World Applied Sciences Journal 18 (10): 1400-1411, 2012
ISSN 1818-4952
© IDOSI Publications, 2012
DOI: 10.5829/idosi.wasj.2012.18.10.1316

Employees' Effectiveness

[1]Tahereh Nedaee, [1]Khalil Alavi and [2]Zahra Nobakht Ramezani

[1]Department of Physical Education, University of Qom, Qom, Iran
[2]Department of Physical Education, Islamic Azad University, Qazvin Branch, Qazvin, Iran

Abstract: The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between power bases of sports federations' presidents (PBSP-other) and effectiveness of employees (both from the viewpoint of employees).The populationinthis studyconsisted of the employees of sports federations including experts, chiefs and vise chiefs of federation committees, among whom 288 people were selected as the statistical sample. The POSP-other questionnaire (with 15 questions in 9-pointLikert scales) and employees' effectiveness questionnaire (with 20 questions in 5-pointLikert scales including 6 questions on job satisfaction, 6 questions on job stress, 4 questions on job performance and 4 questions on the intend to stay) were confirmed after being translated and approved by 30 experts in the fields of language, management and physical education. Internal consistency of the questionnaires was estimated using Cronbach's alpha which obtained r=0.95 and r= 0.81 for power and effectiveness of employeesfrom their points of view, respectively. Pearson correlation coefficient and hierarchical multiple regression analyses were used to analyze all the hypotheses. The results indicated that employees believed that presidents of sports federations had legitimate, referent, expert, reward and coercive power bases, respectively and a significant relationship was found between PBSP-other and effectiveness of employees (r=0.35). Hierarchical multiple regression analyses revealed that, among power bases of sports federations, referent power base was a better predictor for employees' effectiveness than job performance, job satisfaction, job stress and intend to stay.

Key words: Power bases · Federations' presidents · Federations' employees · Employees' effectiveness

INTRODUCTION

According to Bertrand Russell (1938), similar to energy as a fundamental concept in physics, power is a fundamental concept in social sciences [1]. The definition of Hersey and Blanchard (2005) for leadership as the ability of the person for influencing and affecting others to reach the goals reveals that having power tools is the required capability for this purpose [2]. Rahim (1989) considered power the capability of the person to change and control behaviors, attitudes, beliefs, goals and needs of others in order to obtain the goals of the organization [3]. John B. Miner (1998) defined power as the ability in having another person do something while s/he would not otherwise [2]. According to him, influence has a broader concept than power and power is in fact a form of influence. Imam Mohammad Ghazali (1058-1111) also used four stages of human desires including instinctive, nervous, sinister and divine for presenting the concept of power [4]. Hilland and Yousp quoted by Ashraf Al-Oghalai (1999) believed that real power is obtained when people eagerly help their manager or organization in reaching the goals [5]. Munduate and Medina (2004) and Barksdal (2009) presented two important characteristics of power as ability in using power and its communication aspects;in the first case, a person may have power but does not use it;in the second case, a person may use power depending on the relationship between people and situations in which they are placed [6, 7]. The process of influencing others as the most important tool available for managers takes place through power imagination, the generation of which requires accessing power sources [8]. Etziony (1961) divided power sources into two official and personal groups and believed that the directions of official and personal powers were from top to bottom and from bottom to top, respectively. Official power depends on the level of reward, coercion and sanction which are imposed by the manager or leader on their followers;

Corresponding Author: Tahereh Nedaee, Department of Physical Education, University of Qom, Qom, Iran.
Tel: +9127469805.

however, personal power is the level of obtaining trust and assurance of those people who are important in terms of influence. The most important categorization of power bases was done by French and Riven (1959) who referred to five intrapersonal power bases including reward, coercive, expert, referent and legitimacy power types. Considering this categorization, official power and personal power are related to reward, coercive and legitimacy and to referent and expert powers, respectively [9, 2, 6].

Coercive power (punishment, force): is the idea resulted from the required ability for punishing and reprimanding due to the lack of performance of employees and is the negative aspect of coercive power [10, 11]. If this power is constantly used by the managers of the organization, it could generate feelings like discouragement, despair, fear, reduction in efficacy, performance and effectiveness, dissatisfaction, turnover, resentment and hostility among the employees [12, 2, 13, 9].

Reward power: is the idea of the ability for providing what is desirable to be owned by others. Excessive reliance on this kind of power leads the employees to think that they are means for the ends of their managers. Also, they may lose their motivation and tendency to work and this kind of power loses its influence [12, 7, 2].

Legitimate power (legal): is the idea of manager's efficiency in decision making based on ranking or organizational level [10, 2]. Constant use of this kind of power causes discouragement and indifference of employees and invalidates this kind of power, especially when it is awarded without any expertise. In such a case, it wastes human forces and, finally, leads to the dissatisfaction and unwillingness of employees [14, 12].

Referent power (authority): is the notion resulted from creating attraction and charisma among the followers. This kind of power has an emotional nature in which employees benefit from states like attraction, infatuation, loyalty, commitment, imitation and effort [6, 13].

Expert power: is the idea of having experience, expertise, knowledge and power for analyzing conditions. This is what the group members are lacking [11]. Expertise is one of the most important power sources in the organizations. As a result of task specialization, people highly depend on the expert to reach their goals.

Having power bases for organizational managers is a tool for influencing and generating obedience in employees. Appropriate and timely use of power bases by managers leads the behavior of organizations' employees toward fulfilling the organizational objectives. The closer the organization to its (individual, group and organizational) objectives, the more effective the organization could be called [2, 15, 16].

Another fundamental concept in each organization is effectiveness. Effectiveness is conceptualized in four approaches: goal achievement approach (in terms of fulfillment level of organizational objectives and final achievements of the organization), systematic approach (in terms of ability in using and processing data, its achievement ways and maintaining stability of the organization), strategic factors approach (in terms of fulfilling expectations of external factors, on which organization stability depends) and competitive values approach (in terms of identifying all fundamental variables which influence the performance of organization and the connection of these variables). Likert (1967) believed that three causal, mediator and efficiency categoriescould determine the effectiveness of an organization [2]. Some others have considered effectiveness of an organization as the degree or level of achieving at organizational objectives [17]. Hamidi (2003) stated that organizational effectiveness is rooted in management processes and successful organizations have three characteristics in terms of organizational design: simple form, few employees and decentralization aiming at efficiency increase [18].

Management effectiveness is the fundamental basis of organizational effectiveness and is in line with it. Management effectiveness starts with objectives, identification, believing, commitment, alignment and assimilation and generates mobility and motivation toward the objectivesin the manager [9]. According to Mintzberg (1983), the thing that makes management even more effective is the possibility of making communication, listening and having social interactions with employees. Employees' effectiveness is the survival and flourishing factors if each organization gains meaning from the employees. Thus, the closer the objectives of employees and those of manager and organization to each other, the easier it would be to achieve those objectives; therefore, the goals of managers and employees would berealized [19].

Different variables are involved in the studies related to organizational behavior and in the dimension of employees' effectiveness. The effectiveness-dependent variables which have been studied include job satisfaction, job performance, job stress, leaving the job and so on (Gholipour, 2007; Chen and Silvertoren, 2004; Thompson and Vecchio, 2005) [20-22]. Job satisfaction

means tendency level or positive feeling and love of the person to his/her job (Weiss, 2002) [23]. Job performance means the efforts and behaviors of individuals for fulfilling organizational objectives (Compbell,1999) [24]. Job stress is a physiological, behavioral, psychological and cognitive outcome of the person toward his/her job and can have a positive and functional approach [20] and leaving the job means permanent exit of the person from the organization which means physiological and psychological withdrawal. Lack of tendency in the employees of an organization disturbs the continuity of organizational tasks and creates despair and lack of motivation in others; finally, it can influence job satisfaction, effectiveness and efficiency and its opposite point is the tendency towardintend to stay in the organization (Campion *et al*., 1991) [25].

In spite of different studies on the power bases of French and Riven (1959) thus far, there are few studies on the application of these bases and their effects on the employees' effectiveness.

Mozafari and Tabaeyan (2004) demonstrated that power bases of the presidents of physical educationfacultiesincludedexpert, information, reward, personal, relational, legitimate and punishment in order and effectiveness of managers increased with the increase in power of expert, information and reward [26].

Ramezaninejad *et al*. (2010) concluded that couches should use power of expert and referent more than other power-imposing methods in order to increase satisfaction among individual and team athletes. Reward, legitimate and coercive powers were in the next positions [27]. Moreover, legitimate power had no effect on personal performance. Eelangovan and JialinXie (2000), Ivancovich (1970) and Burk and Wilcox (1971) found a positive relationship between the dependent variable of job satisfaction and expert power of the manager [28-30]. In addition to the dependent variable of job satisfaction, this kind of conclusion was found by Bachman *et al*. (1968) in terms of performance of employees [31].

Cope (1972) found a weak relationship between legitimate power and job satisfaction while Rice *et al*. (2005) found that legitimate and expert powers had priority among the five power bases of French and Riven [32, 33]. Verhost (2004), Student (1968), Lutans (1995), Sheridan and Verdenburg (1978) and Tworoger and Preziosi (2004) obtained a significantly positive relationship between powers of referent and expert of managers and performance of employees [34-38]. Bal *et al*. (2008) considered ranking, charisma, communication, information, expert, coercive and reward powers for effectiveness [39]. Mampilly (2008) identified power sources and their appropriate composition with personality factors of managers as a suitable predictor for the managers' effectiveness [40]. In his doctorate dissertation, Ates (2003) considered the contribution of information and expert powers along with appropriate leadership in appropriate situations for the maximum effectiveness [41]. Banks (2008) believed that organizational power of managers can be influential for effectiveness [42]. Wan *et al*. (2003) reported power of coaches and managers of physical education programs from the viewpoints of athletes as follows: coaches had more legitimateand expert powers while managers had more legitimate and punishment powers and less referent power [43]. Nourbakhsh and Mohammadi (2004) concluded that power sources of managers of physical education faculties all over the country included expert, legitimate, referent, coercive and reward [44]. KarimiTorqabeh (2004) found that managers of Physical Education Organization in Mashhad used personal power source and especially expert power to a more extent [45]. Bachman *et al*. (1966) conducted a study and found a weakly positive relationship and a negative relationship between expert and referent powers of the managers of faculties on the one hand and their job satisfaction and intent to stay on the other, respectively [46]. Slocum (1970) reported a high, positive relationship between expert and referent power and employees' performance and a low positive relationship between legitimate power and performance [47]. Rahim *et al* (2001) believed that performance can be increased by reward, legitimate, expert and finally referent powers [48]. Thamhain and Gemmill (1974) reported low positive, significantly positive, low negative, negative and negative relationships between power bases of referent and performance, expert and performance, reward and performance, legitimate and performance and coercive with performance and job satisfaction, respectively [49]. Moreover, Busch (1980) and Martin and Hunt (1980) obtained positive and negative relationships between expert, referent and legitimate and intend to stay and also between coercive and intend to stay, respectively; this result was in contrast with the one obtained by Student (1968), in which negative and positive relationshipswere reported between referent, legitimate and reward and intend to stay and also between expert and intend to stay, respectively [35, 50, 51]. Dunne *et al*. (1972) found no relationship between reward power and job satisfaction [52]. Bateman (1999) attributed power of reward and expert to the performance in a positive way [53]. Gupta and Sharma

(2008) believed that soft power sources (expert, referent, information) would lead to broader obedience of organizational employees compared with hard power sources (reward and coercive) [54]. A significant relationship was found between expert and reward power of couches and satisfaction of athletes in Turman (2006) [55]. According to Lee (2008), application of referent, expert and reward powers leads to both higher influence of managers over lower-ranking managers and their satisfaction [56]. Erkutlu and Chafra (2006) believed that personal powers like coercive and legitimate ones increased job stress;also, power of reward had a high negative relationship with job stress [57]. Klocke (2004) considered encouraging power along with soft influencing tactics (expert, reward and referent) more influential than limited control and hard influencing tactics (coercive and legitimate) in group performance and tendency toward team knowledge [58]. Chen (2004) investigated employees' effectiveness in his doctorate dissertation and classified them in four subscales of job stress, job satisfaction, job performance and intendtostay in or leave the job and found no significant relationship between different types of leadership and these effectiveness factors [21]. Except for matching coercive power with directive leadership style and referent power with cooperative leadership style, Garsia and Santa Barbara (2009) found no matching between power sources and leadership styles of managers toward employees [59].

Although various studies have been done on the relationship between power sources of managers and variables like job performance, job satisfaction, job stress and intend to stay in organizations and offices between managers and employees, there has been few studies in the field of sports organizations including presidents of sports federations; specifically, when effectiveness is considered a multi-dimensional and complicated variable which is seemingly closer to the power sources available to the managers. The variables which can facilitate or challenge obtaining personal and organizational goals by themselves or along with each other should be investigated in order to clarify the issue. Furthermore, it is important and necessary to consider sports managers who are seeking for the success of their organizations and have influence and power tools and the employees who have a direct relationship with federations' presidents and follow them; via this common interaction, their effectiveness and ineffectiveness would be determined in terms of the mentioned variables. Thus, the main question is this: Is there a relationship between power sources of presidents of sports federations and effectiveness factors of employees like job satisfaction, job stress, job performance and intent to stay? Which power source can be an appropriate predictor for these effectiveness variables?

Research Methodology

Research Method: This research had a correlational design which was done in the field.

Population, Samples and Sampling Method: The research population included all employees of sports federations. The employees were all experts of sports federations with at least a Master's degree or a level-2 coaching certificate who had worked for one year (full-time or part-time) at the time of the study (committee chiefs of the federation and their vice chiefs were in this group as well). The employees determined power bases of presidents of sports federations and their effectiveness. They were 700 people at first and 248 people were selected as the sample size according to Morgan's table. 300 questionnaires were distributed in the stratified sampling method due to the possibility of lack of return and carelessness in filling out the questionnaires; finally, 288 thoroughly completed questionnaires were analyzed.

Research Tools: Two questionnaires were used for doing this research.

- Power bases of sports federations' president (PBSP-other) questionnaire from Van *et al*. (2000) which included 15 questions in the form of 9-pointLikert scale from very correct [1] to very incorrect [9]. All three questions measured the same power base.
- The questionnaire on the effectiveness of employees obtained from Chen (2005) which included 20 questions in the form of 5-pointLikert scale from strongly disagree [1] to strongly agree [5]. This questionnaire had 6 questions on job satisfaction, 6 on job stress, 4 on job performance and 4 on intent to stay.

Evaluating Reliability and Validity of the Research Tools: Content and face validity: After translating the questionnaire, the ideas of 30 experts in the fields of language, management and physical education were consideredfor determining and approving the content and face validity of the questionnaire.

Reliability: To evaluate the reliability of the questionnaire, internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) was applied. The alpha of power bases and total effectiveness of employees were r= 0.95 and r= 0.81, respectively. Each effectiveness factor of employees including job satisfaction, job stress, job performance and intent to staywas estimated as r= 0.88, r= 0.91, r= 0.64 and r= 0.82, respectively.

Research Methodology: 300 questionnaires were distributed among the participants; however, only 288 perfectly completed questionnaires were collected during a four-month period.

Statistical Methods: To analyze the data, the $SPSS_{16}$ software was sued. Descriptive statistics was used for calculating frequency, mean, standard deviation and percentage. To test the hypotheses, first, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to determine the normality of data distribution and the parametric test of Pearson correlation was applied for specifying the relationship between the research variables. Then, the criterion variables were predicted using hierarchical regression analysis.

Research Findings and Results

Descriptive Findings

a-1: Men and women constituted 70.8% and 29.2% of the participants, respectively. 11.1% had high school diploma, 52.4% Bachelor's degree, 16% Master's degree and 5.9% Doctorate degree. The age of 35.4% of the research participants was between 31 and 40 years old, 23.6% between 41 and 50 years old, 21.9% over 50 years old and 19.1% below 30 years old. In terms of job experience, 22.9% had 6 to 10, 20.5% between 1 and 5, 16.7% more than 20, 14.6% between 16 and 20 and 14.6% between 11 and 15 years of experience. Only 10.8% had one year job experience. As far as coaching was concerned, 21.2% had international, 18.1% level-one, 17.7% national, 13.5% level-2 and 6.2% level-3 coaching certificates.

a-2: According to Table 1 which shows mean and standard deviation of sports power bases of federations' presidents from the viewpoints of the employees, the mean of legitimate power (6.95) was more than other components of sports power bases. Mean of punishment power (4.88) was lower than other components.

According to Table 2 which indicates mean and standard deviation of employees' effectiveness, mean of job performance (4.20) was more than that of other components and mean of job stress (3.16) was less than that of others.

Table 1: Mean and standard deviation of components of power bases of sports federations' presidents from employees' viewpoints

Variables	Mean	Standard deviation	Skewness	Elongation
Reward	5.90	2.01	-0.15	-0.80
Coercive	4.88	2.17	0.17	-0.86
Referent	6.42	2.03	-.514	-.854
Expert	6.03	1.89	-.210	-.622
Legitimate	6.95	1.87	-.989	.599

Table 2: Mean and standard deviation of components of employees' effectiveness

Variables	Mean	Standard deviation	Skewness	Elongation
Reward	5.90	2.01	-0.15	-0.80
Coercive	4.88	2.17	0.17	-0.86
Referent	6.42	2.03	-.514	-.854
Expert	6.03	1.89	-.210	-.622
Legitimate	6.95	1.87	-.989	.599

Table 3: Pearson correlation coefficients for the relationship between total sport power bases and factors of employees' effectiveness

Effectiveness factors	Correlation coefficient	Significancelevel
Job stress	0.190-	0.001
Job satisfaction	0.155	0.008
Job performance	0.158	0.007
Intent to stay	0.434	0.001

Table 4: Pearson correlation coefficients for the relationship of each sports power bases with factors of employees' effectiveness

Variables	Stress	Satisfaction	Performance	Intent to stay
Reward	-.138*	.057	.094	.255**
Coercive	-.074	.062	.134*	.170**
Referent	-.212**	.246**	.100	.543**
Expert	-.200**	180**	.255**	.324**
Legitimate	-.178**	.150*	.078	.540**

Testing the Hypotheses

b-1: There was a relationship between power bases of federations' presidents and factors of employees' effectiveness, i.e. job performance, job satisfaction, job stress and intend to stay.

In Table 3, Pearson correlation coefficients demonstrate a significant relationship between power bases of federations' presidents and factors of employees' effectiveness (job performance, job satisfaction, job stress and intent to stay) ($P<0.01$). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis was confirmed. Power bases of federations' presidents had a significantly positive relationship with job performance, job satisfaction and intent to stay and a significantly negative one with job stress.

Table 4 demonstrates Pearson correlation for each and every effectiveness factor and power base. These coefficients showed a significant relationship

between intent to stay and all factors of power bases among federations' presidents (P<0.01). There was a significantly positive relationship between job performance on the one hand and coercive and expert on the other; however, it did not have any significant relationship with reward, referent and legitimate. Job satisfaction had a significantly positive relationship with referent, expert and legitimatepowers but no significant relationship with reward and coercive ones. Stress had a significantly negative relationship with all the factors of power bases among federations' presidents. As an exception, coercive had a negative relationship which was not significant.

b-2: Power bases of federations' presidents (reward, coercive, legitimate, referent and expert) were proper predictors for factors of employees' effectiveness (job stress, job satisfaction, job performance and intent to stay).

b 2-1

Power Bases And Job Performance: Using hierarchical regression, legitimate and referent powers were entered into the equation and 8.8% of changes in job performance were explained. Since F(2.258)=13.83, P<0.001 was obtained after the analysis of sum of squares in hierarchical regression analysis, the relationship between the above variables and job performance was significant. The following table demonstrates the square of multiple correlations (R2) and regression analysis.

The results of the above table showed that prediction equation consisted of:

Job performance= 0.113 (legitimate) – 0.222 (referent) + 5.179

The summary of regression analysis showed that referent was a better predictor for the job performance. 6.5% of job satisfaction determined through referent and legitimate explained only 2.3% of changes in the job performance.

b 2-2

Power Bases And Job Satisfaction: Using hierarchical regression, reward and legitimatepowers were entered into the equation which explained 7.7% of changes in job satisfaction. F(2.285)=11.88, P<0.001 was obtained for the analysis of sum of squares in the hierarchical regression analysis; thus, a significant relationship was found between linear combination of the above variables and job satisfaction. The following tables demonstrate the square of multiple correlations (R2) and regression analysis.

Table 5: Hierarchical regression analysis for the relationship between power bases and job performance

Components	B	Standardcoefficient	t	R^2	Significancelevel
Referent	222.0	441.0	95.4	065.0	0.001
Legitimate	113.0-	240.0-	69.2-	0.023	0.007

Table 6: Hierarchical regression analysis for the relationship between power bases and job satisfaction

Components	B	Standardcoefficient	t	R^2	Significancelevel
Referent	126.0	352.0	4.77	0.060	0.001
Reward	061.0-	168.0-	2.27-	0.017	0.024

Table 7: Regression analysis for the relationship between power bases and job stress

Components	B	Standardcoefficient	T	R^2	Significancelevel
Referent	096.0-	212.0-	677.3-	045.0	001.0

Table 8: Analyzing hierarchical regression for the relationship between power bases and intend to stay

Components	B	Standardcoefficient	t	R^2	Significancelevel
Referent	173.0	412.0	140.5	0.295	0.001
Expert	151.0	331.0	48.4	0.039	0.001
Reward	080.0-	189.0-	3.028-	0.021	0.003

The results in the above table showed that prediction equation was as follows:

Job satisfaction = 0.061 (reward) – 0.126 (referent) + 3.46

The summary of regression analysis showed that referent was a better predictor for job satisfaction. 6% of job satisfaction determined through referent and reward explained only 1.7% of the changes in job satisfaction.

b 2-3

Power Bases And Job Stress: Using hierarchical regression, only referent was entered into the equation which explained 4.5% of the changes in job stress. Since F(.286) = 13.52, P<0.001 was obtained for the hierarchical regression analysis, then the relationship between referent and job stress was significant. The following table reveals the square of multiple correlations (R2) and regression analysis.

The results in the above table showed that the prediction equation was as follows:

Job stress = 0.096 (referent) – 3.77

b 2-4

Power Bases And Intend To Stay: Using hierarchical regression analysis, referent, expert and reward were entered into the equation and 35.5% of the changes in intend to staywas explained. Since $F(3.4)= 51.99$, $P<0.001$ was obtained for the analysis of sum of squares in the hierarchical regression analysis, the relationship between the linear combination of above variables and intend to stay was significant. The following table shows the square of multiple correlations (R2) and regression analysis.

The results of the above table showed that the prediction equation was as follows:

Intend to stay = 0.080 (reward) – 0.151 (expert) + 0.173 (referent) + 2.34

The summary of regression analysis showed that referent was a better predictor for intend to stay. 29.5% of intend to stay was determined through referent and two other variables explained only 6% of the changes for intend to stay.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The main axis of each organization's efforts is a competent manger who believes in the role of his/her influence and power. Power of each manager is the key and main principle in every organization since no organization can be established and no order can be implemented without power [2, 19]. If a manager is the effectiveness mastermind of every organization, the employees are the beating heart and stout hands of that organization for fulfilling its effective goals and paving this way via their own efforts and actions. Among the smoothing variables of this challenging way, power bases of the manager and effectiveness of employees can be referred to. According to the findings of the present research:

The employees of sports federations considered power bases of federations' presidents in the following way and order: legitimate, referent, expert, coercive and reward. Similar to most of other governmental and official organizations with a hierarchical structure, in sports federations, organizational rules and regulations play a main and powerful role; the higher the legitimate power and manager status, the more his/her influence on the employees would be. Seemingly, in sports federations, it is the manager's legitimate power (more than his/her referent and expert ones) which necessitates the obedience and acceptance of his/her orders and this is awarded to every manager by the organization. The reason can be the weak and rigid relations between the federations' presidents and employees, which is merely based on objectives and this leads to more effect of legitimate power compared with expert, technical, knowledge, referent, charisma, attraction and even reward powers. Another reason may be that employees, especially at the level of chiefs and vice chiefs of committees, perform their duties only according to the official and written orders and rules of their managers. This result was confirmed in the findings by Wann *et al*. (2000) and Rice *et al*. (2005) [33, 43] while the findings of Mozafari and Tabaeyan (2004), Bal *et al*. (2008), Nourbakhshand Mohammadi (2004), Ramezaninejad *et al*. (2010), Burk and Wilcox (1977), Batman (1996), Lee (2008), Karimi (2004) and Rahim (1989) did not approve that [3, 26, 27, 30, 39, 44, 53, 56, 45, 3].

The relationship between power bases of sports federations' presidents and factors of employees' effectiveness showed that: job performance had a significantly positive relationship only with expert and coercive power bases. As far as expert power of the manager and its positive relationship with employees' performance is concerned, it can be said that the employees may feel that their managers have skill, expert, knowledge and experience in that specific field and they do not have these elements or have them at lower levels. Thus, they require themselves to follow their managers and as a result increase their job performance [12, 13].

In terms of the relationship between coercive power and increase of job performance among the employees, the argument can be somehow complicated. Probably, the employees do not have the feeling of responsibility, capability, preparation and interest in their duty and work and may be only required to do their activities by the coercive power of their superiors [20, 13]. Since they do their tasks in contrast to their propensity and by force, an increase in performance may happen at first; however, the emphasis on this type of power in a long run can lead to resentment, hostility, frustration, despair and discouragement and probably decrease in their performance [11]. Another analysis with regard to this result can refer to the positive aspect of punishment. Some researchers believe that coercion of employees may cause modification of their attitudes, behavior and performance at both levels [13, 20, 21]. In terms of the increase in job performance as a result of the

application of expert power, these results were confirmed by the findings of Ramezaninejad *et al*. (2010), Mozafari and Tabaeyan (2004), Batman (1999) and Lee (2008) [26, 53, 56]. They were not confirmed by the findings of Sheridan and Verdenburgh (1978), Thamhain and Gemmill (1974) and Student (1968) [37, 35, 49]. The positive relationship of applying coercive power and increase of job performance, which was found in the current work, was also confirmed by the findings of Bachman *et al*. (1968) and Student (1968) [31, 35]; however, the results of Ramezaninejad *et al*. (2010), Bachman *et al*. (1966), Sheridan and Verdenburgh (1978) and Verhost (2004) did not confirm them [27, 34, 37, 47].

Another finding of this research was on the correlation of job satisfaction of employees and power bases of managers which was in the following order: referent, expert and legitimate. For the interpretation of this result, it can be said that an organization's manager may be accepted by the employees, generate positive attitudes among them and result in job satisfaction due to having referent power, i.e. popularity, reliability, attraction and respect. On the other hand, the employees may perform their tasks and duties with complete satisfaction andin correct and timelymanner due to the existence of technical, knowledge andexpert, precise recognition of objectives, obstacles and challenges, sensible judgment in the evaluation of affaires, i.e. expert power, among presidents of the federations; this can somehow indicate job satisfaction. This result that legitimate power of a manager generates job satisfaction among employees is not a far-fetched issue. Perceiving legitimate behaviors in the organization such as promoting, training, paying and improving which are subsidiary factors of job satisfaction and are paid and implemented for the legal responsibilities of the person may affect job satisfaction [22, 23]. These results were also observed in the findings by Dunne (1978), Ramezaninejad *et al*. (2010), Burk and Wilcox (1977), Martin and Hunt (1980) and Elangovan and Jia Lin Xine (2000) [27, 28, 30, 51, 52]. Rahim (1989) found that increase in job satisfaction can be only achieved by referent and expert powers and had a negative relationship with legitimatepower [3]. In the findings by Slocum (1970), there was a positive relationship between job satisfaction and referent and expert powers and a very weak relationship with legitimatepower [47]. Moreover, Cope (1972) reported a very low positive relationship between all three power bases and criterion variable of job satisfaction [32].

This research also found a significantly positive relationship between intend to stay and power bases of referent, legitimate, expert, reward and coercive. It is evident that powers of referent, legitimate, expert and reward of a manager which have been emphasized in different studies require employees to stay (Campion, 1991; Chen, 2004; Busch. 1980) [21, 25, 50]. The employees of each organization who are working beside qualified, believing, reliable, professional, regulated, fair and encouraging managers think about leaving their jobs by a low likelihood; however, the important point is that there was a positive relationship between coercivepowerand intend to stay. Probably, its reason can be attributed to the interest, tendency and love for the profession so that even punishment, reprimand and blame of the superior cannot lead the person toward leaving the job. From another perspective, inappropriate economic status of the family and society results in intend to stay despite all the hard work and the outcomes caused by the application of this kind of power.

Furthermore, employees consider thigh and positive resultant use of other bases such as expert, referent and reward and prefer to stay in spite of the punishment which happens every now and then. These findings were approved by the results found by Martin and Hunt (1980) who obtained a positive relationship between powers of expert, referent and legitimate on the one hand and intent to stay on the other; however, they were not confirmed by the negative relationship found between powers of reward and coercive and intend to stay [51]. The research by Bachman *et al*. (1968) reported a negative and a very low positive relationship between powers of expert and referent and intend to stay and also between power of legitimate and the same variable; the first part was not in line with this study but the second part was to some extent in agreement with this work [31]. The results of the current research were in correspondence with the research by Busch (1980) which found a positive relationship between powers of expert, referent, legitimate and reward and intend to stay and were not in line with the negative relationship of coercive power and intent to stay [50]. Student (1968) demonstrated a negative and positive relationship between intent to stay and powers of referent, legitimate, reward and punishment along with expert. Except for the positive relationship of expert and intend to stay, in other cases, the mentioned study was not in line with the present work [35].

This study also showed a negative correlation between job stress and five power bases, which indicated a significantly negative relationship between job stress and powers of referent, expert, legitimate and reward, respectively. This matter can be interpreted by the point that the managers who have powers of referent and expert behave in an acceptable and fair manner with their employees due to their own spirit of charisma and expert capabilities; this influencing and moderate impact can lead to satisfaction and decrease their job stress since the employee knows that his/her superior is both knowledgeable and capable in the cases in which s/he may not have the required knowledge and capability. Offering material and spiritual reward can decrease or control the generation of and/or continuity of stressful conditions; however, according to the results, the important point is that stressful conditions may increase rather than decrease as a result of using powers of legitimate and official rules and regulations. Probably, the interpretation of this issue can be justified by discussing the concept of positive stress. In such a state, organizational and legal rules and regulations which are ruled by managers generate positive and practical stress and increases energy and motivation of the people and groups in emergency conditions [20, 24]. Therefore, it is possible that the emphasis of the manager on law generates a kind of desirable stress with no negative outcomes. These findings were not confirmed by the studies by Erkutlu and Chafra (2006) in the section that found that expert, referent and reward reduce stress and another section in which legitimate power was found to increase stress [57]. Moreover, Elangovan and Jia Lin Xine (2000) and Podaskoff and Schriesheim (1985) found that legitimate power had a negative relationship with stress, which was in contrast with the findings of this study [28, 60].

The results obtained from hierarchical regression showed that referent power and legitimate power were proper predictors in terms of job performance and power bases in order. As far as the relationship between job satisfaction and power bases is concerned, referent power and reward power were proper predictors. Also, referent power was a proper predictor for the relationship between job stress and power bases. Powers of referent, expert and reward were proper predictors for the relationship between intent to stay and power bases.

The interpretation of this important finding that referent power is a proper predictor for the relationship with all these effectiveness variables reveals that having the spirit of charisma, acceptable behavior, being a model in terms of behavior, attitude and thought and respectable personality of the manager influence employees in the first place; second, it can probably predict the outcome variables of employees' effectiveness in the positive direction. These results were confirmed using the same statistical method by Erkutlu and Chafra (2006) [57].

Probably, it is better to return to the idea of Bertrand Russell (1938) in terms of the dimension of referent power; he believed that referent power of the manager comes from persuasion capability of the individuals and is a function of honesty, attraction, popularity, mutual reasoning power and considering individual freedom in presenting ideas [1]. With the power of knowledge and referent as the most popular tool of influence, success horizons of the organization would be expanded, which is an emphasis for the final finding of the present researchthat referent power was a better predictor for job performance, job stress, job satisfaction andintend to stay.

Suggestions Based on the Results:

- The findings of this study showed a positive relationship between power bases of sports federations' presidents and factors of employees' effectiveness (both from the viewpoint of the employees). Also, referent power was a more proper predictor among all the effectiveness factors. Therefore, it is recommended for the employees of organizations, especially sports organizations, to choose the managers who are expert in their related fields and have personal and attractive attributes and characteristics which can generate voluntary obedience and respect, not obligatory and legal ones, in the employees.
- Considering the significant and non-significant relationship between coercive and expert powers and referent, reward and legitimate powers in order, it is recommended for the employees to choose those managers who tend to encouragement and legal tools since obligatory and punishment tools wouldbe useless and generate tension in a long run.
- Considering the positive relationship between coercive power and intent to stay and job performance and the positive relationship between legitimate power on the one hand and job stress and job satisfaction on the other, it is suggested to conduct this study in other governmental and sports organizations (such as Physical Education Organization) and non-governmental organizations

in order to determine that the dependence of employees on governmental systems has created such results and that, in some organizations, the first reason for job stress and intend to stay is the referent and expert powers of the manager.

- Considering that this study investigated power bases of the presidents and employees' effectiveness, it can be theoretically recommended to study the variable of employee preparation along with these variables.

REFERENCES

1. Russell, Bertrand, 1938. *Power, A New Social Analyses*. London, Rutledge classics Press. 80: 56.
2. Hersey Paul, Kennet H. Blanchard and Dewey E. Johnson, 2005. Management of Organizational Behavior. Eight Edition, USA, Prentice Hall Press.
3. Rahim, M.A., 1989. Relationships of leader Power to Compliance and Satisfaction: Evidence from a National Sample of Managers. Journal of Management, 15: 545-557.
4. Mahdavi, Abdolmohammad, 2001. Power play in the organization. Management Development. No. 24 and 25: 21-24.
5. Hilland Pruse andYousp Merl, 1999. Essential points for managers. Translated by Ashraf Al-Oghalai, Tehran, Vesghy Publications, 1st edition, pp: 15.
6. Monduate Lourdes and Francis J. Medina, 2004. *Power, Authority and Leadership*. Journal of Applied Psychology, 5: 48-38.
7. Barksdal Michael, M., 2008. *Power and Leader effectiveness in organizations: A Literature Review*. Master of Business Administration thesis. Naval Postgraduate school. Montgomery, California.
8. Zare, Hossein, Saied Rajaipour, MehriJamshidian and Hossein Molavi, 2008. Learning organization as a model for today's world. 1st edition. Published by Jahad Daneshgahi, Isfahan unit, PP: 42-56.
9. Gupta, B. and N.K. Sharma, 2006. Compliance With Base of Power and subordinates' Perception of Superiors: Mode Rating Effect of quality of Interaction. Singapore management Review, 30(1): 1-24.
10. Stoner James, A.F.R., Edward Freeman and Daniel R. Gilbert, 2003. *Management*. Translated by Ali Parsaian and Seyed Mahmoud Arabi. Second vol., Tehran, Published by Office of Cultural Research, pp: 302-312.
11. Morehead, G. and A.W. Griflin, 2005. Organizational behavior. Translated by Seyed Mehdi Alvani and Gh. Memarzadeh, 9th edition, Tehran, Morvarid Publications, pp: 311.
12. Moshabaki Asghar, 2006. Management of organizational behavior. Tehran. Tarjomeh Publications, pp: 296.
13. Yuki, G.A., 1994. Leadership in organization. 3ed. London: prentice hall
14. French, Vandal, Sicily, H. Bell, 2000. Change management in organizations. Translated by Seyed Mehdi Alvani and Hassan Danaiifard. Tehran. Eshraghi Publications, pp: 311.
15. Defet Richard, L., 2003. Organizational theory and design. Translated by Ali Parsaian and Mohammad Arabi, Second vol., Tehran, Office of Cultural Research, pp: 104-126.
16. Feizi tahereh, 2007. Fundamentals of Organization and Management. Tehran, PayamNour Publications. pp: 303-305.
17. Abdollahi, N Bijan and Abdolrahim Navehebrahim, 2006. Empowering employees, the golden key of managing human resources. Tehran, Publication of Nashr Virayesh, pp: 39.
18. Hamidi Mehrzad, 2004. Investigating the relationship between organizational structure, effectiveness and organizational commitment at employee level of Iranian sports organizations. Doctorate thesis of Faculty of Physical Education, University of Tehran
19. Mintzbergm, H., 1983. Power in the Around Organizations. New Jersey Prentice – Hall press, pp: 198.
20. Gholipour Arian, 2007. Management of organizational behavior (individual behavior). SAMT publications. 1st vol., pp: 114-128.
21. Chen, jui Chen, 2004. An Empirical Test of Leadership Effectivenessand the Match/Mismatch in leadership Style. Doctor of Business Administration Thesis. School of Business and Entrepreneurship, Nora southeastern university.
22. Thompson, Geir and Robert, Vecchio, 2009. Situational Leadership: a Test of Three Version. The Leadership Quarterly, 20(4): 837-848.
23. Weiss, H.M., 2002. Deconstructing Job Satisfaction: Separating Evaluation, Belifes and Affectve Experiences. Human Resource Management Review. 12: 173-194.

24. Campbell, J.P., 1999. The definition and measurement of performance in the new age. In D.R. Ilgen and E.D. Pulakos (Eds), the Changing Nature of Performance: Implications for Staffing. Motivation and Development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, pp: 399-429.
25. Campion, M.A., L. Cheraskin and M.J. Stevens, 1994. Career-Related Antecedents and Outcomes of Job Rotation.academy of Management Journal, 37: 151-168.
26. Mozafari Seyed Amir Ahmad and Seyed Ahmad Tabaeyan, 2004. Relationship between power bases and effectiveness and performance of faculty presidents and department heads of Physical Education in Iranian governmental universities from the viewpoint of faculty members themselves. Motor and Sports Sciences, 4: 123-139.
27. Ramezaninejad Rahim, Mehrali Hemmatinejad, NoushinBanar and Marieh Fallah, 2010. The relationship between methods of imposing power by trainers and satisfaction of women athletes in Mazandaran Province. Olympic Journal, No. 1, 18th year, pp: 119-136.
28. Elangovan, A.R and Jia Lin Xine, 2000. Effects of Perceived Power of Supervisor on Subordinate Work Attitude. Leadership Organization Development Journal, 21(6): 319-328.
29. Ivancevich, J.M., 1970. An analysis of control, bases Of, Management Journal, 13: 427-436.
30. Burk, R.J. and D.S. Wilcox, 1971. Bases of supervisory power and subordinate job satisfaction. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 3: 183-193.
31. Bachman, J.G., D.G. Bowers and P.M. Marcus, 1968. Bases of supervisory power: A comparative study in five organizational Setting. Journal of personality and Social Psychology, 7(6): 231-246.
32. Cope, R.G., 1972. Bases of Power Administrative preferences and Job satisfaction: A situational approach. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 2: 457-465.
33. Rice, L. Margaret, Haroid, Bishop, Michele Acker-Hocevar and Barbara Pouners, 2005. Power And Leadership Practices By The Superintendent: What Do They Mean To Leaders And Followers? WWW.National FORUM Journals.com. pp: 143-154.
34. Verhost, K., 2004. Effects of alimong, performance contracting and Competition The performance of a public agency: a case study. Available at: www. Red ova. com.
35. Student, K.R., 1968. Supervisory influence and work group Performance. Journal of Applied psychology, 52: 188-194.
36. Lutans, F., 1995. The Practice of Supervision and management. Mc Grow Hill Press, pp: 87.
37. Sheridan, J E. and D.J. Verdenburgh, 1978. Usefulness of leadership Behavior and social power variable in predicting job tension, Performance and turnover of nursing employees. Journal of Applied Psychology, 63: 89-95.
38. Tworoger Tom, M. and C. Preziosi Robert, 2004. Leadership Effectiveness and Power Bases Perceptions.www.aapp.net
39. Bal. Vidual., Michael. Campbell., Joudith. Steed and Kyle Medding, 2008. The Roll of Power in Effective Leadership. Center of Creative Leadership, 4: 132-145.
40. Mampilly Rupert and Sebastian, 2008. Power percept for manager.www.cusat.ac.ir. 30(2): 181-199.
41. Ates Edward, Clarence, 2003. The Perceptions of African American Community College presidents concerning Their Leadership Styles and use of Power. Doctor of Philosophy Thesis. The University of Texas at Austin.
42. Banks Bonnie, 2008. Leaders unmet Needs can Precipitate power abuse in Relationship with flowers. Journal of Strategic Leadership, 1: 2-8.
43. Wann Daniel, L., A. Linda, Metcalf, Keri R. Brewer and Harold D. Whiteside, 2000. Development of the Power in Sport. Sport Behavior, 23(4): 230-245.
44. Nourbakhsh Mehvash and Sardar Mohammadi, 2004. Relationship between management styles and power sources in the presidents of Iranian faculties of physical education from the viewpoint of faculty members. Movement, 19: 109-124.
45. Karimi Torqabeh, Elham, 2004. Determining power resources of managers in City of Mashhad and its relationship with the preparation level of the employees. Master's thesis, University of Tehran.
46. Bachman, J.G., C.B. Smith and J.A. Slinger, 1966. Control, performance and satisfaction: An Analysis of structural and individual effects. Journal of personality and social Psychology, 4: 127-136.
47. Slocum, J.W. Jr, 1970. Supervisory influence and The Professional employee. Personal Journal, 49: 484-488.
48. Rahim, M. Afzalur., David, Antonioni and Clement Psenika, 2001. A Structural Equatings Model of leader power, Subordinates, Styles of handling conflict and job performance. The international Journal of Conflict Management, 12(3): 191-211.

49. Thamhain, H.J. and G.R. Gemmill, 1974. Influence styles of Project managers: some project performance correlates. Academy Of management Journal, 17: 216-224.
50. Busch, P., 1980. The sales manager's bases of social power and influence upon the sales force. Journal of Marketing, 44: 91-101.
51. Martin, T.N. and J.G. Hunt, 1980. Social influence and Intent Tw leave: A path-analytic process model. Personnel Psychology, 33: 505-528.
52. Dunne, F. jr., M.J. Stahl and Melhart, L.J. jr. 1978. Sources of project and functional managers in matrix organizations. Academy of Management Journal, 21: 135-140.
53. Batman,C.L., 1999. Relationship among empowerment, organizational Health and principal effectiveness. university of Missouri Columbia
54. Gupta, B. and N.K. Sharma, 2006. Compliance With Base of Power and subordinates' Perception of Superiors: Mode Rating Effect of quality of Interaction. Singapore Management Review, 30(1): 1-24.
55. Turman Paul, D., 2006. Athletes perception of Coach power Use and the Association Between Playing Status and sport satisfactions. Communication Research Reports, 23(4):273-282.
56. Lee Kim Lian, 2008. Bases of Power and Subordinates' Satisfaction with Supervision. The Contingent Effect of Educational Orientation. International Education Studies, 1(2): 3-13.
57. Erkutlu Hakan,V. and Jamel Chafra, 2006. Relationship between Leadership Power Bases and job Stress of subordinates: Example from boutique hotels. www.management Research News, 29(6): 285-297.
58. Klocke, Ulrich, 2004. Effects of Power on Team Processes and performance: Dose the Way in Which Power is used Make Different? Www. Psychologie. hu-Berlin.de/orgpsy/Mitabeiter
59. Klocke Ulrich, 2004. Effects of Power on Team Processes and performance: Dose the Way in Which Power is used Make Different? Www. Psychologie. hu-Berlin.de/orgpsy/Mitabeiter
60. Podaskoff Philip, M. and A. Schriesheim Chester, 1985. Field stdies of French and Riven's Bases of Power: Critique, Reanalysis and suggestions for Future Research. Psychological Bulletin, 97(3): 387-411.