

Managers power bases, employees' job stress and intent to stay

**Zahra Nobakht Ramezani¹, Tahereh Nedae², Hossein Alimohammadi²
and Javad Adabi Firouzjah²**

¹*Assistant Professor, Qazvin Branch, Islamic Azad University, Qazvin, Iran*

²*Assistant Professor, Qom University, Iran*

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between power bases of sports federations' presidents (PBSP-other) with employee's job stress and intent to stay (both from the viewpoint of employees). The population in this study consisted of the employees of sports federations including experts, chiefs and vice chiefs of federation committees, n=288 that were completed (POSP- other) questionnaire (with 15 questions in 9-point Likert scales) and employees' job stress and intent to stay questionnaires (with 4 questions for both , in 5-point Likert scales) respectively, after translation process and approved , with commentary of experts, face and content validity of the questionnaire was performed and with Using confirmatory factor analysis, construct validity was confirmed. Reliability of each scale was tested: POSP_other Cronbach's alpha =0.95 and employees job stress and intent to stay, $\alpha = 0.83$ and $\alpha = 0.81$. 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 negative significant relationship was found between PBSP-other with job stress ($r = -0.190$) and a positive significant relationship was found between PBSP-other with intent to stay ($r = 0.434$). Hierarchical multiple regression analyses revealed that, among power bases of sports federations; referent power base was a better predictor for employees' job stress and intent to stay.

Key words: Power Bases, Federations' Presidents, Federations' Employees, Employees' job Stress, Employees' Intent to Stay

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]. Etzioni (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; 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 Raven (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, and 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, and 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, and 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 [15, 16, 2].

Different variables are involved in the studies related to organizational behavior and in the dimension of employees' effectiveness, include job stress, job performance, leaving the job, intent to stay and so on (Gholipour, 2007; Chen and Silvertoren, 2004; Thompson and Vecchio, 2005) [17, 18, 19]. Some researchers suggest that the leaders or managers who use their powers and giving instructions to the workers without paying any attention on their ideas, it may cause negative effects in the organization include of: job dissatisfaction, intent to leave, job stress and so on... [20].

Stress is defined in terms of its physical and physiological effects on a person, and can be a mental, physical or emotional strain. At workplace and working environment; as a result they do not feel good about their job is called as response approach. Finally, when working environment and affect at work, simultaneously caused stress in called stimulus-response approach [20, 21]. Historically, stress as critical factor for organizational losses in term finance as well employee health. Stress causes illness, job dissatisfaction, turnover, intent or leave to stay and absenteeism. Job stress explains the stress exists in working environment. Employees feel pressure when they found miss match between requirement of job and their capacity to work effectively. Job stress differs from organization to organization, job to job and person to person. Generally, job stress at work has a contingent impact on employees and cause intention to quit the organization [17].

Intent to stay is a psychological process. The concept of "intent to stay" refers to the degree of likelihood that an employee plans to remain with the .It does not assume employees will not depart if they perceive strong job opportunities in the labor market but does allow for factors, that can enhance organization retention [22]. Intention to stay or intention to leave includes the arrival of new employees and the departure of existing employees, but most research focuses on leaving rather than on entering the organization, intention to leave can be classified into two

categories: voluntary and involuntary. Voluntary intention to leave occurs when the employee terminates the employment relationship. Involuntary intention to leave is when the employee wants to stay but the employer decides to terminate the relationship. Some researchers found that most intention to leave is voluntary and is, therefore, potentially avoidable and controllable, costly, and disruptive to an organization. Some researchers thought that voluntary intention to leave could be caused by a number of factors including poor job feedback, job dissatisfaction, unmet job expectations, performance problems, situational constraints, inappropriate leadership behavior, socialization difficulties, greater degree of job stress, and a lack of career advancement opportunities. Intention to leave is a key predictor of actual leaving and most of the time is accurate when the time horizon of the prediction to leave is short, level of job stress plays a major role in virtually all intention to leave [23]. 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' job stress and intention to stay [2].

Mozafari and Tabaeyan (2004) demonstrated that power bases of the presidents of physical education faculties included expert, information, reward, personal, relational, legitimate and punishment in order and effectiveness of managers increased with the increase in power of expert, information and reward [24].

Busch (1980) and Martin and Hunt (1980) obtained positive relationships between expert, referent and legitimate and intend to stay and also negative relationship between coercive and reward with intend to stay, respectively; this result was in contrast with the one obtained by Student (1968), in which negative and positive relationships were reported between referent, legitimate and reward and intend to stay and also between expert and intend to stay, respectively [25, 26, 27]. 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 [28]. Wallace (2010) reported negative relationship between coercive power of managers and employee's intent to stay [29]. Moreover Lee (2008) obtained positive relationship between referent expert and reward power of managers with employee's intent to stay [30]. Wan and et al. (2003) reported power of coaches and managers of physical education programs from the viewpoints of athletes as follows: coaches had more legitimate and expert powers while managers had more legitimate and punishment powers and less referent power [31]. 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 [32]. Karimi Torqabeh (2004) found that managers of Physical Education Organization in Mashhad used personal power source and especially expert power to a more extent [33]. Bachman et al. (1968) 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 [34]. Chen (2004) investigated employees' effectiveness in his doctorate dissertation and classified them in four subscales of job stress, job satisfaction, job performance and intends to stay in or leave the job and found no significant relationship between different types of leadership and these effectiveness factors [18]. Elangovan and Jia Lin Xin (2000) obtained coercive and legitimate power were proper predictor for job stress [35]. Although various studies have been done on the relationship between power sources of managers and variables like job stress and intention 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 job stress, intention to stay 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 with job stress and intention to stay? Which power source can be an appropriate predictor for these variables?

MATERIALS AND METHODS

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

b) 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.

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

1) Power bases of sports federations' president (PBSP-other) questionnaire from Wan and et al. (2000) which included 15 questions in the form of 9-point Likert scale from very correct (1) to very incorrect (9). All three questions measured the same power base.

2) The questionnaire employees' job stress and intent to stay obtained from Chen (2005) which included 4 questions in the form of 5-point Likert scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree, respectively(5).

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 considered for determining and approving the content and face validity of the questionnaire. With Using LISREL software, confirmatory factor analysis, construct validity was confirmed.

Table 1 .Index test and confirmatory factor analysis of questionnaire

RMSEA	GFI	NFI	CFI	X ² /df	Questionnaire
0/075	0/87	0/89	0/90	2/9	Power Bases
0/081	0/88	0/91	0/93	2/69	Job stress
0/073	0/86	0/88	0/91	2/70	Intent to stay

Reliability: To evaluate the reliability of the questionnaire, internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) was applied. The alpha of power bases, job stress and intent to stay were $\alpha = 0.95$, $\alpha = 0.83$, $\alpha = 0.81$ respectively.

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

e) **Statistical Methods:** To analyze the data, the SPSS₁₆ software was used. 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.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

a) 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 2 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 coercive power (4.88) was lower than other components.

Table 2: Mean and standard deviation of components of power bases of sports federations' presidents from employees' viewpoints

Variables	Mean	Standard deviation	K-S	significance level
Reward	5/90	2/01	1/21	0.11
Coercive	4/88	2/17	1/42	0.09
Referent	6/42	2/03	1/51	0.08
Expert	6/03	1/89	1.29	0.07
Legitimate	6/95	1/87	1.57	0.06

According to Table 3 which indicates mean and standard deviation of intent to stay (4.03) was more than of mean of job stress (3.16).

Table 3: Mean and standard deviation of employees' job stress and Intent to stress

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	K-S	significance level
Job Stress	3/16	0/92	1.38	0.054
Intent to stay	4/03	0/85	1/33	0.060

b) Testing the Hypotheses

B-1: There was a relationship between power bases of federations' presidents with employees' job stress and intent to stay.

In Table 4, Pearson correlation coefficients demonstrate a significant relationship between power bases of federations' presidents with employees' 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 negative relationship with job stress and significantly positive relationship with intent to stay.

Table 4: Pearson correlation coefficients for the relationship between total sport power bases and employees' job performance and job satisfaction

Variables	Correlation coefficient	Significance level
Job stress	-0/190	0/001
Intent to stay	0/434	0/001

Table 5 demonstrates Pearson correlation for job stress, intent to stay and power bases. There was a significantly negative relationship between job stresses on the one hand and referent, expert, legitimate and reward power on the other; however, it have significant positive relationship between intent to stay with, referent, legitimate, expert, reward and coercive power.

Table 5: Pearson correlation coefficients for the relationship of each sports power bases with employees' job stress and intent to stay

Variables	Job Stress	Intent to stay
Reward	-0/138	0/255
Coercive	-0/074	0/170
Referent	-0/212	0/543
Expert	-0/200	0/324
Legitimate	-0/178	0/540

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

b 2-1: 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 (R^2) and regression analysis.

Table 6: Regression analysis for the relationship between power bases and job stress

Components	B	Standard coefficient	T	R^2	Significance level
Referent	-0/096	-0/212	-3/677	0/045	0/001
Constant	3/77		2/272		0/023

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

$$\text{Job stress} = 0.096 (\text{referent}) - 3.77$$

4.5% of Job stress was determined through referent.

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 stay was 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 (R^2) and regression analysis.

Table 7: Analyzing hierarchical regression for the relationship between power bases and intend to stay

Components	B	Standard coefficient	T	R^2	Significance level
Referent	0/173	0/412	5/140	0/295	0/001
Expert	0/151	0/331	4/48	0/039	0/001
Reward	-0/080	-0/189	-3/028	0/021	0/003
Constant	2/34		2/21		0/041

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

$$\text{Intend to stay} = 0.080 (\text{reward}) - 0.151 (\text{expert}) + 0.173 (\text{referent}) + 2.34$$

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 % (3/9% expert and 2/1 % reward) of the changes for intend to stay.

DISCUSSION

The main axis of each organization's efforts is a competent manager 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 [36, 17, and 2]. 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 with employees' job stress and intent to stay can be referred to. According to the findings of the present research:

1- 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, who are 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) [30], while the findings of Mozafari and Tabaeyan (2004), Nourbakhsh and Mohammadi (2004), Lee (2008), Karimi (2004) and Rahim (1989) did not approve that [24, 30, 32, 33, 3].

2- 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 (Chen, 2004; Busch, 1980) [18, 25]. 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 coercive power and 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 [26]. The research by Bachman *et al.* (1968) reported a negative and a very low positive relationship between powers of expert and referent and intends 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 [34]. 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 [25]. 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 [27].

3-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 [17, 19]. 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 [28]. Moreover, Elangovan and Jia Lin Xine (2000) found that legitimate power had a negative relationship with stress, which was in contrast with the findings of this study [35].

4-The results obtained from hierarchical regression showed that 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 job stress and intent to stay 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' job stress and intent to stay in the positive direction. These results were confirmed using the same statistical method by Erkutlu and Chafra (2006) [28].

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 research that referent power was a better predictor for employees' job stress and intent to stay.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study showed a negative relationship between power bases of sports federations' presidents with employees' job stress and a positive relationship power bases with intent to stay (both from the viewpoint of the employees). This study showed referent power was a more proper predictor for employees' job stress and intent to stay, too.

Suggestions

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.

1. Considering the positive relationship between coercive power and intent to stay and between legitimate power on the one hand and job stress and 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.

2. Considering that this study investigated power bases of the presidents and employees' job stress and intent to stay, it can be theoretically recommended to study the variable of employee readiness along with these variables.

REFERENCES

- [1] Russell, Bertrand, Power, *A New Social Analyses*, London, Rutledge classics Press, **1938**, 80, 56.
- [2] Hersey, Paul, Kennet, H Blanchard, Dewey, E Johnson, *Management of Organizational Behavior*. Eight Edition, USA, Prentice Hall Press, **2005**.
- [3] Rahim, M A, *Journal of Management*, **1989**, 15: 545-557.
- [4] Mahdavi, Abdolmohammad, *Management Development*, **2001**, 24 and 25: 21- 24.
- [5] Hilland, Pruse , Yousp, Merl, *Essential points for managers*. Translated by Ashraf Al-Oghalai, Tehran, Vesghy Publications, 1st edition, **1999**, pp 15.

- [6] Monduate Lourdes , Francisco J Medina, Power, Authority and Leadership. *Encyclopedia of Journal of Applied Psychology* , **2004**, Volume X:1-8.
- [7] Barksdal, Michael M, *Power and Leader effectiveness in organizations: A Literature Review*. Master of Business Administration thesis, Naval Postgraduate school. Montgomery, California, **2008**.
- [8] Zare, Hossein, Saied Rajaipour, Mehri Jamshidian, Hossein Molavi, *Learning organization as a model for today's world*, 1st edition, Published by Jahad Daneshgahi, Isfahan unit, **2008**, pp 42- 56.
- [9] Gupta B, Sharma N K, *Singapore management Review*, **2006**, 30/1: 1-24.
- [10] Stoner, James A F R, Edward, Freeman, Daniel, R, Gilbert, *Management*. Translated by Ali Parsaian and Seyed Mahmoud Arabi, Second vol., Tehran, Published by Office of Cultural Research, **2003**, pp 302- 312.
- [11] Morehead, G, Grifflin A W, *Organizational behavior*, Translated by Seyed Mehdi Alvani and Gh, Memarzadeh, 9th edition, Tehran, Morvarid Publications, **2005**, pp. 311.
- [12] Moshabaki, Asghar, *Management of organizational behavior*, Tehran, Tarjomeh Publications, **2006**, pp 296.
- [13] Yuki, G A, *Leadership in organization*, 3ed. London, prentice hall, **1994**.
- [14] French, Vandal, Sicily, H Bell, *Change management in organizations*, Translated by Seyed Mehdi Alvani and Hassan Danaiifard, Tehran, Eshraghi Publications, **2000**, pp 311.
- [15] Defet, Richard, L, *Organizational theory and design*, Translated by Ali Parsaian and Mohammad Arabi, Second vol, Tehran, Office of Cultural Research, **2003**, pp 104- 126.
- [16] Feizi, tahereh, *Fundamentals of Organization and Management*. Tehran, Payam Nour Publications, **2007**, pp 303- 305.
- [17] Gholipour, Arian, *Management of organizational behavior (individual behavior)*, SAMT publications 1st vol, **2007**, pp 114- 128.
- [18] Chen, jui Chen, *An Empirical Test of Leadership Effectiveness and the Match/Mismatch in leadership Style*, Doctor of Business Administration Thesis, School of Business and Entrepreneurship, Nora southeastern university, **2004**.
- [19] Thompson, Geir, Robert, Vecchio, Situational Leadership: a Test of Three Version, *The Leadership Quarterly*, **2009**, 20/4: 837-848.
- [20] Azizi, Yahaya, Noordin ,Yahaya, Farhana ,Amat, Abdul, Talib Bon, Zurihanmi, Zakariya , *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, **2010**, pp 123-143.
- [21] Williams, Annette, *Job Stress, Job Satisfaction, and Intent to Leave Employment among Maternal-Child Health Nurses*, Masters of Science in Nursing Thesis, Marshall University Huntington, West Virginia, **2003**.
- [22] Markowitz , Gary A, *Faculty Intent to Stay and the Perceived Relationship with Supervisor at a Career-Focused University*, Doctor of Education, theses. <http://scholarlyrepository.miami.edu/oa-dissertations>, **2012**.
- [23] Ahmad , Bashir, Muhammad, Shahidm, Zill-E- Huma, Sajjad, Haider, Turnover Intention: An HRM Issue in Textile Sector, *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, **2012**, 3: 2.
- [24] Mozafari, Seyed, Amir, Ahmad, Seyed, Ahmad, Tabaeyan, *Motor and Sports Sciences*, **2004**, 2/4: 123- 136.
- [25] Busch, P, *journal of Marketing*, **1980**, 44 : 91 – 101.
- [26] Martin, T N, Hunt, j G, *Personnel psychology*, **1980**, 33: 505 – 528.
- [27] Student, K R, *Journal of Applied psychology*, **1968**, 52: 188 – 194.
- [28] Erkutlu, Hakan, V, Jamel, chafra, Relationship between Leadership Power Bases and job Stress of subordinates: Example from boutique hotels. *www.management research news*, **2006**, 29/6: 285-297.
- [29] Wallace, Scott, T, *Leader source of power, reinforcement, punishment and employee attitudes and behaviors*, <http://hdl.handle.net>, **2010**, 4/226.
- [30] Lee, Kim, Lian, Ir, Guan, Tui, Low, *International Education Studies*, **2008**, 1 /2: 3-13.
- [31] Wann, D L, Metcalf, L A, Brewer, K R, Whiteside, H D, *Journal of port Behavior*, **2000**, 23/ 4: 423-443.
- [32] Nourbakhsh, Mehvash, Sardar, Mohammadi, *Movement*, **2004**, 19: 109- 124.
- [33] Karimi, Torqabeh, Elham, *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, **2004**.
- [34] Bachman, J G, Bowers, D G, Marcus, P M, Bases of supervisory power: A comparative study in five organizational settings, In A. S. Tannenbaum (Ed.), *Control in organizations*, **1968** (pp 213-227), New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [35] Elangovan, A R jia, Lin, Xine, *Leadership Organization Development Journal*, **2000**, 21/6:319-328.
- [36] Nobakht Ramezani, Z, Teimori, A and Nedae, Taherh, *European Journal of Experimental Biology*, **2013**, 3(5), 61-67.