several different ways. For example, it can be measured in terms of target perceptions or in terms of objective characteristics of an agent and the agent's position (Yukl & Van Fleet, 1992). Within the Canadian Forces (CF), leadership has been defined as the direct or indirect purposeful exercise of formal authority or personal influence (Wenek, 2002). By its very definition, the leadership process necessitates exercising power and influence over others. Therefore, it is important for the study of leadership to include investigation into the role of power.

The concept of power, however, is not well understood. Yukl (1998) commented that there is more conceptual confusion about influence processes than about any other facet of leadership. Terms such as influence, power, and authority have been conceptualized in different ways by different writers, and are often used without any explicit definition. For the purposes of this paper, power is defined as an agent's potential influence over the attitudes and behavior of one or more target persons (Yukl, 1998). Power is the potential to influence others and it is exercised through the use of influence tactics.

Historically, research on power has included the identification of different types of power, how leaders gain or lose power, how different amounts and types of leader power are related to leadership effectiveness, and how the influence of behavior is related to effective leadership (Yukl & Van Fleet, 1991). However, the influence process between leaders and

followers is not unidirectional (Yukl, 1998). Leaders influence followers, but followers also have some influence over leaders. This is especially true in large organizations where the effectiveness of managers depends on their influence over superiors and peers in addition to their influence over subordinates. Increasingly, researchers are acknowledging the bidirectional relationship of influence between leaders and their followers (e.g., Levy, Collins, & Nail, 1998; Yukl & Falbe 1990; 1993; Yukl & Tracey, 1992). However, the focus of the present paper is on the downward influence of leaders on subordinates as this is consistent with the culture in the CF and the mandate of this project.

Power over others is an inevitable part of leadership, but it also carries with it the risks associated with the misuse or abuse of power. The role of leaders as transmitters and upholders of organizational values is essential. Scandals such as the behavior of Canadian troops in Somalia in the early 1990's, stress the potential negative ramifications of (what was attributed to) poor leadership in the senior ranks of the CF (Hannaford, 2001). In a military context, lack of trust in leadership and lack of group belonging during combat have been found to be related to psychological breakdown in combat (Steiner & Neuman, 1978). These incidents also demonstrate the importance of studying the role of power in leadership to prevent future occurrences of such dramatic events. When power is misused or abused within the military the results can be devastating in terms of both the reputation of the CF as well as for the public trust and support of the CF. Moreover, this damage is corrosive to both the members' pride and morale (Wenek, 2002).

The purpose of this paper is to discuss the role of power in leadership, and specifically, how leader power can lead to misuse and abuse. This paper consists of the following seven sections. Section I outlines the role of power in leadership and the importance of studying

leadership from this perspective. Section II outlines the concepts and delineates some of the more popular models in the study of power and social influence. Section III reviews several models of leadership and discusses the role of power within each model. Section IV discusses the misuse of power and its unintended consequences. Section V presents the findings on the effectiveness of the different sources of power on both subordinate and organizational outcomes. Section VI discusses how leadership and the use of power affect organizational culture and the socialization of newcomers to the organization. And lastly, Section VII integrates the literature into the CF context and provides recommendations to reduce the misuse or abuse of power.

In the first section, the importance of considering the role of power in leadership will be established. Several taxonomies of both power and influence strategies are presented to provide a framework. We will then explore how power is used to influence subordinates' behaviors, and to instill organizational values and culture in both appropriate and inappropriate ways. Lastly, we will discuss how to ensure the ethical use of power within the CF and recommendations will be presented.

The Role of Power in Leadership

Power plays a major role in the interactions occurring in organizational life. Power over others is intertwined with an understanding of leadership processes. Yet, despite the relevance of power to organizations and the understanding of the leadership process, research studies of power and leadership are not well integrated (Hollander & Offermann, 1990). Hollander and Offermann noted that assumptions regarding power often remain unstated and untested in the literature.

The literature generally suggests that effective leaders express their need for power and influence in ways that benefit the organization. Some scholars (e.g., Clements & Washbush,

1999) contend that there is a common delusion among leaders that their efforts are always well intended and that their power is benign. They believe leaders are motivated to be pro-social toward the organization and its goals rather than driven by desire for personal gain. McClelland (1970) demonstrated how effective leadership could be instrumental in promoting social disaster. Historically, even the most villainous personalities often arouse social-power responses in their followers, who saw themselves as elevated and empowered.

In the following section, the major theories and taxonomies of power are presented. These include French and Raven's (1959) model of the bases of power, Bass' (1960) theory of power that distinguishes between personal power and position power, and McClelland's (1970; 1976) theory of the underlying, motivating forces that drive an individual's need for power. At the end of the section, Kipnis' model (1972) of the effects of power on the power holder is presented.

II. Overview of Concepts

Taxonomies of Power

Efforts to understand power usually involve distinctions among various forms of power. Several taxonomies have been developed from theory and empirical research to categorize and classify how individuals attempt to influence others. Power possessed by a leader is important not only for influencing subordinates, but also for influencing peers, superiors, and even people outside the organization (Yukl & Van Fleet, 1992).

French and Raven's taxonomy of power. French and Raven's taxonomy of power is based on the concept that power refers to the ability or potential of an agent to influence a target. In other words, power is defined in terms of influence, and influence is defined as psychological change including changes in behavior, opinions, and attitudes. In 1959, French and Raven

originally proposed the following five bases of power: 1) legitimate, 2) reward, 3) coercive, 4) expert, and 5) referent power. Legitimate power refers to the capacity to impose a sense of obligation or responsibility on another. Reward power refers to the capacity to provide others with things they desire or value. Coercive power refers to the ability to take away rewards and privileges or administer sanctions and punishments. Expert power is the ability to provide another with needed information, knowledge, or expert advice. Referent power refers to the ability to provide others with feelings of personal acceptance, approval, efficacy, or worth. In 1965, Raven proposed a sixth basis of power, namely information power which refers to the ability to access and distribute (or withhold) important information[1].

Wenek (2002) outlined how French and Raven's taxonomy applies in the CF. All six bases of power are evident and substantial in the CF. The legitimate authority of commanders and other supervisors is a central feature within the CF. Great importance is attached to maintaining the integrity of the chain of command, and in honoring customs surrounding individual commissioning, promotion, and change of command. Reward power within the CF is also considerable, increasing with rank and centrality of authority. Coercive power is extensive for those in command appointments. High value is placed on expert power within the CF as evidenced by the extensive investments made in training and education. Expertise bestows considerable power and influence potential on the specialists who manage the organization's strategic contingencies. Information power is dependent on organizational centrality in the CF, with those in higher positions acquiring considerable information power. And, referent power is obtained through qualities such as friendliness, respect, sensitivity to and concern for others, authenticity, character, and integrity. The CF culture strongly supports "clan ties" and leadership

[1] The reader should note that only brief definitions have been provided to outline the constructs; the interested reader should refer to Raven (1992) and Podsakoff and Schriesheim (1985) for more information on these constructs.

by example, suggesting that commanding officers are likely to engender considerable referent power.

French and Raven's taxonomy of power has been one of the most widely used and researched in the study of power. Yukl and Van Fleet (1992) noted that this taxonomy has dominated the conceptualization of power sources and research on leader power. However, this taxonomy does not include all of the power sources relevant to managers (Yukl, 1998). Research investigating the effectiveness of the different bases of power typically assesses whether effective leaders have or use different types of power compared to ineffective leaders. Most studies use questionnaires to ask subordinates how much a leader used each type of power, and then correlate this information with measures of subordinate satisfaction or performance. Only a few studies have correlated power to proximal outcomes of influence such as changes in subordinate attitudes and behavior (Yukl, 1998).

Overall, research has found that expert, referent, and legitimate power are all positively related to attitudinal commitment, whereas reward and coercive power are positively related to behavioral compliance (Thambain & Gemmill, 1974; Warren, 1968; Yukl & Falbe, 1991). Research has also found expert and referent power to be positively correlated with subordinate satisfaction and performance (Podsakoff & Schriesheim, 1985). However, the results for legitimate, reward, and coercive power are inconsistent such that correlations with criteria such as subordinate satisfaction and performance were usually negative or non-significant rather than positive. The effectiveness and the outcomes associated with each of the bases of power will be discussed in greater detail in Section V.

More recently, Raven (1992) elaborated on and further differentiated each of the six bases of power. For example, he highlighted that coercive power and reward power can be

exercised in both personal and impersonal forms. Personal forms of these bases of power include personal approval (or disapproval) from someone whom we value highly. Originally, reward power and coercive power were defined only in terms of tangible rewards (e.g., bonuses, promotions) and real physical threats (e.g., reprimand, dismissal). However, it is now acknowledged that personal forms of coercive and reward power can be just as effective as more impersonal forms.

Legitimate power was also extended from its original conceptualization where subordinates comply with requests made by superiors because of a sense of obligation. Raven (1992) acknowledged that there are other, perhaps more subtle, forms of legitimate power that draw on other social norms. These include the legitimate power based on the norm of reciprocity (i.e., where individuals feel obligated to return previous favors), the legitimate power of equity (i.e., after having worked hard, individuals feel entitled to compensation), and the legitimate power of responsibility or dependence (i.e., an obligation to help those who cannot help themselves or those who are dependent upon us).

Expert power and referent power, originally conceptualized only in terms of the positive outcomes associated with their use, were updated to include a "boomerang effect." That is, sometimes individuals may do exactly the opposite of what the influencing agent recommends or requests. Additionally, individuals may also do exactly the opposite of what an unattractive or unappealing influence agent recommends. Lastly, the conceptualization of informational power was extended to include both direct and indirect information. Indirect forms of informational power such as overhearing third-party communications, may in fact, be even more persuasive than direct forms of communication because the agent is perceived to be objective.

Raven (1992) presented a model delineating the power and influence process from the perspective of the influence agent as well as a model that outlined the process from the perspective of the influence target. Briefly, the model outlines how an agent's motivation to influence leads to the assessment of power bases available to the agent in relation to his/her power, preferences, and inhibitions. Next, some preparation or stage setting may be necessary for the bases of power to become operative. For example, to use coercion, it is sometimes necessary to first make the target realize that the agent has both the means and the will to follow through on the threat. Similarly, to use expert power, it may be necessary to demonstrate one's expertise. Once the preparations have been made, the agent must choose the power base, the power mode (i.e., influence tactic), and the manner or tone in which influence will be exerted. Following the influence attempt, the agent will want to assess the effects (e.g. was it successful?). The agent may also assess if there are any secondary effects such as whether the target's perception and evaluation of the agent was affected. The effects of the influence attempt will then feed back to the agent and may consequently alter his/her self-perceptions, perceptions of the target, the perceived effectiveness, costs, and preferences for various social power and influence strategies.

Raven's second model depicts the power and influence process from the perspective of the target. The model assumes that the target is initially motivated to resist the influence attempt. Several reasons are suggested for why the target initially resists including the target is committed to a previous course of action or behavior, a need for independence, power, or self-esteem, or simply not wanting to give the agent the satisfaction of compliance. Once the influence strategy has been implemented, the target must decide whether to comply. The target may evaluate the influence attempt through factors such as the propriety of the attempt, whether there is good logic or information to justify compliance, or whether the offered reward is sufficient to lead to

compliance. The next stage in the model examines the effects of compliance or non-compliance for the target and whether there is internalized attitude change or simply behavioral compliance. The outcome of the influence attempt subsequently leads to the evaluation of side effects. These may include changes in self-perceptions and perceptions of the agent, change to the power relationships, and attempts to repair any resulting damage. Lastly, a feedback loop was included illustrating how the outcome of an influence attempt leads back to the target's motivation to comply with a future influence attempt. In other words, the influence process has changed the target such that he/she may now be amenable to influence strategies that would not have worked the first time around, or he/she may be more resistant to strategies that may have previously been effective.

In summary, Raven's model from the agent's perspective, outlines the roles of power and influence beginning with the motivation to influence, through to the actual implementation of an influence attempt. The model may be useful for those who are in positions of influence, to help them understand more clearly the bases of their own actions, and the possible alternatives to their actions. The model from the target's perspective outlines the target's motivation to comply, his/her evaluation of the influence attempt, and how these combine to predict target behavior. For potential targets of influence, the model may give a better understanding of the factors leading to compliance or noncompliance, and ways to resist influence when such resistance is appropriate. Both models also acknowledge the feedback and re-evaluation that occurs following an influence attempt by both the agent and the target, and how this affects future influence attempts. Thus, these models highlight the dynamic and interactive nature of the power and social influence process.

Bass' taxonomy of power. Another conceptualization of power that continues to be widely accepted is the dichotomy between personal power and position power proposed by Bass (1960). Position power includes formal authority, control over punishments, rewards, and information, and ecological control (control over the physical environment, technology, and organization of work). Due to their status, supervisors are likely to control the granting and denying of important rewards to subordinates, and this control subsequently yields power. In other words, supervisors have power to influence when they have control over what is desired (Bass, 1960; 1981). Research has consistently shown a general tendency for those higher in status in an organization to wield more power to influence those lower in status (e.g., Blankenship & Miles, 1968).

Personal power is derived from one's relationship with others rather than one's position in the hierarchy. Those with personal power can grant to others affection, consideration, sympathy, recognition, and secure relationships and attachments. They can also punish others by becoming more distant, formal, cold, and impersonal. There is evidence that we seek the affection and support of those we hold to be personally powerful (Wurster, Bass, & Alcock, 1961).

French and Raven's taxonomy of the six bases of power can be subsumed under Bass' position and personal dichotomy of power. Specifically, legitimate, reward, coercive, and information power all fit under position power; while expert power and referent power can be classified as personal power.

Overall, research has supported the effectiveness of both personal and positional power. Yukl and Falbe (1991) found empirical support for this two-factor conceptualization, and also found that these two forms of power are relatively independent from one another, although each

included several distinct but partially overlapping components. Research conducted using questionnaires generally indicate that effective leaders rely primarily on personal power to motivate subordinate commitment to task objectives and leader strategies (Yukl, 1998). However, Yukl and Van Fleet (1992) caution that these findings were based on self-reports and may be biased by attributions and social desirability. Evidence from other types of research suggests that position power is also relevant for leader effectiveness (Yukl & Falbe, 1991). Yukl and Van Fleet (1992) suggest that effective leaders most likely rely on a combination of power sources. It is unknown how position power and personal power combine to jointly determine a leader's influence over subordinates, peers, and supervisors. Yukl and Van Fleet (1992) proposed that an interactive model (i.e., person x position) might be more useful than an additive model (i.e., person + position) for explaining why some people have more power than others. However, more research is needed to address this issue.

The amount of both types of power needed by a leader to ensure subordinate compliance probably depends on the nature of the organization, task, and subordinates. Yukl and Van Fleet (1992) speculate that, in general, a moderate amount of position power is optimal. While leaders need to engender enough position power to make changes, facilitate the work of subordinates, reward competent subordinates, and punish troublemakers, the literature suggests that large amounts of power can corrupt a leader to misuse it, leading to resentment and rebellion (McClelland, 1975; Kipnis, 1972). Kipnis (1972) found that leaders with more reward power used it to a greater extent to influence subordinates, were more likely to devalue the personal worth of subordinates, were more likely to maintain greater social distance from subordinates, and were more likely to attribute subordinate effort to the use of power rather than to the subordinate's ability or motivation. Therefore, it is likely that as a leader's positional power

increases so does the potential for the misuse or abuse of power to occur. Some researchers (e.g., Yukl, 1981; Yukl & Van Fleet, 1992) have recommended that organizational constraints on the use of power be implemented in situations where leaders have substantial position power, citing examples such as regulations prohibiting particular forms of power abuse by supervisors, appeals procedures, independent review boards to protect subordinates, and formal decision procedures to ensure that power is not centralized too strongly in a few individuals.

McClelland's taxonomy of power. In his research on managerial motivation, McClelland and his colleagues (McClelland, 1970; McClelland & Burnham, 1976) identified two types of power, namely egoistic power (also referred to as personalized power) and social power. Egoistic power entails using others for personal gain. Social power involves facilitating group cooperation and effort for the achievement of the general good. These two forms of power are considered the underlying, motivating forces that drive an individual's need for power. McClelland (1973) argues that personalized power tends to be associated with personal dominance, which is a socially unacceptable expression of the power motive. Conversely, social power is centered on having impact for the sake of others and is considered to be a socially acceptable, even desirable, form of expressing power.

In their early work, McClelland and his colleagues found that the most effective managers were those who possessed a high need for power and had a desire to influence others. Moreover, this need for power had to be greater than their need to be liked by others (i.e., need for affiliation). These personality traits were found to be essential to successful leadership because managers cannot perform all the tasks necessary for success by themselves. He/she must manage others so that they will do things for the organization (McClelland & Burnham, 1976).

In addition to possessing a high need for power, effective organizational leaders must not have a strong orientation toward personalized or egoistic power, but rather a strong orientation to serve the organization and to make a positive impact for the greater good (McClelland & Burnham, 1976). Managers who are motivated by a high need for social power are able to foster high morale because they produce the highest sense of organizational clarity and team spirit.

McClelland is well known for his subsequent work (e.g., McClelland, 1987; McClelland & Boyatzis, 1982) in which he and his colleagues developed a motivational profile of effective leaders. Specifically, they identified three leader motives: 1) need for power, 2) need for achievement, and 3) need for affiliation. McClelland's work suggests that the most effective leaders are high on need for power (prosocial), moderate on need for achievement, and moderate on need for affiliation. The need for power should be prosocial as those with a high need for personalized power are likely to be aggressive and to show a high need for dominance, which are associated with negative outcomes. In contrast, successful leaders use their high need for power to influence others to tackle goals that benefit their subordinates and the organization, as well as themselves. Thus, they express their need for power and influence in ways that benefit everyone in the organization. A moderate need for achievement is necessary as those who are too high on this trait are likely to go out and do the job themselves, while effective leadership requires influencing others to accomplish goals. Similarly, effective leaders' need for affiliation should be lower than their need for power so that they are able to efficiently and effectively carry out their responsibilities without being overly concerned with whether or not others like them.

Anderson (1999) provides a review of McClelland's theory. He clarifies some of the common misconceptions associated with this theory. For example, the theory does not imply a linear relationship between power motivation and leadership effectiveness; rather, the need for

power must be the dominant need in relation to the achievement and affiliation needs. Overall, the findings are supportive of McClelland's theory, that managers with a strong need for power (in relation to lower need for achievement or affiliation) are more likely to be effective than those with a lower need for power.

In summary, research has shown aggressiveness, power-orientation, or high dominance needs as trait characteristics of leaders (House, 1977; House & Baetz, 1979). Successful leaders possess the ability to use their high need for power to influence others to attack goals that benefit their subordinates and the organization in addition to themselves.

Kipnis' model of the effects of power. Based on considerable research, Kipnis (1976) developed a change model describing the effect of power on the power holder. He posited that power can corrupt when those who acquire power develop exalted views of themselves as they tend to believe that they are above common moral standards. People who have a strong need for power and gain control of resources are likely to experience a desire to influence others. If these individuals use strong methods of influence (e.g., rewards and coercion) to satisfy their personal wants, and if these methods work, then the power holder begins to believe that the behavior of those being influenced is not self-controlled. Rather, it is caused by the power holder himself/herself. Consequently, the individuals that are being influenced are gradually devalued, and the power holder is likely to prefer maintaining social and psychological distance. The power holders' self-evaluations also change to the point where they view themselves more favorably than they view the persons whom they influenced. Kipnis' model highlights how individuals with a high need for power may be more vulnerable to abusing power when it is bestowed upon them.

Evaluation of the research on power. Much of the research coming under the power-influence approach attempts to explain leadership effectiveness in terms of the amount and type of power possessed by a leader and the way power is exercised. Most research on the consequences of power for leader effectiveness has relied on questionnaires measuring the target person's perceptions of the agent's power. However, Podsakoff and Schriesheim (1985) identified several deficiencies with questionnaires used in most of the early research on leader power, including reliance on single-item scales, use of rankings rather than ratings of power, and measurement of power in terms of importance as a reason for compliance rather than as potential influence derived from position and person characteristics. In addition, most research treats the various bases of power as being independent from one another even though it is more likely that in reality leaders use the different bases of power in combination.

The following section outlines the research and taxonomies of social influence. First, we begin by defining the concept of social influence. Second, we present an overview of Kipnis' and Yukl's taxonomies of influence tactics. Third, we delineate the relationship between power and influence.

Taxonomies of Influence

Researchers (e.g., Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl & Van Fleet, 1992) have noted that one of the most important determinants of managerial effectiveness is success in influencing subordinates, peers, and superiors. Barry (2001) defined social influence as a process through which individuals modify their cognitions, attitudes, and behaviors in response to socially construed contexts. Dyadic social influence refers more specifically to the interpersonal process when an individual actively seeks to elicit attitudinal or behavioral compliance from a single,

target other. Influence attempts are willful, goal-directed strategies that are used to get targets to do something that they would not do independently.

The examination of power alone is not sufficient to explain the effectiveness of a leader in influencing people and motivating commitment to the task (Yukl, 1998). Power is the capacity to exert influence, but it can be used in different ways. The manner in which power is enacted involves influence behavior. In other words, power is exercised through the use of social influence. Rather than focusing exclusively on power as a source of potential influence, research has examined the specific types of behavior used to exercise power.

Research on influence has focused on developing taxonomies of tactical behaviors, examining the conditions under which specific behaviors are deployed, and the effectiveness of different influence tactics on outcomes such as resistance, compliance, and commitment. Work by Kipnis and his colleagues (e.g., Kipnis, 1972; 1984; Kipnis, Castell, Gergen, & Mauch, 1976; Kipnis, Schmidt, & Wilkinson, 1980; Kipnis, Schmidt, Swaffin-Smith, & Wilkinson, 1984) along with modifications proposed by Yukl and his colleagues (e.g., Yukl & Falbe, 1990) have formed the basis of how influence tactics are studied in organizational settings (see Barry & Watson, 1996, for a review).

Kipnis' taxonomy of influence tactics. This taxonomy was developed by asking managers to describe incidents in which they attempted to change the behavior of subordinates, peers, or superiors (Kipnis, et al., 1980). Factor analysis was then used to identify more global dimensions of influence tactics used by managers in organizational settings. The following seven dimensions were identified: 1) reason (the use of facts and data to support the development of logical arguments), 2) friendliness (the use of impression management, flattery, and the creation of goodwill), 3) coalition (the mobilization of other people in the organization), 4) bargaining (the

use of negotiation through the exchange of benefits or favors), 5) assertiveness (the use of a direct and forceful approach), 6) higher authority (the support of higher levels in the organization to back up requests), and 7) sanctions (the use of organizationally derived rewards and punishments).

From this research, Kipnis et al. (1980) developed a scale, *The Profile of Organizational Influence Strategies* (POIS), to measure the use of the seven influence tactics. Research conducted using the POIS found that when seeking to influence superiors, managers relied most often on reason, followed by coalitions, and then friendliness. Resorting to the use of higher authorities was used least often to influence superiors. Managers most frequently used reason when influencing subordinates. However, the second most popular strategy was assertiveness. This is consistent with the notion that managers can assert themselves aggressively when they demand compliance from their subordinates, but not when they are seeking compliance with requests from their superiors (Kipnis et al., 1984).

Kipnis et al. (1984) posited that various organizational, personal, and situational factors combine to determine a manager's influence style. The researchers found that a manager's relative power, the manager's objectives for wanting to use influence, and the manager's expectation of the target person's willingness to comply were related to the selection of influence strategies. Specifically, they found that managers who controlled resources that were valued by others or who were perceived to be in positions of dominance used a greater variety of influence strategies than those with less power. Managers were more likely to use strategies such as assertiveness, friendliness, bargaining, and higher authority when influencing subordinates than when influencing superiors. It was believed that managers were able to apply greater pressure on subordinates to comply because they potentially had a greater range of available strategies.

Moreover, if one strategy failed, managers could continue to exert pressure on subordinates by using alternate strategies. In addition to using a greater number of strategies, managers with power were more likely to invoke stronger influence tactics (e.g., assertiveness). Kipnis et al. (1984) speculated that the greater the discrepancy in power between the influencer and the target, the greater the probability that more directive influence strategies will be used.

Managers also appeared to vary their influence strategies in relation to their objectives such that when managers sought benefits from a superior, they often relied on the use of "soft" tactics (e.g., friendliness). In comparison, managers attempting to persuade their superiors to accept new ideas were more likely to use reason (e.g., use of data, explanation, logical arguments). Similarly, when influencing subordinates, managers were more likely to use reason to sell ideas and friendliness to obtain favors. Furthermore, the researchers found that the greater the number of reasons managers had for exercising influence, the greater the number of influence strategies employed.

Lastly, Kipnis et al. (1984) found that managers varied their influence strategies according to how successful they expected to be in influencing the target. Under conditions with a high probability of success, managers were more likely to use simple requests to gain compliance, versus conditions with a low probability of success in which managers were more likely to use assertiveness and sanctions to achieve their objectives.

Yukl's taxonomy of influence tactics. Building on Kipnis and his colleagues' earlier work, Yukl and his colleagues (Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl, Falbe, & Youn, 1993) identified additional types of influence behaviors and objectives using different methodologies (e.g., peer-report, subordinate-report, critical incident technique) and newer measures. The following ten influence tactics were identified: 1) pressure tactics, 2) exchange tactics, 3) coalition tactics, 4) ingratiating

tactics, 5) rational persuasion, 6) inspirational appeals, 7) consultation tactics, 8) legitimating tactics, and 9) personal appeals.

Pressure tactics are those in which the influence agent uses demands, threats, frequent checking, or persistent reminders to influence the target to do what he/she wants. Exchange tactics involve offering an exchange of goods, services, or promises to return the favor later or promising the target a share in the benefits if the target complies with the request. Coalition tactics are those in which the agent enlists the aid of a third party to persuade the target to do something, or uses the support of others as a reason for the target to agree. Ingratiation tactics involve the use of flattery, praise, or friendly behavior to get the target in a good mood or to think favorably of the agent before making a request. Rational persuasion involves the use of rational arguments and facts to convince the target that a request is reasonable and viable, and that it is likely to result in the attainment of the objectives. Inspirational appeals include requests or proposals from the agent for something that arouses the target's interest and enthusiasm by appealing to his or her values, ideals, and aspirations or by increasing target self-confidence. Consultation tactics entail the agent asking for the target's participation in planning a strategy, activity, or change that requires target support and assistance; or modifying a proposal to incorporate suggestions from the target. Legitimating tactics consist of trying to legitimate a request by claiming the authority or right to make it or by verifying and stressing that it is in accordance with organizational policies, rules, or traditions. Lastly, personal appeals are appeals to the target's feelings of friendship and loyalty when asking for something. Yukl's taxonomy was developed from Kipnis', but was revised to be more relevant for managers specifically and to include a wider range of influence tactics.

Overall, research using Yukl's taxonomy (e.g., Yukl & Tracey, 1992) has found that the most effective tactics for obtaining target commitment to the agent's request were rational persuasion, consultation, and inspirational appeals, while the least effective tactics for obtaining target commitment were pressure, coalition tactics, upward appeals, and legitimating tactics. Ingratiation, exchange, and personal appeals were intermediate in their effectiveness for engendering target commitment. However, tactics such as pressure and legitimating tactics that were unlikely to result in target commitment were sometimes effective in obtaining target compliance.

Similarly, Yukl and his colleagues have found that different influence tactics are used to influence subordinates, superiors, and peers, and that different tactics are predominately used to exert influence in different directions (Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl, et al., 1993; Yukl & Tracey, 1992). For example, they found that inspirational appeals, consultation, ingratiation, exchange, legitimating, and pressure were more likely to be used when attempting to influence subordinates; while rational persuasion was more likely to be used when attempting to influence superiors. In addition, differences have been found in the sequencing of tactics within prolonged influence attempts. Yukl et al. (1993) and Yukl (1998) found that "softer" tactics such as personal and inspirational appeals, rational persuasion, and consultation were used earlier on, while "harder" tactics such as pressure, exchange, and coalition were more likely to be used later if initial attempts failed. The researchers speculated that this was because the harder tactics involve greater costs and risks.

Research has shown that agents may also use a combination of tactics simultaneously (Falbe & Yukl, 1992; Yukl et al., 1993). Moreover, some combinations were more effective than others. Using the critical incident technique, Yukl et al. (1993) studied the effectiveness of

different combinations of influence tactics when used simultaneously. Effectiveness was defined as greater commitment, compliance, and less resistance. They found that combinations of soft tactics such as consultation, inspirational appeals, and personal appeals are usually more effective than using a single soft tactic. Combining soft tactics with a harder tactic such as pressure was usually less successful than using a soft tactic alone. Furthermore, combining them with rational persuasion further enhanced the effectiveness of soft tactics.

Yukl et al. (1993) presented a preliminary model outlining the selection and sequencing of influence tactics. The model posits that how frequently an influence tactic is used in a particular direction is determined by the following factors: a) consistency with prevailing social norms and role expectations about use of the tactic in that context, b) agent possession of an appropriate power base for use of the tactic in that context, c) appropriateness for the objective of the influence attempt, d) level of target resistance encountered or anticipated, and e) costs of using the tactic in relation to likely benefits. Based on this model, the researchers were able to derive and test specific hypotheses. They found that some tactics were used together (e.g., inspirational appeals, consultation, ingratiation, and legitimate tactics) more often than others (e.g., rational persuasion). Some tactics were used more in initial attempts (e.g., rational persuasion), while other tactics were used more in follow-up attempts (e.g., pressure).

Barry (2001) stated that empirical research on influence tactics is infrequently grounded in theory, and few connections have been made between conceptual models of influence and empirical investigations of influence seeking behavior. Questions continue to be raised about the conceptual and empirical value of inventories and taxonomies used to classify influence tactics and little is known about the psychological processes that lead individuals to select certain tactics over others in a given situation (Barry, 2001; Barry & Watson, 1996).

The relationship between power and influence. The relationship between specific forms of power and specific influence behaviors is not yet well understood (Yukl, 1998). The following four models have been posited to describe the relationship between power and influence. The first possibility is that agent power affects the agent's choice of influence tactics. Some tactics require a particular type of power to be effective. For example, strong forms of pressure such as warnings and threats are more likely to be used by an agent who has some coercive and reward power over the target and the authority to use it. A second possibility is that power acts as a moderator variable to mitigate or exacerbate the effectiveness of a tactic based on that power. For example, an agent with high reward power may have more success offering an exchange than an agent with little reward power. Third, the effect of agent power may enhance the success of an influence attempt involving tactics for which the power is not directly relevant. An agent with strong coercive power is more likely to gain compliance with a simple request, even though no pressure or exchange tactics were used. And the last possibility is that agent power may influence the behavior of a target regardless of whether the agent does anything to overtly influence him/her. For example, subordinates may be nicer to an agent with substantial reward power in the hopes of future rewards. Yukl (1998) notes that little research has been conducted investigating these four types of relationships. Limited, but inconsistent evidence has been presented for the proposition that power influences the choice of influence tactics. To date, there is no evidence for the proposition that power moderates the choice of influence tactic. And, only anecdotal evidence that power increases compliance or changes target behavior independently of the use of tactics based on this power is available.

Several scholars (e.g., Kipnis, 1984; Kipnis, Castell, Gergen, & Mauch, 1976; Raven, 1992; Rind & Kipnis, 1999) have suggested that the act of influence can change not only the

behavior of the target, but also the values and attitudes of persons doing the influencing. Research has shown that the use of strong influence tactics (e.g., coercion) produces the belief that the person being influenced is externally controlled (O'Neal, Kipnis, & Craig, 1994). Using French and Raven's bases of power, Rodrigues (1995) and Rodrigues and Lloyd (1998) have studied the attributions made of both influence targets and the outcomes based on the type of power exercised. The researchers dichotomized reward, informational, and referent power into one group and legitimate, expertise, and coercion into a second group. The two groupings were based on locus of causality (i.e., internal versus external) and controllability.

The results indicated that the perceived causes for compliance differed between the two groups. Individuals were perceived as more in control of their actions after complying with a request when reward, informational, and referent power were used than when legitimate, expertise, and coercive power were used. Consequently, when people are perceived to be in control of their own behavior they experience more pride, enhanced self-esteem, and perceive themselves to be more responsible for positive outcomes resulting from compliant behavior. Conversely, under conditions of failure, individuals who are in control of their actions experience more guilt, lower self-esteem, and feel responsible for negative outcomes resulting from compliant behavior. When individuals are perceived to not be in control of their actions, less responsibility for both positive and negative outcomes resulting from compliant behavior is attributed to them.

The practical implications of these findings is that when the basis of power is expertise, legitimacy, or coercion, the persuader may not generate internal, psychological compliance, even when external behavioral compliance is achieved. It is likely that this type of compliance will only be effective if surveillance can be exercised. Conversely, if reward, informational or

referent power are used, future compliance will be less dependent on surveillance as it will be more likely to have been internalized (Raven, 1992).

Research on attitude change suggests that persuasion techniques also influence users' opinions of themselves. Specifically, those who use rational influence were more likely to describe themselves as more intelligent than those who used more aggressive influence tactics (Kipnis, 1984; Rind & Kipnis, 1999). In comparison, those who used authoritative influence tactics described themselves as dominant and unfriendly.

The implication of these findings is that when strong influence tactics are used any positive resulting outcomes are not attributed to the target but rather to the use of the tactic itself. Users devalue the ability of target persons as well as themselves. Thus, ethical issues may be involved because the use of strong influence tactics might cause users to develop contempt for themselves and for those they are influencing.

The next section outlines several theories of leadership including the trait-based approach, leader-member exchange, charismatic leadership, transactional leadership and transformational leadership. The role of power in each is discussed. It is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss all leadership theories. Thus, only theories which have withstood empirical tests and are currently used in organizations were retained.

III. The Role of Power in Leadership Models

As mentioned, the leadership process has been conceptualized in numerous ways ranging from a hierarchical process to a dynamic group process. For example, charismatic and transformation theories have stressed the importance of group processes (Northouse, 1997). In contrast, military leadership has historically stressed the importance of tenacity, willpower and

the ability to impose direction through rank (Horn, 2000). Thus, the role of power and the appropriate use of different types of power within each of these models differ significantly.

Trait-based Approach

The trait approach to leadership was one of the earliest modern theories of leadership flourishing from the 1930's to 1950's. Building on the "great man" theories of leadership this approach proposed that great leaders were born, not made. Trait-based theories focused on identifying the innate qualities and characteristics possessed by great social, political, and military leaders. Thus, research based on trait theories of leadership examined what traits made people great leaders and what traits distinguished leaders from followers (Den Hartog & Koopman, 2001). Under the trait-based approach, the following three categories of characteristics have been researched: 1) physical features (e.g., height, appearance, age), 2) ability (e.g., intelligence, knowledge, fluency of speech), and 3) personality features (e.g., dominance, emotional control, expressiveness).

The trait approach came under criticism in the 1950's because of conceptual, methodological, and empirical problems. However, research interest in what made people great leaders re-emerged in the 1980's with studies by Lord, DeVader, and Alliger (1986) and Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991). These studies found that personality traits were strongly associated with individual's perceptions of leadership (Northouse, 1997). Based on their research, Lord et al. proposed that leaders differed from non-leaders on six traits: a) drive, b) the desire to lead, c) honesty and integrity, d) self-confidence, e) cognitive ability, and f) knowledge of business (Northouse, 1997). Northouse identified the following five factors associated with leadership: 1) intelligence, 2) self-confidence, 3) determination or desire to get the job done, 4) integrity, and 5) sociability.

In trait based approaches , leadership is something that is done to followers. Power rests within the character of the leader and the leader gains power by virtue of his/her personality. In other words, leaders will have power over subordinates by virtue of certain traits. Thus, those possessing the traits associated with leadership should have the personal power to lead. However, trait theories neglect the role of socialization, competency, and training in the implementation of power, assuming that leadership and the effective use of power will come naturally to a leader. Trait theories imply that leaders will have power over subordinates because subordinates will recognize the superior nature of the leader's personality, character, and gift to lead. Furthermore, trait theories assume that individuals with legitimate, reward, and coercive power will also have expert and referent power and that subordinates will accept this power without question. Little power is ascribed to subordinates in the leadership process. As such, problems could arise when subordinates do not recognize a leader as an exceptional or "great" man/woman. Moreover, when leaders have high needs for power they may be very willing to exercise their power. However, leaders who cannot balance these power needs with the needs of their followers are likely to derail.

Leader-Member Exchange Theory

Dansereau, Graen, and Haga (1975) conceptualized leadership as a process that occurred in the interactions between leaders and followers, as opposed to something that a leader did to a follower. Thus, the leader-member exchange (LMX) perspective of leadership interprets leadership at the dyadic level of analysis where a dyad consists of the leader and one subordinate. LMX theory proposes that leadership will be effective when high leader member social exchanges are developed and maintained. Members who experience high quality LMX relationships have high levels of responsibility, decision influence, and access to resources.

Members who experience low quality LMX relationships receive little support from their leaders, have low levels of responsibility, and have little influence in the decision making process (Northouse, 1997).

Early studies (e.g., Dansereau et al., 1975; Graen, 1976; Graen & Scandura, 1987) on LMX theory focused on the nature of vertical linkages that leaders formed with their followers and lead to the conceptualization of in-groups and out-groups. In-group members were found to engage in extra-role behavior while out-group members engaged in behaviors that were strictly based on their defined roles. Employees became members of the in-group based on how well they worked with the leader and how well their leaders worked with them. Members of the in-group received more information, influence, confidence, and concern from their leaders than did members of the out-group. Moreover, in-group members were described as more dependable, motivated, and communicative than out-group members.

More recent studies of LMX theory (Gerstner & Day, 1997; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Liden, Wayne, & Stilwell, 1993; Vecchio, 1982) have found that high-quality leader-member exchanges produce less subordinate turnover, more positive performance evaluations, higher frequency of promotion, more attention and support from the leader, greater participation, and faster career progress.

Graen and Uhl-Bien (1991) further proposed that the relationship between a leader and a follower develops over time in three phases: 1) the stranger phase, 2) the acquaintance phase, and 3) the mature partnership. These researchers proposed that interactions are different in each of the three phases. The stranger phase is characterized by reliance on contractual relationships that are rule-bound such that leaders and subordinates relate to each other within prescribed organizational roles; motivation is directed toward self-interest, and the quality of exchanges

resembles out-group exchanges. Interactions during the acquaintance stage are characterized by the sharing of resources and information. This stage is considered a testing period for the leader and subordinate where both parties assess whether the subordinate is interested in taking on more roles and responsibilities, and whether the leader is willing to provide new challenges. Trust begins to develop in this stage and motivation becomes increasingly focused on the purposes and goals of the group. The mature partnership stage is marked by high-quality LMX characterized by high levels of mutual trust, respect, and obligation towards each other.

The role of power in LMX theory resides mutually in the leader and the follower, although, the leader clearly has greater positional power to initiate and sustain a positive relationship with a subordinate. This is particularly true in a military setting. Specifically, a leader may choose to initiate behaviors with a subordinate that lead to a greater sense of trust and caring, giving the leader power over the subordinate. Similarly, a subordinate can either be receptive or non-receptive to relationship overtures from a leader. In military settings, for example, formal sanctions exist based on rank that can hinder subordinate efforts at developing a positive relationship with a leader, and subsequently reduce the subordinate's ability to initiate reciprocal exchanges.

The role of power in LMX theory is likely to vary depending upon the stage of the relationship. For example, in the stranger phase, it is likely that a leader will engage in behaviors that reflect reward, coercive, and legitimate power strategies. These bases of power in military settings are very formalized and based on rank. Therefore, when new recruits enter a unit or basic training, these may be the most appropriate initial power strategies for leaders to adopt. However, studies demonstrate that the use of coercive power is negatively related to LMX quality (Cogniser & Schriesheim, 2000) suggesting that the use of coercive power be limited,

even in military settings. Thus, in the early phases of the LMX relationship, a leader should be encouraged to use expert and referent power.

As a recruit becomes socialized to the military culture and moves up the ranks (i.e., the acquaintance phase), leaders would be expected to use different types of power strategies. In this stage, reward, coercive and legitimate power strategies would still be present, however, expert power may emerge such that the subordinate now perceives the leader as knowledgeable and is now committed to his/her leader. Power for developing and maintaining the relationship is likely to become increasingly shared. For example, a leader may initiate relationship-building behaviors such as giving a sought after assignment and the subordinate may either rise to or reject the overtures. Referent power may also emerge in this stage such that the subordinate is inspired by, or identifies with, the leader. This stage is likely to be critical for trust building and it is essential that a leader engage in behaviors that create trust such as behaving with integrity, keeping promises, providing expressions of interest or caring, and communicating positively. As the LMX relationship continues to develop, a reciprocal base of power develops, and mutual trust should emerge. Conversely, failing to exercise legitimate or positional power over a subordinate would be considered a failure from the LMX perspective of leadership.

Charismatic leadership.

House (1977) developed the concept of charismatic leadership at about the same time that Burns' concepts of transactional and transformational leadership were introduced. Currently, charismatic leadership is described in ways that equate the concept with transformational leadership. Weber (1947) originally defined charisma as a special personality characteristic that gave a person exceptional powers; charisma was thought to be reserved for only those of divine origin, and resulted in a person being treated as a leader. House viewed dominance, need to

influence others, self-confidence, and a strong sense of moral values as the hallmarks of a charismatic leader. He delineated charismatic behaviors to include being a strong role model, appearing competent, articulating ideological goals, communicating high expectations to followers, exhibiting confidence in followers' abilities, and arousing task relevant motives in followers. House also proposed that the effects of charismatic leaders emerge in times of crisis and stress because during such times followers look to leaders to deliver them from their difficulties (Northouse, 1997). Thus, power in charismatic leadership rests in the personal power (i.e., referent and expert power) of the leader.

Researchers (e.g., House & Shamir, 1993; Conger & Kanungo, 1988) all assert that charismatic leaders demonstrate determination, optimism, self-confidence, and confidence in their teams' ability to accomplish the mission and realize the vision. Moreover, such behavior is claimed to be empowering for followers as it is believed to inspire confidence and self-efficacy.

Many charismatic leaders, however, have been known to be highly punishing (e.g., General Patton). Atwater and Lau (1997) suggested that punishment could play a role in developing perceptions of charisma as it may signal the leader's high expectations. They argued that non-contingent punishment could have the effect of creating learned helplessness and negative emotions. In other words, the power that creates perceptions of charisma could also create negative unintended consequences. Thus, charismatic leadership may be a double-edged sword.

Problems could arise if the proposition that charismatic leadership is appropriate at all levels if charismatic leadership with opposing visions occurs at different ranks. This situation could result in competing visions and subsequent failure to achieve senior leaders' vision. Thus,

it is suggested that vision should be developed at the top ranks and transmitted down through the ranks.

Conceptual ambiguity regarding the similarities and differences between transformational and charismatic leadership creates problems in comparing these two theories. Some theorists view transformational and charismatic leadership as being very similar (e.g. House & Shamir, 1993) and there is a tendency in the literature to treat the two approaches as equivalent (Shamir, 1999). Although transformational leadership includes a leader's ability to be charismatic, a leader can be charismatic without being transformational (Bass, 1985). The primary difference between the two types of leadership is that transformational leadership tends to empower followers, making it less likely that followers will attribute extraordinary powers to the leader, whereas charismatic leadership does not (Shamir, 1999). The following section will discuss transactional leadership, after which transformational leadership will be discussed.

Transactional Leadership

Burns first defined both transformational and transactional leadership in the 1970's (Burns, 1978). He described transactional leaders as those who sought to motivate followers by appealing to their self interests. The transactional theory of leadership is founded on the premise that leader-follower relations are based on a series of exchanges or implicit negotiations between leaders and followers (Bass, 1985). This perspective proposes that a leader provides benefits to followers that include direction, vision, recognition, and other esteem needs that result in heightened responsiveness to the leader by followers. Transactional behavior focuses on the accomplishment of tasks and good subordinate relationships in exchange for desirable rewards. This exchange relationship may in turn encourage leaders to adapt their styles and behaviors to

meet the perceived expectations of their followers. This implies that followers have the potential to influence their leader in a two-way relationship.

Thus, the transactional perspective bestows an active role to followers and suggests greater power to the follower compared to traditional trait approaches to leadership. By legitimizing leadership, followers can affect the strength of a leader's influence, style of behavior, and the performance of the group (Hollander, 1993). However, the primary role of power from a transactional perspective follows from traditional authority (i.e., expert, legitimate, and reward power) of the leader over his/her followers. This is particularly applicable in military settings where power is inherent in rank.

Transactional leadership encompasses the following four types of leader behavior: 1) contingent reward, 2) passive management by exception, 3) active management by exception, and 4) laissez-faire leadership. Contingent reward refers to influence behavior by the leader that uses rewards or incentives to achieve results when expectations are met. This type of influence strategy corresponds to French and Raven's reward power. French and Raven (1959) suggested that the use of contingent rewards lead to compliance with leader direction because doing so produces positive results. Power is vested in the leader to provide sought after rewards. Conversely, the follower has a certain amount of power in his/her choice to engage in behaviors that bring rewards.

Passive management by exception refers to behaviors such as correction or punishment in response to unacceptable performance or deviation from accepted standards. This management style corresponds to French and Raven's (1959) coercive power. Power in this type of influence behavior stems from follower fear of the negative consequences that may occur if one fails to comply. The greatest amount of power is likely afforded to the leader using this type of

influence, as typically, a follower would have significant difficulty punishing a leader, particularly in military settings. However, coercive power is noted to be related to negative organizational outcomes such as turnover and thus should be used sparingly (see Section V for a more detailed discussion of the relationship between coercive power and organizational outcomes).

Active management by exception refers to the active monitoring of work performed and the use of corrective methods to ensure the work is completed to meet accepted standards. Legitimate and coercive power is reflected in this type of behavior. Lastly, laissez-faire leadership refers to a "hands-off" approach toward workers and their performance such that the leader ignores the needs of others, does not respond to problems and does not monitor performance. This style of leadership abdicates power and would generally be seen as ineffective in military settings.

All of the aforementioned transactional leadership behaviors are likely to be used by most leaders to some degree. However, overdependence on the transactional approach could place too much emphasis on the bottom line, and lead to pressure to engage in unethical or immoral behavior. Further, transactional leadership does not focus on meeting a follower's needs for meaningful work, nor does this style encourage creativity. If used as the primary style of influence, transactional leadership could lead to a climate of negative political behavior that could be counterproductive to group performance. Thus, long-term unit success may depend on a more inspiring, transformational style of leadership (Kane & Tremble, 2000).

Transformational Leadership

Bass (1985) proposed that transformational leadership is a type of leadership that changes and transforms individuals through modeling values, behaving ethically, and setting clear and

high performance standards and long-term goals. Transformational leadership goes beyond the cost-benefit exchange of transactional leadership by motivating and inspiring followers to perform beyond expectations (Bass, 1985). Burns (1978) considered transactional and transformational leadership to be at opposing ends of a continuum of leadership behavior. In contrast, Bass (1985) viewed transactional and transforming leadership as complementary, such that transformational leadership builds upon the exchange nature of transactional leadership. Bass (1998) proposed that transformational leaders motivate followers to do more than originally thought possible, set higher standards for performance, and set more challenging expectations. He identified the following four components of transformational leadership: 1) charisma, 2) inspirational motivation, 3) intellectual stimulation, and 4) individualized consideration.

Bass (1998) described charismatic leaders as role models who are admired, respected, and trusted by followers. He stated that followers identify with these leaders, want to emulate them, and perceive these leaders as endowed with extraordinary capabilities, persistence, and determination. According to Bass, these types of leaders are willing to take risks and demonstrate high standards of ethical and moral conduct. Followers of charismatic leaders tend to be more self-assured, experience more meaning in their work, report more support from their leaders, work longer hours, and have higher performance ratings than followers of non-charismatic leaders (Bass, 1998). Inspirational motivation refers to a leader's ability to motivate and inspire those around them by providing meaning and challenge to their followers' work, thus heightening team spirit. According to Bass (1998), these leaders foster follower involvement in envisioning a positive future, clearly communicating expectations, demonstrating commitment to goals and a shared vision.

The third component, intellectual stimulation, refers to a leader's ability to stimulate followers to be innovative and creative by questioning assumptions, reframing problems, and approaching old situations in new ways with minimal criticism. Lastly, individualized consideration refers to paying special attention to each follower's need for achievement, acceptance, and personalized interactions. Furthermore, tasks are assigned for developmental purposes.

Overall, research has found that transformational leadership is positively related to subordinate satisfaction, motivation and performance (Bass, 1998). In their meta-analytic review, Lowe, Kroek, and Sivasubramaniam (1996) found that transformational leadership correlated positively with subordinate satisfaction and performance.

Transformational leadership implies a greater sharing of formalized power. This sharing of formal power is exercised through the encouragement of questioning the status quo, creative suggestions, minimal criticism, and delegation of tasks that would typically be undertaken by a leader. Thus, the role of power in transformational leadership is focused on referent power, and the power of individual leader characteristics. In this regard, the role of power in transformational leadership is similar to its role in trait-based approaches. Expert power is also extensive in transformational leadership because followers hold leaders' knowledge in high regard. Transformational leadership practices stand in contrast to the prevailing military culture of political correctness, risk aversion, and zero tolerance of mistakes (Horn, 2000). If a transformational style of leadership is valued as effective for the CF, significant changes in attitudes and behavior will be required. Paradoxically, it is the transformational leader that could bring about such changes. At the root of this change will be the willingness to view power as a shared commodity, rather than an attribute of rank.

We typically tend to think about the positive outcomes associated with effective leadership. However, there are also risks and negative consequences associated with ineffective or fanatical leadership resulting from the misuse or abuse of power. The following section discusses the misuse and abuse of power and some of the potential unintended consequences.

IV. The Misuse of Power and the Unintended Consequences

The Dark Side of Power

The very behaviors that distinguish effective leaders (e.g., high need for power) also have the potential to produce problematic or even disastrous outcomes for organizations (Conger, 1997). When a leader's behaviors become exaggerated, lose touch with reality, or become vehicles for purely personal gain, they may harm the leader, his/her followers, and the organization. This situation is referred to as "the dark side of leadership."

McClelland's (McClelland, 1970; McClelland & Burnham, 1976) dichotomy of personal and social power may provide some insight into the underlying motivational antecedents of abuse of power. In addition, McClelland, (1985) proposed that activity inhibition (the degree of restraint one feels toward the use of power) determines whether power is expressed in socially appropriate ways or in an aggressive manner. As personal power entails using others for personal gain and tends to be associated with personal dominance, leaders motivated by personal power are likely to see power as a zero-sum game and are not likely to empower or share power with others. Expressions of personal power motivation can range from attempting to control others through overt aggression, gaining influence or reputation, or trying to affect the emotions of others, to providing help and advice. Thus, individuals with a high need for personal power may be predisposed to misusing or abusing power to achieve their own personal goals because they feel entitled to use power for their own gain and are more likely to use personal dominance.

In contrast to personal power motivation, Bargh and Alvarez (2001) contend that abuse of power may not always be an intentional, strategic, and knowing act on the part of the abuser. Rather, abusers may no even realize that what they are doing is wrong or misguided, and may believe that they are objective and fair minded, and acting in the best interests of their subordinates and their organization. Researchers contend that this type of abuse of power is far more insidious and pervasive than instances in which an abuser is malevolently pursuing a self-serving agenda. They suggest that two unconscious sources of decisions and action control, namely, automatic negative evaluations of subordinates and automatic activation and operation of goals are to blame. Specifically, affective reactions to people on the basis of their social group influences how one decides to judge others and behave towards them. This evaluation has been found to occur unintentionally and within a split second. Thus, leaders can be unconsciously biased in their evaluations and decision making of subordinates for whom they have negative affective reactions. Similarly, the automatic activation and operation of goals suggests individuals will form that automatic association between a situation and one's own personal goals. Over time, being in a specific situation will activate the associated goal which will subsequently be put into operation. Moreover, research suggests that individuals are unaware of having pursued the unconsciously activated goal. Thus, leaders may pursue selfish and personal goals when they have power over others without knowing or realizing what they are doing. Individual differences also come into play in terms of selecting which goals are automatically associated with the concept of power (Bargh & Alvarez).

Researchers (e.g., Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994; Hogan & Hogan, 2001) have begun to investigate the personality traits associated with the dark side of leadership. They contend that effective leadership requires both the presence of positive characteristics and the absence of

"dark side" characteristics. As discussed, we know that leaders frequently operate in dysfunctional and harmful ways that undermine both the group's and the organization's best interests.

The following section reviews behaviors that are negatively experienced by subordinates and discusses further organizational implications of the inappropriate use of power. Dysfunctional processes and the associated outcomes of each will be examined, including: a) inappropriate drive for consensus, known as groupthink, and b) bullying and harassment behaviors encompassed within abrasive leadership and dysfunctional personality. Lastly, this section will review personality and motivational contributions to "dark side" behavior.

Groupthink

The term groupthink was coined to describe the phenomena of consensus seeking at any cost (Janis, 1997). It may be viewed as an extreme form of group conformity that results in diminished decision-making capabilities. Groupthink involves the non-deliberate suppression of critical thoughts because of internalization of the group's norms. This implies that groupthink does not occur because of the use of coercive power; rather, it occurs when members of a group or team become so enmeshed and close knit that their thinking becomes conditioned by the group. Leaders who encourage the development of in-groups and out-groups or who use their positional or personal power to create extremely cohesive groups, might unwittingly also increase their group's vulnerability to developing groupthink. Charismatic and transformational leaders who focus specifically on personal power to build connections with the group could also set up a particular vulnerability to this process. Military groups, with their deference to rank may be especially vulnerable to groupthink as,

> "the more amiability and esprit de corps there is among members of a policy-making in-group, the greater the danger that independent critical thinking will be replaced by

> groupthink, which is likely to result in irrational and dehumanizing actions directed against out-groups" (Janis, 1997, p. 166).

Groupthink can happen in any group. The Cuban missile crisis and the Challenger disaster are two extreme and classic examples of groupthink that resulted in significant failure of good decision-making in very intelligent teams with charismatic leaders.

Groupthink is characterized by eight symptoms. The first symptom is the illusion of invulnerability. This leads the group to become overly optimistic, take extreme risks, and fail to respond to clear warnings of danger by limiting discussions to few alternatives. The second symptom, rationalization, occurs when members focus on past successes as an indication of future performance. This serves to discount warnings, leading to the failure to re-examine decisions initially preferred by members, when new risks are identified. The third symptom is the tendency to believe unquestioningly in the inherent morality of their in-group, leading members to ignore ethical or moral consequences of decisions. The fourth symptom identified in groupthink is the tendency to stereotype outsiders, leading to the belief that their group really is the best and the consideration that others who are not of their group really don't understand them or are so inferior that negotiating differences with them is unwarranted. The fifth symptom is the application of direct pressure to any individual who expresses doubts about any of the group's shared illusions or who questions the validity of the group's arguments. The sixth symptom of groupthink is self-censorship such that members keep silent about any misgivings they may have and even minimize the importance of their doubts to themselves. The seventh symptom is the illusion of unanimity, such that members are encouraged to "get with the program." Finally, the eighth symptom of groupthink is the existence of "mindguards" such that members cultivate either intrinsic or extrinsic mechanisms that tend to protect the group from outside or contrary thoughts.

The most serious outcome of groupthink is poor decision-making. Thus, given the high potential for failure of appropriate group decision-making, it is important to assess the similarity and diversity of teams. For those teams high in similarity, groupthink may be a serious pitfall in team performance and even result in disaster. For example, some of the characteristics of groupthink may apply to the incidents in Somalia. This includes a) a belief in the inherent morality of one's own group (i.e. unit), and b) out-group stereotyping of the Somalians. This dehumanization of the Somalians, in turn, may have enabled the psychological distance and justification for their execution.

Janis (1997) made the following five recommendations to guard against the over-use of conformity. First, leaders and groups should be educated about the causes and consequences of groupthink. Second, teams should take time to assess the similarity and diversity of perspectives and opinions within the team. Third, leaders should use their positional and personal power to create a work climate of openness that encourages outside observation, participation, and comment where members can discuss their feelings and apprehensions with non-members. Fourth, leaders should encourage members of a group to challenge decisions and actions of the group without fear of reprisals. Finally, team participation in goal setting activities in projects and the avoidance of severe time pressures should lead to rational decision-making. These strategies reflect the use of interpersonal skills, openness, and participation in leadership, and are reflective of behaviors entailed in transformational leadership.

Abuse of Power

Reports of corruption and the misuse of power in organizations have become prevalent in our society. Within organizations where some people are given official power over the important outcomes of others (who have no reciprocal control of their own), abuse of power is likely to

occur (Bargh & Alvarez, 2001). This is of particular concern within the ranks of the CF where superiors have substantial power and influence over their subordinates.

Some of the traditions within the CF are based on The Warrior Model of leadership, which asserts that leadership is inseparably related to conflict (Machiavelli, 1992; Nice, 1998). The warrior model encourages leaders to: 1) control the flow of information to followers and opponents, 2) value results more than method, and 3) exploit others. Reliance on a warrior model of leadership results in many negative consequences. Nice expressed concern that the "doing whatever it takes" mentality of the warrior model leads to followers' modeling of undesirable behaviors because they witness the successful outcomes leaders achieve through violence, betrayal, and terror. Historically, this type of leadership has lead to great human agony (e.g., military interventions in Yugoslavia). He suggested that exploiting the vulnerabilities of others and shifting blame could lead to the perception of unethical leadership. And, as previously discussed, if the public develops this perception of the CF, financial and moral support could greatly diminish:

> "…to preserve the reputation of the CF and trust in the military as a public institution, leaders must ensure that culture-embedding mechanisms are aligned with the values of the military ethos and that member conduct in all spheres of activity likewise conforms to these values; civic, ethical, and professional values must govern all activities" (Wenek, 2002, p. 24).

Wenek (2002) argues for a moral military leadership that effectively performs a range of duties. Therefore, it becomes important to identify negative and amoral practices so that the CF can create norms that promote effective rather than harmful practices. Coercive power is legitimized in military settings; however, overuse of this type of power may lead to negative consequences. Kipnis (1972) demonstrated that those utilizing coercive power techniques devalue the abilities of target employees. Similarly, O'Neal et al. (1994) proposed that those who

use coercive power evaluate a target person's cognitive abilities less favorably, leading to the derogation of the target and the rationalization of the effectiveness of coercive techniques. They argued that once a behavior is rationalized, there is an increased likelihood of the use of such behavior. This rationalization of the use of coercive power may lead to a host of damaging behaviors such as harassment, bullying, mobbing, and abuse.

Mobbing, bullying, and abusive supervision are terms currently used to describe relational violence in the workplace. Mobbing involves more than one person in negative behavior, such that a number of people are engaged in psychologically harmful behavior towards another, while bullying is the one-on-one occurrence of personal harassment (Davenport, Distler Schwartz, & Purcell, 1999). Bullying and abusive supervision are generally defined as a sustained and enduring display of hostile verbal and nonverbal behaviors, excluding physical contact. These behaviors may include being yelled at, glared at, shut out of communication, gossiped about, lied to, subjected to temper tantrums, blamed for others' mistakes, put under undue pressure, and having needed resources withheld.

Many studies have found that supervisors, as a group, are most frequently identified as abusers within organizations (Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996; Namie & Namie, 2000; Quine, 1999; Rayner, Hoel, & Cooper, 2002). Bullying assumes a power differential between the perpetrator and the target; and power has typically been conceptualized as an organizational position. Thus, leaders, by virtue of their position and access to resources and influence, are proposed to have a greater potential to bully through the misuse of this power.

Abusive leadership has been associated with autocratic leadership and authoritarian ways of settling conflicts (O'Moore, Seigne, Mcguire, & Smith, 1998; Vartia, 1996). This suggests that legitimate and positional forms of power are linked with abusive leadership. In contrast,

Ashforth (1994) suggested that leaders who feel powerless could resort to abusive behaviors using whatever power they feel they have to obtain control. Laissez-faire leadership has been associated with peer bullying such that the leader's inability to recognize bullying behavior or refusal to deal with such behavior provides a fertile ground for bullying among peers. In a similar vein, dissatisfaction with the amount and quality of feedback, guidance, and instructions from a leader has been shown to be associated with higher levels of bullying (Einarsen, Raknes, & Matthiesen, 1994).

Given that harassment has been related to power and that military settings by nature entail a high level of authority within the ranks, the CF may be particularly susceptible to the misuse or abuse of power by leaders. Morrow (2000) conducted a study of various forms of harassment in civilian workers of the Department of National Defense. He found that those reporting abuse of authority reported most frequently abusive leadership behavior including: "attempts to intimidate me" (78% for females and 76% for males); "unfairness in receiving work assignments" (60% for females and 57% for males); and "unfairness in the provision of training opportunities" (41% for females and 62% for males). In addition, 49% of participants reported that out of all forms of harassing behaviors, abuse of authority had the greatest impact on them.

Abusive leadership produces negative outcomes at both individual and organizational levels. Quine (1999) found that staff that had been bullied had significantly lower levels of job satisfaction and higher levels of job induced stress, depression, anxiety, and intention to leave the job, compared to non-bullied staff. Rayner et al. (2002) found that 20% of those witnessing emotional abuse in the workplace reported deciding to look for another job. In addition, Namie and Namie (2000) found that 41% of targets of bullying were diagnosed with depression, over 80% reported reduced productivity at work, and 31% of women and 21% of men were diagnosed

with posttraumatic stress disorder. Together these findings show that bullying costs organizations billions of dollars through absenteeism, high staff turnover, and legal action (Davenport et al., 1999, Namie & Namie 2000; Tepper, 2000).

Organizational justice theory is often used to explain employee outcomes (i.e. turnover, retaliation, dissatisfaction and employee stress) in the face of negative organizational behavior (Folger, 1993; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997; Tepper, 2000). Organizational justice refers to the role of fairness as it directly relates to the workplace (Moorman, 1991). Research has identified at least three separate dimensions of organizational justice: 1) distributive justice, 2) procedural justice, 3) interactional justice. Distributive justice refers to the fairness of outcomes (Adams, 1965; Deutsch, 1975; Leventhal, 1976). A common method of achieving distributive justice is through equity rules that ensure that people receive rewards that are consistent with the contributions they make or bring to a situation. When a leader uses non-contingent punishment or does not reward performance, this could lead to a sense of injustice. Procedural justice refers to the fairness of the procedures used to derive one's outcomes (Leventhal, 1980; Thibaut & Walker, 1975). Procedures are often perceived as more fair when the affected individuals have an opportunity to either influence the decision process or have input into decisions. Authoritarian leaders or leaders who develop in-groups could contribute to a sense of injustice by not consulting subordinate out-group members. Interactional justice refers to the perceived fairness of the interpersonal treatment received from one's supervisor (Bies & Moag, 1986). Interactional justice includes whether a supervisor provides a complete and adequate explanation for decisions, and whether the supervisor treats subordinates with dignity, respect, and civility.

The use of coercive power as opposed to information or referent power, seldom involves the use of logic or rational arguments to ensure subordinate compliance. When a leader engages

in bullying behavior, a subordinate is likely to experience interactional injustice. Incidents involving the misuse or abuse of power can be interpreted in light of each of these forms of justice. For example, the use of transformational leadership behaviors is likely to increase perceptions of fairness, while the use of abusive, punitive, or controlling behaviors is likely to lead to perceptions of injustice, which can lead to negative consequences for the organization.

Perceptions of injustice can evoke acts of revenge, sabotage, obstructionism, theft, vandalism, withdrawal behaviors, turnover, spreading gossip, grievances, cynicism, and mistrust (Neuman, 2000; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). Analoui (1995) found that 65% of all acts of sabotage stemmed from discontent with management and its unfair behavior toward workers. Crino and Leap (1989) suggested that this discontent with management also leads to reduced loyalty and an increased likelihood of committing an act of sabotage. Further, supervisors who themselves feel unfairly treated could attempt to "get even" by mistreating their employees or could even intentionally abuse their subordinates as an act of sabotage. Thus, abusive supervision is likely to be pervasive in organizations where concerns regarding organizational justice are devalued.

Leadership Personality Contributions to Dark Side Behavior

Hogan and Hogan (2001) proposed that managerial incompetence is related to undesirable personality characteristics. A range of personality traits and profiles related to negative individual and organizational outcomes are discussed in this section. Specifically, an overview is provided of the relationship between Type-A personality and negative affectivity and the abuse of power. Following this discussion, several dysfunctional leader profiles are reviewed.

Type-A behavior. Type-A behavior is typically thought of as a style of personality that leads to success. However, it is also associated with negative traits such as egocentricism, self-

centeredness, abrasiveness, aggressiveness, and poor listening ability. Because of their impatient, competitive, control-oriented nature these individuals are likely to demonstrate a lack of consideration, to give subordinates little opportunity for discretion or initiative, give vague performance goals and incongruent role expectations, and to fail to consult with employees on work unit decisions (Ganster, 1995). In military settings, this could prevent emergent leadership in lower ranks, create additional stress in crisis situations, and prevent the development of effective transformational leadership styles.

Negative Affectivity. Individuals high on negative affectivity tend to be distressed, upset, and have a negative view of themselves regardless of the situation (Heinisch & Jex, 1998). A constantly negative supervisor is likely to have difficulty providing support, positive feedback or coaching to subordinates. This situation is therefore, likely to be stressful for subordinates.

Dysfunctional Leader Profiles. The use of negative psychological defense mechanisms is generally acknowledged as dysfunctional. Allcorn and Diamond (1997) identified the following five types of negative leadership profiles: 1) perfectionistic, 2) arrogant vindictive, 3) narcissistic, 4) self-effacing, and 5) resigned. The perfectionistic leader is described as: imposing difficult to meet objectives, self righteous and critical, highly judgmental of others, projecting an image of superiority, failing to accept criticism or give approval, obsessed with the control of others, and as not delegating. The perfectionistic leader is likely to use coercive power to force inappropriate standards on followers. Research demonstrates that followers' perception of their power is negatively related to job satisfaction, dependence, intense feelings of powerlessness and learned helplessness (Kouzes & Posner, 1995). Research demonstrates that followers' perceptions of their leader's power are negatively related to job satisfaction, dependence, and intense feelings of powerlessness and learned helplessness (Kouzes & Posner). In military

settings where quick decision-making is required and where there is no time to consult others, learned helplessness could lead to errors in judgment or lack of action that produce deadly consequences.

The arrogant vindictive leader is highly competitive and must win at all costs; he/she is intent on humiliating others, may be amoral in pursuit of victory, is deceitful and manipulative, suspicious and paralyzes others with fear. Like the perfectionistic leader, the arrogant vindictive leader will likely use coercive power inappropriately. This type of leader is likely to use bullying and harassment behaviors extensively. In military settings, these behaviors may also lead to legal actions and poor public opinions.

The narcissistic leader projects an image of self-confidence and demands admiration and loyalty from others, avoids dealing with details, often works on many projects at one time without completion, can be manipulative, autocratic, and does not delegate. Narcissistic personalities are frequently driven by intense needs for power and prestige, and therefore, often occupy top leadership positions. Narcissists believe they are entitled to be served. In short, narcissistic leaders can be extremely demanding taskmasters. Narcissistic leaders need admiration and may gravitate towards those who provide it, creating out-groups and resentment, and leaving the remaining in-group vulnerable to groupthink. This could subsequently lead to poor teamwork. Narcissistic leaders often strive to fill bold, impossible visionary dreams, and may have charismatic appeal. However, if the narcissistic leader demonstrates charismatic leadership and has negative attitudes towards the organization and the capacity to induce negative attitudes toward the organization, the leader can become a force against member commitment and organizational goals (House & Shamir, 1993). Finally, narcissistic leaders may

not own up to mistakes or take alternative action when necessary, thus risking the negative consequences of impulsive, poorly thought out plans of action that are not based in reality.

Self-effacing leaders prefer to be dependent and follow orders. They want to be liked and supported by others. Thus, they are likely to delegate their authority to their followers to prevent taking responsibility. And lastly, the resigned leader prefers to be left alone, avoids challenges, is frequently in conflict with authority figures, is mistrustful of others who are felt to be controlling, dumps responsibility rather than meaningfully delegating, avoids relationships preferring to be isolated, and can be rebellious. This profile is antithetical to the command and control structure of military organizations and is likely to result in personal and group failure under both peaceful and combat conditions.

In summary, the abuse of power may be mediated by dysfunctional leader traits. In other words, leaders whose traits and personalities facilitate the formation of strong interpersonal relationships that embody trust, loyalty, and respect are unlikely to abuse power. Conversely, individuals with Type-A personalities, those who are high on negative affectivity, and those with dysfunctional leader profiles are likely to have poor interpersonal relationships that belittle others, create stress, or insulate a group from reality - all of which are associated with negative outcomes. Individual level negative outcomes are likely to include, increased stress, decreased satisfaction with the unit, leaders, and the military as whole, and turnover. At the leader level, poor decision making not reflective of CF policy and leadership vision is a likely outcome. At the unit level, poor morale, and ineffective group performance are likely to occur. Finally, the inhibition of emergent leadership is likely to be constrained by dysfunctional leadership.

Thus, ensuring that leaders (and members) of the CF are psychologically healthy could help prevent the abuse of power. Appropriate personality screening, interpersonal skills training,

psychological counseling, and coaching of leaders may benefit leaders in the CF and reduce the misuse or abuse of power.

The following section will provide a summary of the leadership literature and empirical research that link the various forms of power to individual and organizational outcomes. The discussion is organized around French and Raven's taxonomy of power as this taxonomy has the largest body of relevant research findings.

V. The Relationship Between Leader Power and Leadership Effectiveness

Leaders' behaviors play a crucial role in determining subordinates' work attitudes, behaviors, and performance, in addition to distal organizational outcomes. The nature of this dyadic relationship influences numerous individual and organizational outcomes, including productivity, motivation, turnover, satisfaction, and commitment. People in positions of authority give instructions to subordinates everyday. These leaders employ various forms of power (e.g., reward, referent) to ensure tasks are accomplished. Empirical research has focused on determining the effects associated with certain forms of power. Bruins, Ellemers, and De Gilder (1999) highlighted the importance of investigating the antecedents of effective use of the various forms of power, without jeopardizing the relationship between leaders and followers.

Effectiveness of the Different Bases of Power

Coercive Power. Consistently having one's work corrected, decisions overruled or input ignored, being intimidated, and threatened with punishments by one's supervisor are behaviors and situations considered to be very unpleasant, leaving employees feeling resentful and angry towards the authority figure. These behaviors are characteristic of leaders who use coercive power. A laboratory study by Bruins et al. (1999) found that the frequency at which leaders exert their power is positively related to subordinate intentions of leaving their organization.

Organizational justice theories are premised on the notion that unfair treatment of employees is associated with detrimental consequences for the individual and the organization (Colquitt, 2001). Interactional justice is particularly relevant because of its focus on the subordinate-leader relationship and the leader's behaviors towards the subordinate. In addition, these behaviors are perceived as violating interactional justice principles; the subordinate feels unfairly treated and perceives the leader as abusing his/her power. These feelings have been associated with subordinates' reluctance to cooperate with leaders' instructions, reduced altruistic and citizenship behaviors, and even to retaliatory behaviors (e.g., stealing, tardiness) and sabotage of group projects or organizational property (Greenberg, 1990; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). In addition, subordinates who worked with leaders who exerted their "veto" power over task-related decisions, indicated the intention to be less cooperative with the leader in a future task and provided more negative leader evaluations (i.e., leaders were regarded as being less competent). Consistent with previous research on LMX theory, the frequent use of power by supervisors resulted in subordinates' loss of autonomy and increased frustration with their task and the supervisor (Bruins et al.).

A meta-analysis on the relationship between leader behaviors, leadership substitutes, and subordinate outcomes found that subordinates' levels of general satisfaction were higher when leaders did not administer rewards or punishments contingent upon their performance (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Bommer, 1996). Furthermore, non-contingent punishment was positively associated with role conflict. The allocation of rewards and punishments based on performance are hallmarks of reward and coercive powers, respectively. Anderson (1998) wrote about the inappropriateness of coercive power in the military. He stated that leaders who employ coercive forms of power become ineffective in the long run and that their behaviors are

detrimental to both their immediate subordinates and to the organization. Reacting to coercion, subordinates increase their dislike and hostility towards the leader, and resistance towards future acts of influence.

A laboratory study conducted by Sharma and Gupta (2000) found that subordinate compliance was most effective in response to supervisors' use of coercive power. Although this outcome may ensure subordinate obedience, further analyses revealed the underlying causes for coercive power's positive effects. Subordinates complied with their coercive supervisor because they attributed their supervisor's actions to his/her expertise and high levels of task-related information. Subordinates justified supervisory actions based on the belief that their leader was important and knowledgeable, and thus justified in using such forms of power. However, this positive outcome may subside over time and in organizational setting. A field study conducted with American supervisor-employee dyads indicated that the use of coercive and reward power were ineffective in bring about change in subordinates' behaviors. The researchers recommended that the use of coercive power should be de-emphasized as the base of power for American leaders (Rahim et al., 1999).

Coercion also has negative effects on the coercer. Acts of coercion decrease the amount of confidence and trust leaders feel towards their subordinates, increasing their perceived need for surveillance of subordinate behaviors. In turn, monitoring of subordinates' behaviors further diminishes leaders' impressions of subordinates' capabilities, and increases feelings of distrust (Raven, 1992). This vicious cycle projects a perception of heightened leader power void of an absolute increase. Raven has indicated that coercion power requires significant surveillance of subordinate behavior on the part of the influencing agent. Thus, the leader actually looses power and time spent monitoring his/her subordinates' every move.

Reward Power. Reward and coercive power are often assumed to be used in conjunction (e.g., transactional leadership). However, an important distinction can be made between these two forms of power. The former relies on rewards to influence and motivate action, while the latter relies on punishments. It is well known that people prefer and are more responsive to rewards, as opposed to punishments. Thus, we find positive outcomes related to the use of reward power. Longitudinal studies have found a causal relationship between leaders' rewarding behaviors and subordinates' performance (Bass, 1981). The meta-analysis conducted by Podsakoff and his colleagues (1996) indicated that contingent reward was positively related to in-role performance. Subordinates' perceptions of leader effectiveness were also positively influenced by leaders' access to and distribution of rewards: The more valued the rewards, the more likely supervisors were to be recognized as possessing leadership characteristics (Bass, 1981).

Extrinsic rewards have been associated with decreased intrinsic motivation for performing work tasks (Deci, 1971). Thus, if subordinates are extrinsically motivated by these rewards, their removal may significantly decrease subordinates' task-related motivation and performance, leading to withdrawal and retaliatory behaviors such as absenteeism and even sabotage. Similar findings emerge from the organizational justice literature. Employees who feel inequitably treated by their leaders are more likely to reduce their performance levels and engage in retaliatory behaviors in an effort to re-establish equity between their perceived level of work input and reward outcome (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). Therefore, establishing a precedent that performance and compliance are associated with rewards may be detrimental to the organization's performance, particularly in the event that rewards must be withheld. Moreover, as with coercion, supervisors employing reward power are required to closely monitor

subordinates' behaviors to ensure their compliance and that proper rewards are in turn delivered (Raven ,1992).

Legitimate Power. Legitimate power is often attained through ones position (i.e., appointment or designation) and the level of authority associated with that position. This form of power is readily available to individuals occupying managerial, executive, or commander positions. However, individuals assigned to these positions through emergence (via organizationally-based promotional systems) followed by subordinate election are most effective at increasing subordinate satisfaction and performance, are better liked, and their influence is more readily accepted. Rahim et al. (1999) found that legitimate and expert sources of power were positively associated with subordinates' organizational commitment levels.

A leader's use of coercive or reward power can often be viewed as legitimate when the leader occupies a high status position. According to subordinates' internalized power and position values, supervisors have a right to and are justified in commanding actions. A study by Bruins et al. (1999) confirmed this interactive relationship. The negative effects of frequent power use were attenuated when subordinates perceived the leader as being legitimate in his/her use of power. In this study, legitimacy was inferred through leader competence, in that subordinates, who perceived their leaders as being competent, were not negatively affected by their frequent use of power. In support of the moderating effect of legitimate power, Bass (1981) indicates that resistance to coercive power decreases as perceived legitimacy increases.

Expert Power. Expert power is generally viewed as a positive and effective form of power (Sharma & Gupta, 2000). Subordinates are likely to defer decision-making and task instructions to the expert, thus easily being persuaded by leaders who use expert power. Unlike coercive power, subordinates publicly and privately are likely to accept an expert's opinion and

willingly act in accordance with his/her instructions. Laboratory research has found that subordinates performed better on a task as a result of receiving information from a leader perceived to be an expert on the subject matter (ref., Bass, 1981). Similarly, field studies have demonstrated that expert power used to explain a new wage incentive program, increased subordinates' satisfaction with the new system (Bass, 1981). These findings are also consistent with research on the effectiveness of influence tactics which has found that rational persuasion was the most effective tactic for obtaining subordinate compliance (e.g., Yukl & Tracey, 1992).

The most important findings related to expert power have emerged from research examining subordinates' reactions to ill-informed or moderately informed leaders. Although performance did not decrease for subordinates working under a non-expert leader, subordinates were more likely to exhibit covert disobedience and resistance towards leaders' attempts at influence (Bass, 1981). Thus, organizations should be mindful of promoting under-qualified individuals to leadership positions. The resulting subordinate withdrawal behaviors may, in the long-term, lead to declining performance and more severe retaliatory behaviors.

Referent Power. The strength of the leader-subordinate relationship and the extent to which subordinates identify with their leader determines the amount of influence a leader has on a subordinate's behavior. The potential to influence subordinates is most effective when leaders employ referent forms of power. In fact, Anderson (1998) refers to referent power as the most effective form of power for influencing US Marine officers. Referent power is centered around a two-way leader-subordinate relationship, built on trust, respect, esteem, and acceptance (Bass, 1981). Through this mutual influence, referent power allows leaders to empower their followers. This can be achieved by transferring decision-making responsibilities, delegating, and holding subordinates accountable for their actions. It is crucial for leaders to share their power with

subordinates. Powerlessness can lead to attempts at controlling others, resistance to influence, aggressive behaviors, and feelings of incompetence that quickly spread throughout the organization (Kanter, 1981). Referent power allows powerless organizational members to gain power and become effective and productive. Contrary to popular thought, power is not a zero-sum entity. Sharing and spreading power throughout an organization actually increases individual and collective amounts of power. This increased power benefits all organizational members, their leaders, and the organization's overall performance (Kanter). Referent power is also associated with subordinate feelings of liking towards the leader, as well as increased individual performance (Rahim et al., 1999).

Another benefit of using referent power is the internalization of compliance with the power holder's requests. Subordinates willingly comply with their leader, publicly and privately accepting to perform the desired actions. Referent power does not require leaders to supervise or monitor subordinates' behaviors, leading to heightened self-competence, autonomy and liking for the leader. Cioffi and Garner (1996) found that students who actively, as opposed to passively, volunteered to join a controversial education group, were more committed and convinced of the value of their decision to join the group and of its mission. Active volunteers' self-perceptions and values were more consistent with the group's cause, and were also more likely to volunteer for this group in the future. The internalization of supervisors' demands and voluntary performance of desired behaviors should have subsequent positive effects on subordinates' level of commitment and attitudes towards the work team and its mission. As indicated in Section II, referent power allows subordinates to adopt an internal locus of control regarding the consequences of their enactment of leaders' requests (Rodrigues, 1995; Rodrigues & Lloyd, 1998).

Some rare research findings indicate that referent power can lead low-power or incompetent subordinates to use ingratiation as influence methods to gain acceptance from leaders. In turn, leaders reward these followers (Kipnis & Vanderveer, 1971), who should have been disciplined for their poor performance. Conger and Kanungo (1998) identified "the shadow side of charisma" which includes extreme narcissism and a quest for the attainment of self-serving goals to the detriment of the organization. One component of referent power is intense follower identification with the leader, his/her goals, and vision. This commitment can be exploited by leaders for the attainment of personal, self-centered, and possible unethical goals (Parry & Proctor-Thomson, 2002).

Informational Power. Compared to all the other bases for power, only information power allows subordinates to remain socially independent from the influencing agent (Raven, 1992). In essence, social independence does not require the leader's continued use of power to ensure the maintenance of change in subordinate behavior. Consequently, information power minimizes leaders' supervision of subordinates' performance and allows subordinates to gain task information from their supervisors. This form of power also increases subordinates' knowledge base, allowing them to independently perform these tasks in the future. Thus, by sharing information, the leader shares his/her (information) power with subordinates, increasing their confidence, autonomy, satisfaction, and motivation to perform. Research on information power is scant because it was not included in French and Raven's original taxonomy, and therefore, most scholars have not recognized it as a primary source of power (Podsakoff & Schriesheim, 1985).

In summary, research suggests that most effective leaders possess and make use of the various forms of power available to them. The broader the leader's base of power, the more

powerful the leader (Burke, 1986). That said, researchers suggest that effective leaders choose the most appropriate forms of power depending on the characteristics of the situation, the organizational culture, and the characteristics of the followers to influence subordinates (Yukl, 1998). This strategy will most likely ensure that the act of influence will yield desired outcomes. In addition, effective leaders tend to rely more on personal rather than position power (Yukl, 1998). The various forms of leadership power each have the potential for positive and negative individual and organizational outcomes.

Although researchers have cautioned against serious methodological and statistical problems existing in most studies investigating French and Raven's power taxonomy (Podsakoff & Schriesheim, 1985; Rahim et al., 1999), it is safe to draw certain conclusions. First, expert, referent, and informational bases of power are generally positively related to functional subordinate and organizational criterion variables (e.g., subordinate performance and motivation; organizational success and financial health). Second, coercive, reward, and legitimate bases of power are generally negatively associated with these same criterion variables, and positively associated with withdrawal and retaliatory behaviors. These conclusions should be considered while bearing in mind that many researchers believe that effective leaders use a mix of different types of power (e.g., Kotter, 1982).

Transformational versus Transactional Leadership

An extensive body of research on transformational leadership indicates a positive relationship between this type of leadership and employee and organizational performance. As indicated in Section III, most transformational leaders rely on referent forms of power to gain cooperation from subordinates. This basis for power contributes to employees exerting extra effort on behalf of their leader and increasing individual performance (Bass, 1981). Conversely,

transactional leaders, particularly those who adopt a passive management-by-exception style or use contingent rewards, rely on reward, coercive, and legitimate forms of power (Bass, 1985). Their subordinates seldom report exerting extra effort on behalf of their leader. This pattern of results was also found when comparing the effectiveness and financial health of organizations led by transformational vs. transactional leaders. One study emanating from the Netherlands found that store supervisors rated high on charismatic and individual consideration components of transformational leadership had employees who were more motivated. Furthermore, charismatic leadership was positively related to employee work satisfaction (Koene, Pennings, & Schreuder, 1992).

A study conducted with US Navy officers demonstrated that transformational leadership was strongly associated with subordinate satisfaction with focal officers (Bass, Waldman, Avolio, & Bebb, 1987). This finding can be attributed to leaders' use of referent or expert power that fosters subordinate positive attitudes and emotions towards the leader. In addition, transformational leadership has a positive impact on team performance, member attitudes, and emotional reactions (Yammarino & Bass, 1990). Specifically, the inspirational component of transformational leadership is characterized by leaders' using referent power which has been found to be related to subordinate satisfaction with their leader and to perceptions of leader effectiveness (Yukl & Van Fleet, 1982). The charismatic and visionary components of transformational leadership inspire and motivate subordinates to strive towards accomplishing the organization's vision (House & Shamir, 1993). Transactional leadership, however, has been associated with reduced performance and propensity to engage in citizenship behaviors. The continual behavioral monitoring and fear of reprimand associated with transactional leadership can result in the suppression of subordinates' initiative and creativity in task performance. These

transactional behaviors communicate to subordinates that low levels of performance are expected, subsequently reducing their levels of motivation and commitment to efficiency and quality task performance (Masi, 2000).

A study conducted by Masi (2000) with personnel working in the US Army Recruiting Command, investigated the relationships between transformational and transactional forms of leadership and various personnel and organizational outcomes. This study clearly demonstrated the superiority of transformational leadership in yielding positive outcomes for subordinates and the organization. Specifically, officers whose unit leaders were characterized as adopting a transformational style were more motivated and reported frequently exerting extra effort to accomplish tasks. Unit leaders characterized as transactional worked with officers who reported being less committed to producing high quality work and received significantly lower productivity scores.

These results were attributed to the bases of power available to each style of leadership. Transformational leaders empower subordinates, encouraging them to take ownership of their work, and to strive for continuous improvement. This inspiration and high performance expectations motivate subordinates to go above and beyond, exerting extra effort in everything they do. Surprisingly, only a weak relationship was found between transformational leadership and unit productivity. A strong negative relationship was expectedly found between transactional leadership and unit performance. Transactional leaders, particularly those who adopt management by exception styles, consistently monitor their subordinates' work. This constant supervision decreases subordinates' feelings of accountability and responsibility for providing quality services and decreases overall organizational performance. This combination of results indicates that transactional leadership has a greater negative impact on overall productivity,

compared to transformational leadership's positive influence. It is often difficult for leaders to develop transformational characteristics, particularly in the military- this style is opposite to the traditional, autocratic leadership philosophy currently operating within the CF. However, the CF should ensure that leaders are not adopting transactional styles, as these can suppress productivity.

A study by Kane and Tremble (2000) found that transactional leadership in US Army battalions had a positive relationship with subordinate officers' reports of exerting extra performance effort as a result of their leaders' behaviors and expectations, as well as with subordinate job motivation levels. Moreover, transformational leadership accounted for incremental variance in the criterion variables, above that accounted for by transactional leadership. Although these results indicate that transactional leadership can have positive influence on subordinate outcomes, this style of leadership does carry potential costs. On the other hand, research has failed to provide conclusive evidence of costs associated with the use of transformational leadership. Consequently, it is reasonable to draw the conclusion that transformational leadership styles are expected to lead to more positive subordinate and organizational outcomes than transactional leadership (Den Hartog & Koopman, 2001). The following section discusses how leadership and the use of power affect organizational culture and the socialization of newcomers to the organization.

VI. The Role of Leadership in Follower Socialization

Transmission of Cultural Norms and Values

Outside the area of transformational leadership, few studies have focused on the relationship between organizational culture, socialization, and leadership (Kozlowski & Doherty, 1989). Many empirical works focus on formal orientation programs that facilitate newcomer

learning of his/her new environment and position tasks. Socialization is a process that involves adaptation and integration into the organization's culture and the learning of appropriate behaviors. The socialization process allows naïve newcomers to make sense of their new environments (Settoon & Adkins, 1997).

During the first few months of employment in a new organization, newcomers acquire the attitudes, behaviors, and knowledge they need to effectively participate as organizational members (Morrison, 2002). More specifically, newcomers acquire knowledge in a number of areas related to their task and role responsibilities, team or group processes, and the organization's climate and culture (Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1998; Thomas & Anderson, 1998). Although several models of socialization processes have been proposed, they all concur that socialization occurs over time, beginning prior to organizational entry and continuing throughout one's career. Socialization is marked by changes in the newcomer's attitudes, values, and behaviors; and is comprised of multiple interactions and experiences with various organizational members, including coworkers and supervisors (Baker & Jennings, 2000).

Most organizations develop formal orientation programs during which new employees are introduced to the organization's mission, values, history, and human resource (HR) policies. However, after the formal orientation is completed, the socialization process continues and the burden shifts to the newcomer's supervisor and coworkers. It is during this period that the informal values, norms, and culture, critical for adequate functioning in any organization and work group, are transmitted to newcomers. Furthermore, the socialization process allows newcomers to process and interpret this information in terms of its relation to his/her role within the organization and work group. This process is very important because of its strong and enduring impact on employees' behaviors and attitudes. Moreover, socialization allows the

organization's culture to be maintained over time and to persist despite employee turnover (Morrison, 2002).

New organizational members are believed to experience several changes in their acquisition of information and the development of work skills and abilities during their adaptation to group and organizational values and norms. It is during the socialization process that new members learn and adapt their behaviors and attitudes to match those of the group or organization's culture. To gain this new information, newcomers turn to other organizational members, such as supervisors and coworkers. Non-interpersonal sources of information, such as vicarious observations and behavioral experimentation by trial and error, can also be tapped during socialization (Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1998). These interpersonal and non-interpersonal sources of information have been shown to play essential roles in newcomers' learning process. Interpersonal sources of information have been rated by recruits as being "most available" and "most helpful" in providing information and as "more useful" compared to formal induction procedures (e.g., organizational orientation programs or "Welcome" manuals containing information on the organization's formal policies and HR programs; Thomas & Anderson, 1998).

Few empirical studies formally distinguish between coworkers' and immediate supervisors' roles in the socialization of newcomers. However, Ostroff and Kozlowski (1998) distinguished between different sources of interpersonal information and found that coworkers played crucial roles in helping newcomers integrate the various pieces of information and communicate subtle group values and norms. Meanwhile, supervisors helped the newcomer gain information regarding their tasks and roles within the organization, as well as help him/her develop the interpretive information system shared by all organizational members which allows

them to attribute similar meanings to events, behaviors, and information, leading to similar actions directed towards a shared goal. Personal adoption of this system is indicative of adaptation and assimilation into the organization's culture (Ostroff & Kozlowski). Thus, supervisors can readily exercise their power over the information transmitted to newcomers and ensure that they adhere to the group's behavioral norms (as deemed appropriate by the supervisor).

Socialization also occurs through social learning mechanisms. A study by Ostroff & Kozlowski (1998) found that observing others' behaviors and interactions was the method most frequently used by organizational newcomers to gain information about their new organization, followed by direct contact with interpersonal sources. Supervisors and coworkers were reported as providing the greatest amount of information. Supervisors were relied upon for all types of information, while coworkers were mostly approached for information pertaining to group values and norms. These results indicate that newcomers become socialized through observations of other organizational members, who are themselves assimilated into the work roles, tasks, and values of the group (i.e., its culture). This result is consistent with the notion that learning occurs through observation and modeling of others' behaviors (Bandura, 1971). Newcomers gather information by observing their organizational role models, supervisors and coworkers. Then, newcomers mimic behaviors and learn through experimentation which behaviors and roles are appropriate within the organizational culture. Thus, social learning and modeling play an important role in the socialization of new organizational members (Weiss, 1977). The newcomer's observation of his/her coworkers' behaviors is important in that these behaviors were in turn learned by observing other coworkers. This continual learning by imitation

contributes to the maintenance of an organization's culture by continually persuading new organizational members to adopt the organization's values and behavioral norms.

Organizational leaders and supervisors are believed to be the primary instigators and creators of their organization's culture and climate. Organizational climate and leadership researchers have recognized the importance of leaders in the formation of organizational climate (Kozlowski & Doherty, 1989). Climate has been defined "as a set of perceptually based descriptions of relevant organizational events, features, and processes" (Kozlowski & Doherty, p. 546). At the individual level, this notion is referred to as *psychological climate*. It is defined as cognitive interpretations of interactions between the individual and other organizational members from which a shared representation of the meaning inherent in organizational events, features, and processes is formed. Empirical studies on the relationship between climate and leadership have found that organizational climate becomes increasingly differentiated in a manner consistent with the leader's style (ref., Kozlowski & Doherty). Thus, organizational leaders have a considerable amount of influence on the development, maintenance, and transformation of an organization's climate, culture, and their ensuing values and behavioral norms. Leaders' behaviors are interpreted by subordinates to be tangible representations of organizational actions, policies, and procedures. Furthermore, leaders' behaviors are perceived as indicators of "the way things are done around here." The nature of leader-subordinate interactions has been found to mediate and structure subordinates' interpretations of organizational actions, policies, and procedures (Kozlowski & Doherty). These findings indicate that although organizations are characterized by a culture reflected through its artifacts, values, and assumptions (Schein, 1985), supervisors play a crucial role in determining how this culture is implemented and applied within his/her group or department. Sub-cultures characterized by their own set of values, behavioral

norms, and assumptions permeate work groups and departments. Newcomers must learn the dominant organization's culture (perhaps during the formal orientation program) in addition to his/her group's idiosyncratic sub-culture to become a productive and integrated member. Supervisors play a large in both determining the sub-culture and transmitting its characteristics to newcomers. Thus, if a leaders' chosen culture is one characterized by abuse of subordinates, intimidation, use of coercive and reward power, it will be implemented as such and transmitted to newcomers.

The results of Kozlowski and Doherty's (1989) study also indicate that supervisors play a crucial role in providing newcomers with information on various domains needed for effective socialization. Information communicated verbally, as well as information obtained via observation of supervisors' actions will shape newcomers' own behaviors. Supervisors and subordinates' actions should correspond and align towards the accomplishment of common goals. If discrepancies arise, the newcomer will most likely, at first, prescribe to the behaviors encouraged by the supervisor to avoid facing disciplinary action. Because the supervisor is perceived as the authority and as possessing reward power, newcomers are more likely to value his/her instructions and behaviors.

Individuals who fail to adopt the new culture risk being ostracized. Organizational members act as gatekeepers of information and can help or hinder the newcomer's task accomplishments. Particularly in cohesive groups with strong cultures, non-conformist members' deviance from behavioral norms risk incurring severe repercussions. By adhering to their group's behavioral norms and values, newcomers benefit from acceptance into the group, enhanced feelings of belongingness, and the potential for friendships. In addition, newcomers avoid alienation and rejection from the group.

A study conducted with British Army recruits found that new recruits' perceptions of the employer's (i.e., the Army) obligations towards them (i.e., psychological contract) changed over time and became more aligned with those of more experienced soldiers (Thomas & Anderson, 1998). This finding supports a social-constructionist view of reality. The socialization process of these recruits increased their knowledge and understanding of their role in the organization. The importance of social knowledge is highlighted by the change in recruits' behaviors, perceptions, and their roles within the Army to become more aligned with the norms socially constructed by the existing members. This study also exemplifies the important role that organizational members play in shaping new recruits' perceptions of the organization, their tasks, missions, behaviors, and shared meaning. As indicated above, supervisors play a crucial role in determining their group's culture. Thus, recruits learn the culture and associated behavioral norms as outlined by the leader. This situation opens the door for leaders to misuse their power by creating a sub-culture of corruption and abuse. This scenario is probable in a military context, where military units and commandos are often isolated and geographically stationed far away from executive leaders. We now turn to a discussion of the consequences of socialization principles and culture formation and transmission in a military context.

Socialization in Military/Paramilitary Work Contexts

The nature of the socialization process in the military departs from those traditionally found in non-military organizations. Although recruits go through the same stages of socialization, their experiences are dramatically different from those of non-military newcomers. All new CF military recruits must attend and successfully complete "boot camp" or basic training. This socialization program aims to instill new military attitudes, responses, loyalties, values, and combat skills in new recruits. During an intense three month period of basic training,

recruits learn the military culture. Upon completion of the "enculturation process," it is expected that recruits will have developed strong bonds with their cohort, loyalty to their commander, and respect for the military. In addition, they are expected to develop their teamwork skills, physical strength, and discipline. This grueling entry process breaks down the individual only to reconstruct a new individual who is: a) loyal to his/her group, b) physically and mentally strong, c) confident, and d) has the utmost respect and dedication to his/her fellow recruits, unit members, and his/her commander in particular. This assimilation process is critical to ensure that the military culture, coined the Regimental tradition, is ingrained into the new recruits. This Regiment culture is characterized by highly cohesive individuals who are loyal to the members of their Regiment. Great pride should be felt and expressed towards the Regiment, and its members are highly protective of its artifacts, rituals, values, and behavioral norms (Winslow, 1998). Regiment cultures are transmitted from generation to generation. Each Regiment is responsible for the selection, training, and personal care of its members, facilitating the transmission of cultural factors to new recruits.

The culture present in the CF is a result of the CF's structure organized into three distinct and operationally independent divisions (i.e., Army, Navy, and Air Force). Each environment is further subdivided into Regiments and commando units, operating separately from each other and from the other environments. The notion of such a Regiment structure is practical because it ensures recruits form solid bonds with members of their unit. In addition, it ensures that soldiers obey their commanding officer in all situations and at all times. This loyalty, solidarity, and complete confidence towards their unit members are thought to propel soldiers to enter battle situations with each other and for each other (Winslow, 1998). It is obvious that this organizational structure is designed to increase combat effectiveness. The high levels of loyalty

and group cohesiveness that ensue from this structure are effective under wartime and certain battle situations. As evidenced below, these feelings, however, can be detrimental for the units, its members, and the CF as a whole during peacetime.

Since the end of the Cold War, the CF has been increasingly called to perform peace-keeping missions (Horn, 2000; Winslow, 1998). The CF's primary mandate has changed; however, its culture has not adapted to the new tasks, responsibilities, and roles associated with peace-keeping. The loyalty and strong bonds between soldiers were designed to motivate them on the battle field by protecting their unit and their fellow soldiers against enemy attack. In the absence of battle and combat situations, this structure and its related culture can have severe negative repercussions. As reported by Winslow, this shift in the CF's mission and purpose has been resisted by many Regiment leaders, and their members, who prefer combat missions and value the continuation of the CF's priority towards its defense agenda, namely the retention and advancement of combat capabilities for the protection of Canadians and their values, at home and abroad. This resistance towards change is not unexpected, however, it poses substantial challenges for the CF leadership to transform its organization's and Regiments' culture.

Incidents involving CF soldiers in Somalia and the former Yugoslavia have highlighted the grave inadequacy of the Regimental culture. These two incidents also point to the power of socialization and enculturation of decent soldiers who became violent to protect their Regiment, its name, reputation, and its members. These incidents had devastating consequences for the brutalized civilians, the soldiers involved, and the CF. These separate events were attributed to the Regimental culture, deeply rooted within the military tradition of loyalty, discipline, and teamwork (Hannaford, 2001; Winslow, 1998). These organizational norms were counter-productive and back-fired because fierce loyalty and extreme group cohesiveness led to the

erection of a wall of silence and protection of misbehaving soldiers. Isolated units failed to report incidences of misbehavior such as alcohol abuse or insubordination. This failure to pass information up the chain of command led soldiers to perceive misconduct as tolerated and consequence-free. The socialization, together with the fear of punishment of insubordination and alienation from the group, ultimately led soldiers to torture and kill an innocent Somalian. The commander's ultimate and unquestioned authority over his/her soldiers' behaviors resulted in their immediate compliance with his orders. Consistent with the Regimental culture, these soldiers never questioned the appropriateness of the orders they received and obeyed them without question (Hannaford, 2001). The Regimental culture also leads to groupthink where the unit members perceive their actions as unconditionally appropriate even in the face of obvious contradictory evidence (Riggio, 2000). In addition, this culture leads to strong "we-they" or in-group versus out-group feelings towards members of other units and Regiments. These group processes have been found to have devastating consequences (Riggio), as evidenced in the Somalia and Bacovici incidents.

The results of the Somalia and Bacovici inquires, as well as the continuing need for peace-keeping missions, stress the need for a new organizational culture within the CF. The current Regimental culture is still thought to be effective for accomplishing the CF's missions and purpose (Winslow, 1998). However, strong leadership is required at all levels of the organization to begin changing the Regimental culture found within the CF. Leaders must play a crucial role in establishing and implementing change in a group's culture. Culture change is a gradual and lengthy process. To prevent these types of incidents from re-occurring, the CF should immediately begin this transformation. An obvious starting point is with the leaders of each Regiment and their unit commanders. Capitalizing on the strong bonds and feelings of

loyalty present within military units, leaders have a tremendous influence over their soldiers' behaviors. Leaders can change their units' culture by emphasizing, for example, the need for reporting misbehaviors, integrity, cooperation with other units and Regiments. In turn, new recruits will be socialized into a Regimental culture that is appropriate for the CF's peace-keeping mandates and will learn behaviors consistent with these new goals and purpose.

VII. Integration of Literature Review and Application to the Canadian Forces

This paper has reviewed the role of power in leadership and how influence tactics are used to exercise power. In short, power is at the crux of effective leadership, and effective leaders are likely to have a high need for power. The role of power in leadership is especially salient in the CF because of the steep organizational hierarchy (i.e., the ranking system) and heavy reliance on most forms of power. Empirical research by Zaleski, Janson, and Swietlicka (1997) demonstrated that Polish military supervisors used significantly more coercive and reward power than civilian supervisors; whereas civilian leaders used more expert, referent, and informational power.

The role of power in several popular models of leadership was examined and applied to the CF context. Specifically, trait-based approaches to leadership focus on the personality traits associated with effective leadership, insinuating what makes a good leader. LMX theory delineates the leadership process that occurs between leaders and followers, and some of the positive outcomes associated with high quality LMX relationships (e.g., increased trust, employee retention, and better performance). How the LMX process works in military settings was also examined. LMX theory provides some guidelines on the use of power to ensure positive relationships between leaders and their followers. Transactional leadership theory was also reviewed. This theory provides an explanation for the attainment of desired outcomes using

reward and coercive forms of power, as well as the costs associated with the use of these bases of power. This is particularly important in the military context because of the potential for greater use of coercive and reward forms of power as a result of the substantial position power bestowed upon leaders.

Both charismatic and transformational leadership theories emphasize the importance of personal power in effective leadership and the ensuing positive organizational outcomes. Transformational leadership theory suggests that effective leadership should include the sharing of power to empower followers and increase their motivation and performance. The present paper outlined the benefits associated with the use of transformational leadership styles within the military. Specifically, it is exactly this style of leadership that can successfully enact substantial organizational change to the prevailing military culture to prevent future misuse or abuse of power.

Power, however, can be a double-edged sword. While there is admiration for leaders' ability to amass great power and admiration for the ways in which great power can be used to benefit society, there is also profound suspicion that power holders will use their resources to exploit others and to further enrich themselves. In the present paper, we have reviewed the "dark side" of power and leadership, and the negative consequences associated with the misuse or abuse of power. With power comes the risk of its misuse or abuse and subsequent negative outcomes. The high need for power that frequently characterizes effective leaders also has the potential to produce problematic or even disastrous outcomes for organizations (Conger, 1997). When a leader's behaviors become exaggerated, lose touch with reality, or become vehicles for purely personal gain, they may harm the leader, his/her followers, and the organization. The

"dark side" of leadership and its negative consequences for the CF have been documented in the incidents in Somalia and the former Yugoslavia.

Abuses of power often involve groupthink, bullying, and harassment of subordinates. These behaviors are not only unethical, but are likely to impair organizational functioning. The military is susceptible to such indiscretions because of the high level of authority within the ranks and the strong group cohesion that can promote discrimination. Winslow (1998) acknowledges that the emphasis on strong group alliance, cohesion, and loyalty are considered important components of combat effectiveness within the CF, can actually impede the functioning of the entire organization.

Research on organizational justice suggests that abuses of power are related to decreases in employee satisfaction, commitment, motivation, and effort, and increases in retaliatory behaviors such as tardiness, absenteeism, turnover, theft, and sabotage. Moreover, scandals from the misuse or abuse of power can be devastating to the CF's reputation and public support as well as members' pride and morale (Wenek, 2002). Therefore, it behooves the CF to be proactive in reducing the likelihood of abuse of power by creating an organizational culture that does not support or encourage such occurrences.

Rogow and Lasswell (1963) suggested that the connection between power and corruption depends on various combinations of individual ego needs and the organizational context within which power is exercised. The organizational context can play a large role in terms of whether or not power will corrupt. Specifically, through tradition, reputation, and leadership, organizations can either encourage or discourage corrupt behavior. The subversion of official organizational power for individual gain has substantial costs not only for those who are mistreated, but also for the purposes of the organization (Bargh & Alvarez, 2001). Leadership can be extremely effective

in increasing follower commitment to shared goals, values, and missions. However, if the leader's goals are in conflict with those of the organization, this can result in negative attitudes toward the organization and resistance from followers (House & Shamir, 1993).

It is crucial for leaders to uphold the ideals of the military because they function as role models, defining the traits, values, and behaviors that are valued by the organization (House & Shamir, 1993). A conflict may therefore exist between a leader's need for power and the organization's need to have that power used to serve the organization's not the individual's agenda. To the extent that a leader uses his/her official power for unofficial reasons, the organization's power and ability to attain its goals are decreased. For this reason, the present paper also focused on the role of leadership in organizational culture and the socialization of new recruits. Leaders have a great deal of influence on the development, maintenance, and transformation of an organization's culture and the values that are endorsed by its members. This is particularly salient in the military's socialization process which instills new attitudes, values, skills, and behaviors in new recruits. This process is designed to prepare soldiers for combat; however, it may be detrimental to the effective functioning of the military during regular operations and peace-keeping missions.

The present paper provided a summary of the effectiveness of the different sources of power on both subordinate and organizational outcomes. The following section provides some practical recommendations for leaders regarding the effective use of the different bases of power.

Recommendations

The research on power and influence is still limited in its ability to provide clear and unequivocal guidelines for leaders on the best way to exercise their power. However, by drawing upon the diverse literature, Yukl (1998) developed some guidelines for leaders on how best to

build and maintain each of French and Raven's bases of power, and how to use each effectively. These guidelines will also reduce the likelihood that CF leaders will abuse of their power.

Legitimate power. Authority is usually exercised to make simple requests of subordinates. The following guidelines are provided to help leaders use legitimate power effectively and to maximize positive outcomes associated with its use:

- Make polite, clear requests.
- Explain the reasons for a request.
- Don't exceed your scope of authority.
- Verify authority if necessary.
- Be sensitive to target concerns.
- Follow up to verify compliance.
- Insist on compliance if appropriate.

Reward power. Reward power is most commonly used to establish incentives or as the basis for an exchange tactic. The following guidelines are provided to help leaders use reward power effectively and to ensure subordinates' compliance and commitment to requests:

- Offer desirable rewards.
- Offer fair and ethical rewards.
- Explain criteria for giving rewards.
- Provide rewards as promised.
- Use rewards symbolically to reinforce desirable behavior.

Expert power. Expert power may be effective in eliciting target compliance or commitment when the leader has expertise beyond that of his/her subordinates. The following guidelines are offered to help supervisors use expert power effectively:

- Explain the reasons for a request or proposal.
- Explain why a request is important.
- Provide evidence that a proposal will be successful.
- Listen seriously to target concerns.
- Show respect for subordinates (don't be arrogant).
- Act confident and decisive in a crisis.

Referent power. Because subordinates tend to imitate leaders with whom they identify, the leader should set an example of appropriate role behavior (including the appropriate use of power). The following guidelines are presented to help leaders use referent power effectively and to engender commitment to requests:

- Use personal appeals when necessary.
- Indicate that a request is important to you.
- Don't ask for a personal favor that is excessive given the relationship.
- Provide an example of proper behavior (role modeling).

Coercive power. Coercive power is invoked by threat or warning that the subordinate will suffer undesirable consequences for noncompliance with a request, rule, or policy. Generally, it is best to avoid the use of coercive power unless it is absolutely necessary because it is difficult to use and likely to result in undesirable side effects (e.g., mistrust, resentment, retaliation). The following guidelines are offered for situations where the use of coercive power cannot be avoided to help minimize negative side affects:

- Inform subordinates of rules and penalties.
- Give ample prior warning.
- Understand situation before punishing.
- Remain calm and helpful, not hostile.
- Encourage improvement to avoid the need for punishment.
- Administer discipline in private.

A potential remedy to reduce the occurrence of abuses of power is for leaders to hold themselves strongly accountable for decisions affecting those over whom they have power. That is, leaders should be able to explain the reasons behind their decisions (Bargh & Alvarez, 2001). This would require conscious awareness of the objective situation and the potential consequences of their behavior. Bargh and Alvarez also recommend educational training programs to raise awareness for large scale elimination and prevention of abuse of power. Participants would learn

to be aware of both the antecedents and the consequences associated with the misuse and abuse of power and how to prevent such occurrences.

In summary, integrity, morality, and ethics are essential underlying concepts of the constructive use of power regardless of the form of power. Selecting leaders with highly developed moral judgment and socializing military leaders to norms that reflect effective leadership, should ensure the constructive use of power inherent in leadership positions in the CF.

References

Adams, A. J. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental psychology* (Vol. 2; pp. 267-299). New York: Academic Press.

Allcorn, S. & Diamond, M. (1997). *Managing people during stressful times: The psychologically defensive workplace*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Anderson, D. A. (1998, December). Using power and influence tactics for better results. *Marine Corps Gazette*, pp. 37-38.

Anderson, J. A. (1999). Are power motivated leaders more effective? A review of McClelland's theory. In F. A. Rahim, R. T. Colembiewski, & K. D. MacKenzie (Eds.), *Current topics in management* (Vol. 4, pp. 41-59). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

Analoui, F. (1995). Workplace sabotage: Its styles, motives and management. *Journal of Management Development, 14,* 48-65.

Ashforth, B. (1994). Petty tyranny in organizations. *Human Relations, 47*, 755-778.

Atwater, L. E., & Lau, A. N. (1997). Effects of rewards and punishments on leader charisma, leader effectiveness and follower reactions. *Leadership Quarterly, 8*(2)*,* 133-153.

Baker, E. H., & Jennings, K. M. (2000). Limitations in "realistic recruiting" and subsequent socialization efforts: The case of Riddick Bowe and the United States Marine Corps. *Public Personnel Management, 29*(3), 367-377.

Bandura, A. (1971). *Social learning theory*. Morristown, NJ: General Press.

Bargh, J. A., & Alvarez, J. (2001). The road to hell: Good intentions in the face of nonconscious tendencies to misuse power. In A. Y. Lee-Chai & J. A. Bargh (Eds.), *The use and abuse of power: Multiple perspectives on the causes of corruption* (pp. 42-55). New York: Taylor & Francis.

Barry, B. (2001). Influence in organizations from a social expectancy perspective. In A. Y. Lee-Chai & J. A. Bargh (Eds.), *The use and abuse of power: Multiple perspectives on the causes of corruption* (pp. 19-40). New York: Taylor & Francis.

Barry, B., & Watson, M. R. (1996). Communication aspects of dyadic social influence in organizations: A review and integration of conceptual and empirical developments. In B. R. Burleson (Ed.), *Communication yearbook* (Vol. 19; pp. 269-317). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bass, B. M. (1998). Transformational leadership: Industrial, military, and educational impact. New York: Laurence Erlbaum.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations.* New York: The Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1981). Power and leadership. In *Stogdill's handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research* (Rev. ed., pp. 169-191). New York: Macmillan Publishing.

Bass, B. M. (1960). *Leadership, psychology, and organizational behavior*. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M., Waldman, D. A., Avolio, B. J., & Bebb, M. (1987). Transformational leadership and the falling dominoes effect. *Group and Organization Studies,* 12(1), 73-87.

Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & M. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research in negotiations in organizations* (Vol. 1, pp. 43-55). Greenwick, CT: JAI Press.

Blankenship, L. V., & Miles, R. E. (1968). Organizational structure and managerial decision making. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 13,* 106-120.

Bruins, J., Ellemers, N., & DeGilder, D. (1999). Power use and differential competence as determinants of subordinates' evaluative and behavioural responses in simulated organizations. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 29*, 843-870.

Burke, W. W. (1986). Leadership as empowering others. In S. Srivastva (Ed.), *Executive power: How executives influence people and organizations* (pp. 51-77). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership.* New York: Harper and Row.

Cioffi, D., & Garner, R. (1996). On doing the decision: Effects of active versus passive choice on commitment and self-perception. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*(2), 133-147.

Clements, C., & Washbush, J. B. (1999). The two faces of leadership: Considering the dark side of leader-follower dynamics. *Journal of Workplace Learning, 11*(5), 170-176.

Cogniser, C. C., & Schriesheim C. A. (2000). Exploring work unit context and leader-member exchange: a multi-level perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21,* 487-511.

Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 386-400.

Conger, J. (1997). The dark side of leadership. In R. P. Vecchio (Ed.), *Leadership: Understanding the dynamics of power and influence in organizations* (pp. 215-232). Notre Dame, IL: University of Notre Dame Press.

Conger, J., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). *Charismatic leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Crino, M., & Leap, T. (1989). What HR managers must know about employee sabotage. *Personnel, 66,* 31-38.

Dansereau, F., Graen, G. G., & Haga, W. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership in formal organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 13,* 46-78.

Davenport, N., Distler, S. R., & Pursell, E. G. (1999). *Mobbing: Emotional abuse in the American workplace.* Ames, IA: Civil Society Publishing.

Deci, E. L. (1971). Effects of externally mediated rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 18*(1), 105-115.

Den Hartog, D. N., & Koopman, P. L. (2001). Leadership in organizations. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial, work, and organizational psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 167-187). London: Sage.

Deutsch, M. (1975). Equity, equality, and need: What determines which value will be used as the basis for distributive justice? *Journal of Social Issues, 31,*137-149.

Einarsen, S., Raknes, B. I., & Matthiesen, S. B. (1994). Bullying and harassment at work and their relationship to work environment quality: An exploratory study. *European Work and Organizational Psychologist, 4*(4), 381-401.

Einarsen, S., & Skogstad, A. (1996). Bullying at work: Epidemiological findings in public and private organizations. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5,* 185-201.

Falbe, C. M., & Yukl, G. (1992). Consequences for managers of using single influence tactics and combinations of tactics. *Academy of Management, 35*(3), 638-653.

Folger, R. (1993). Reactions to mistreatment at work. In J. K. Murnigham (Ed.), *Social psychology in organizations: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 161-183.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

French, J., & Raven, B. H. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies of*

social power. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press Institute for Social Research.

Ganster, D. (1995). Interventions for building healthy organizations: Suggestions from the stress research literature. In L. Murphy, J. J. Hurrell, S. L. Sauter, & K. G. Puryear (Eds.), *Job Stress Interventions* (pp. 323-336). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82,* 827-844.

Graen, G. B. (1976). Role-making processes within complex organizations. In M. M. Dunnette (Ed), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1202-1245). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Graen, G. B., & Scandura, T. A. (1987). Toward a psychology of dyadic organizing. In B. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 9; pp. 175-208). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly 6(2),* 219-247.

Graen G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1991). The transformation of professionals into self-managing and partially self-designating contributions: Toward a theory of leader-making. *Journal of Management Systems, 3(3),* 33-48.

Greenberg, J. (1990). Employee theft as a reaction to underpayment inequity: The hidden cost of pay cuts. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75,* 561-568.

Hannaford, N. (2001). The military and the media in Canada since 1992. *Security and Defense Studies Review, 1,* 199-214.

Heinisch, D. A., & Jex, S. M. (1998). Measurement of negative affectivity: A comparison of self-reports and observer ratings. *Work and Stress, 12(2),* 145-160.

Hogan, R., Curphy, G., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership. *American Psychologist 49*(6), 493-504.

Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (2001). Assessing leadership: A view from the dark side. *International Journal of Selection & Assessment, 9*(1-2), 40-51.

Hollander, E. P. (1993). Legitimacy, power, and influence: A perspective on relational features of leadership. In M. M. Chemers, & R. Ayman, (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions* (pp. 29-48). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Hollander, E. P., & Offermann, L. R. (1990). Power and leadership in organizations. *American Psychologist, 45*(2), 179-189.

Horn, B. (2000). Wrestling with an enigma: Executive leadership. In B. Horn (Ed.), *Contemporary issues in officership: A Canadian perspective* (pp. 123-144). Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Canadian Institute of Strategic Studies.

House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The cutting edge* (pp. 189-207). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

House, R. J., & Baetz, M. (1979). Leadership: Some empirical generalizations and new research directions. In B. M. Staw (Ed.), *Research in organizational behavio*r (Vol. 1, pp. 341-423). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

House, R. J. & Shamir, B. (1993). Toward the integration of transformational, charismatic, and visionary theories. In M. M. Chemers, M. Martin, & A. Roya (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and direction* (pp. 81-108). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Janis, I. L. (1997). Groupthink. In R. P. Vecchio (Ed.), *Leadership: Understanding the dynamics of power and influence in organizations* (pp. 163-176). Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Kane, T. D., & Tremble, T. R. Jr. (2000). Transformational leadership effects at different levels of the Army. *Military Psychology, 12*(2), 137-161.

Kanter, R. M. (1981). Power, leadership, and participatory management. *Theory into Practice 21*, 219-228.

Kipnis, D. (1984). The use of power in organizations and in interpersonal settings. *Applied Social Psychology Annual, 5,* 179-210.

Kipnis, D. (1972). Does power corrupt? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 24,* 33-41.

Kipnis, D., Castell, J., Gergen, M., & Mauch, D. (1976). Metamorphic effects of power. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 61*(2), 127-135.

Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S. M., Swaffin-Smith, C., & Wilkinson, I. (1984). Patterns of managerial influence: Shotgun manager, tacticians, and bystanders. *Organizational Dynamics, 12*(3), 58-67.

Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S. M., & Wilkinson, I. (1980). Intraorganizational influence tactics: Explorations in getting one's way. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 65,* 440-452.

Kipnis, D., & Vanderveer, R. (1971). Ingratiation and the use of power. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 17*(3), 280-286.

Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1991). Leadership: Do traits matter? *The Executive, 5,* 48-60.

Koene, B. A. S., Pennings, J. M., & Schreuder, H. (1992). Leadership, organizational culture, and organizational outcomes. In K. E. Clark, M. B. Clark, & D. P. Campbell (Eds.), *Impact of leadership* (pp. 215-223). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Kotter, J. P. (1982). General managers are not generalists. *Organizational Dynamics, 10*(4), 5-19.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1995). *The leadership challenge: How to keep getting extraordinary things done in organizations.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kozlowski, A. W. J., & Doherty, M. L. (1989). Integration of climate and leadership: Examination of a neglected issue. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*(4), 546-553.

Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? In K. J. Gergen, M. S. Greenberg, & R. H. Willis (Eds.), *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 27-55). New York: Plenum Press.

Leventhal, G. S. (1976). The distribution of rewards and resources in groups and organizations. In L. Berkowitz & W. Walster (Eds.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*. New York: Academic Press.

Levy, D. A., Collins, B. E., & Nail, P. R. (1998). A new model of interpersonal influence characteristics. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 13*(4), 715-735.

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., & Stilwell, D. (1993). A longitudinal study on the early development of leaders member exchange. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78,* 662-674.

Lord, R. G., DeVader, C. L., & Alliger, G. M. (1986). A meta-analysis of the relationship between personality traits and leadership perceptions: An application of validity generalization procedures. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71,* 402-410.

Lowe, K. B., Kroek, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *Leadership Quarterly, 7,* 385-425.

Machiavelli, N. (1992). *The Prince.* New York: Dover Publications Inc. (Original work published 1513)

Masi, R. J. (2000). Effects of transformational leadership on subordinate motivation, empowering norms, and organizational productivity. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 8*(1), 16-48.

McClelland, D. C. (1970). The two faces of power. *Journal of International Affairs, 24*(2), 29-47.

McClelland, D. C. (1987). *Human motivation.* New York: Cambridge.

McClelland, D. C. (1985). *Human motivation.* Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.

McClelland, D. C. (1976). *The achieving society* (2nd Ed.). Princeton, NJ: Harvard University Press.

McClelland, D. C. (1975). *Power: The inner experience.* New York: Irvington.

McClelland, D. C. (1973). The two faces of power. In D. C. McClelland & R S. Steele (Eds.), *Human Motivation* (pp. 300-316). Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

McClelland, D. C., & Boyatzis, R. E. (1982). Leadership motive pattern and long term success in management. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 67,* 737-743.

McClelland, D. C., & Burnham, D. H. (1976, March-April). Power is the great motivator. *Harvard Business Review*, 100-110.

Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76,* 845-855

Morrison, E. W. (2002). Newcomers' relationships: The role of social network ties during socialization. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*(6), 1149-1160.

Morrow, R. (2000). *The effects of three types of harassment on male and female public servants.* Unpublished master's thesis, Carlton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Namie, G., & Namie, R. (2000). *The bully at work: What you can do to stop the hurt and reclaim your dignity on the job*. Naperville, IL: Sourcebooks Inc.

Neuman, J. (2000). *Injustice, stress and bullying can be expensive*. Retrieved May 17, 2001 from http://www.bullybusters.org/home

Nice, D. C. (1998). The warrior model of leadership: Classic perspective and contemporary relevance. *Leader Quarterly*, *9*(3), 321-333.

Northouse, P. G. (1997). *Leadership: Theory and practice.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

O'Moore, M., Seigne, E., McGuire, L., & Smith, M. (1998). Bullying at work: Victims of bullying at work in Ireland. *Journal of Occupational Health and Safety-Australia and New Zealand, 14,* 569-574.

O'Neal, E. C., Kipnis, D., & Craig, K. M. (1994). Effects on the persuader of employing a coercive influence technique. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 15*(3), 225-238.

Ostroff, C., & Kozlowski, S. W. J. (1998). Organizational socialization as a learning process: The role of information acquisition. *Personnel Psychology, 45*(4), 849-874.

Parry, K. W., & Proctor – Thomsom, S. B. (2002). Perceived integrity of transformational leaders in organizational settings. *Journal of Business Ethics, 35*(2), 75-96.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Bommer, W. H. (1996). Meta-analysis of the relationship between Kerr and Jermier's substitutes for leadership and employees job attitudes, role perceptions, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*(4), 380-399.

Podsakoff, P. M., & Schriesheim, C. A. (1985). Field studies of French and Raven's bases of power: Critique, reanalysis, and suggestions for future research. *Psychological Bulletin, 97,* 387-411.

Quine, L. (1999). Workplace bullying in an NHS community trust: Staff questionnaire survey, *British Medical Journal, 318*, 228-232.

Rahim, M. A., Antonioni, D., Psenicka, C., Kim, N. H., & Khan, A. A. (1999). Bases of leader power and subordinates' organizational commitment and effectiveness: A cross-cultural study. In F. A. Rahim, R. T. Colembiewski, & K. D. MacKenzie (Eds.), Current Topics in Management, (Vol. 4, pp. 327-346). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

Raven, B. H. (1992). A power/interaction model of interpersonal influence: French and Raven thirty years later. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 7*(2), 217-244.

Raven, B. H. (1965). Social influence and power. In I. D. Steiner & M. Fishbein (Eds.), *Current studies in social psychology* (pp. 371-382). New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Rayner, C., Hoel, H., & Cooper, C. (2002). *Workplace bullying: What we know, who is to blame, and what can we do?* London: Taylor and Francis.

Riggio, R. E. (2000). *Introduction to Industrial/Organizational Psychology* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Rind, B., & Kipnis, D. (1999). Changes in self-perception as a result of successfully persuading

others. *Journal of Social Issues, 55*(1), 141-156.

Rodrigues, A. (1995) Attribution and social influence. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 25*(17), 1567-1577.

Rodrigues, A., & Lloyd, K. L. (1998). Reexamining bases of power from an attributional perspective. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 28*(11), *973-997.*

Rogow, A. A., & Lasswell H. D. (1963). *Power, corruption and rectitude*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Settoon, R. P., & Adkins, C. L. (1997). Newcomer socialization: The role of supervisors, coworkers, friends and family members. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 11*(4), 507-516.

Sharma, N. K., & Gupta, B. (2000). Reasons for compliance: Leaders' bases of power and subordinates' perceptions. *Psychological Studies, 45*(1-2), 51-57.

Shamir, B. (1999). Taming charisma for better understanding and greater usefulness: A response to Beyer. *Leadership Quarterly, 10*(4), 555-562

Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology 82*(3), 434-443.

Steiner, M. & Neuman, M. (1978). Traumatic neurosis and social support in the Yom Kippur War. *Military Medicine, 143*(12), 866-868.

Tepper, B. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal, 43(2)*, 178-190.

Thambain, H. J., & Gemmill, G. R. (1974). Influence styles of project managers: Some project performance correlates. *Academy of Management Journal, 17,* 216-224.

Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Thomas, H. D. C., & Anderson, N. (1998). Changes in newcomers' psychological contracts during organizational socialization: A study of recruits entering the British Army. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 19*, 745-767.

Vartia, M. (1996). The sources of bullying-psychological work environment and organizational climate. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5,* 203-214.

Vecchio, R. P. (1982). A further test of leadership effects due to between-group variation and within-group variation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 67,* 200-208.

Warren, D. I. (1968). Power, visibility, and conformity in formal organizations. *American Sociological Review, 6,* 951-970.

Weber, R. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization.* New York: Free Press.

Weiss, H. M. (1977). Subordinate imitation of supervisor behavior: The role of modeling in organizational socialization. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 19*, 89-105.

Wenek, K. W. J. (2002). *Defining leadership in the Canadian forces: Content and process frameworks*. Kingston, Ontario, Canada: Canadian Forces Leadership Institute.

Winslow, D. (1998). Misplaced loyalties: The role of military culture in the breakdown of discipline in peace operations. *Canadian Review of Sociology & Anthropology, 35*(3), 345-366.

Wurster, C. R., Bass, B. M., & Alcock, W. (1961). A test of the proposition: We want to be esteemed most by those we esteem most highly. *Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology, 63*(3), 650-653.

Yammarino, F. J., & Bass, B. M. (1990). Long-term forecasting of transformational leadership and its effects among naval officers: Some preliminary findings. In K. E. Clark, & M. B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 151-170). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.

Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in Organizations* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Yukl, G. (1981). Leadership in Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Yukl, G., & Falbe, C. M. (1991). Importance of difference power sources in downward and lateral relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*(3), 416-423.

Yukl, G., & Falbe, C. M. (1990). Influence tactics and objectives in upward, downward, and lateral influence attempts. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*(2), 132-140.

Yukl, G., Falbe, C. M., & Youn, J. Y. (1993). Patterns of influence behavior for managers. *Group & Organizational Management, 18*(1), 5-28.

Yukl, G., & Tracey, J. B. (1992). Consequences of influence tactics used with subordinates, peers, and the boss. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77*(4), 525-535.

Yukl, G., & Van Fleet, D. D. (1992). Theory and research on leadership in organizations. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 3, 2nd ed., pp. 147-197). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Yukl, G. & Van Fleet, D. D. (1982). Cross-situational, multi-method research on military leader effectiveness. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 30,* 87-108.

Zaleski, Z., Janson, M., & Swietlicka, D. (1997). Influence strategies used by military and civil supervisors: Empirical research. *Polish Psychological Bulletin, 28*(4), 325-332.