

## The Relationship between Power Bases of Sports Federations' Presidents with Employees Job Performance and Job Satisfaction

Tahereh Nedae<sup>1</sup>, Khalil Alavi<sup>2</sup>, Seyedeh Farideh Hadavi<sup>3</sup>, Lila Sabbaghian Rad<sup>4</sup>

1, 2. Department of Physical Education and Sports Sciences, University of Qom, Qom, Iran

3. Department of Physical Education and Sports Sciences, Eslamshahr Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

4. Department of Physical Education and Sports Sciences, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, 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 performance and job satisfaction (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, among whom 288 people were selected as the statistical sample. The POSP-other questionnaire (with 15 questions in 9-point Likert scales) and employees' job performance and job satisfaction questionnaires with 4 questions and 6 questions, in 5-point Likert scales respectively, 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  $\alpha=0.95$ ,  $\alpha=0.83$  and  $\alpha=0.66$  for power, employee's job performance and job satisfaction from 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 with job performance ( $r=0.158$ ) and job satisfaction ( $r=0.155$ ). Hierarchical multiple regression analyses revealed that, among power bases of sports federations; referent power base was a better predictor for employees' job performance and job satisfaction.

[Tahereh Nedae, Khalil Alavi, Seyedeh Farideh Hadavi, Lila Sabbaghian Rad. **The Relationship between Power Bases of Sports Federations' Presidents with Employees Job Performance and Job Satisfaction.** *Life Sci J* 2012;9(4):2617-2624]. (ISSN: 1097-8135). <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>. 390

**Keywords:** Power bases, Federations' presidents, Federations' employees, Employees' job performance, Employees' job satisfaction

### 1. Introduction

According to Russell (1938), similar to energy as a fundamental concept in physics, power is a fundamental concept in social sciences (37). 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 (16). 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 (33). Miner (1998) defined power as the ability in having another person do something while s/he would not otherwise (13). 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 (14). Hilland and Yousp (1999) believed that real power is obtained when people eagerly help their manager or organization in reaching the goals (17). Monduate 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 (26, 3). 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; however, personal power is the level of obtaining trust and assurance of those people who are important in terms of influence (19). 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 (15, 16, 2). 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 (14, 8, 44). Job satisfaction means tendency level or positive feeling and love of the person to his/her job. Locke (1976) defined job

satisfaction as arising when an individual perceives his or her job as fulfilling values that is considered important to that individual (21). Spector (1997) described job satisfaction is simply how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their job (40). According to Lawler (1990), Satisfaction refers to people's feeling about the rewards they have received (21). The earlier Likert (1961) identified that job satisfaction is linked to supportive, friendly and also helpful leaders. He also concluded that quality leadership creates a work team where trust and confidence are central, communication is effective and conflict, if any, is constructive (2). However, this hypothesis is not well supported, as job satisfaction is not the same as motivation or aptitude, although they may be clearly linked. A primary influence on job satisfaction is the application of [Job design](#), which aims to enhance job satisfaction and performance using methods. Job performance means the efforts and behaviors of individuals for fulfilling organizational objectives (9). Many pointed out use performance appraisals as a regular managerial procedure (25). Researchers assume that leadership behaviors and influence affect outcomes, such as group performance and goal attainment, by influencing the behaviors of subordinates (47). Bass (1990) and Yuki (1994) also found that leaders sometimes could pose a strong influence on employees and on organizational outcomes (4).. This suggests that the leader has influence on his/her followers by using different leadership styles or by using power bases. 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 satisfaction, job performance. 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 (29). Ramezanejad et al. (2010) concluded that coaches 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 (35). Moreover, legitimate power had no effect on personal performance. Elangovan 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 (12, 18, 6). 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 (1). 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 (9, 36). Verhost (2004), Student (1968), Lutans (1995), Tworoger and Preziosi (2004) obtained a significantly positive relationship between powers of referent and expert of managers and performance of employees (48, 42, 24, 19). Wan 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 (42). 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 (31). KarimiTorqabeh (2004) found that managers of Physical Education Organization in Mashhad used personal power source and especially expert power to a more extent (19). 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 (2). 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 (39). Rahim et al (2001) believed that performance can be increased by reward, legitimate, expert and finally referent powers (34). 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 (43). Dunne et al. (1972) found no relationship between reward power and job satisfaction (11). Bateman (1999) attributed power of reward and expert to the performance in a positive way (5). 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) (15). A significant relationship was found between expert and reward power of coaches and satisfaction of athletes in Turman (2006) (45). 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 (23). 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 (20). Chen

(2004) investigated employees' effectiveness in his doctorate dissertation and classified them in four subscales of job stress, job satisfaction, job performance and intend to stay in or leave the job and found no significant relationship between different types of leadership and these effectiveness factors (8). Nobakht et al (2012) found significant relationship between job satisfaction and managerial roles (31).

Although various studies have been done on the relationship between power sources of managers and variables like job performance, job satisfaction 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 satisfaction, job performance 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 satisfaction and job performance? Which power source can be an appropriate predictor for these variables?

## **2. Materials and methods**

### **2.1. Research Method**

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

### **2.2. 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

### **2.3. Research Tools**

Two questionnaires were used for doing this research.

Power bases of sports federations' president (PBSP-other) questionnaire from Wan 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.

The questionnaire employees' job satisfaction and job performance obtained from Chen (2005) which included 6 questions and 4 questions in the form of 5-point Likert scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree, respectively (5).

#### 2.4. 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.

Reliability: To evaluate the reliability of the questionnaire, internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) was applied. The alpha of power bases, job satisfaction and job performance were  $r = 0.95$ ,  $r = 0.83$  and  $r = 0.66$  respectively.

#### 2.5. Research Methodology

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

#### 2.6. Statistical Methods

To analyze the data, the SPSS<sub>16</sub> 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.

### 3. Results

#### Descriptive Findings

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.

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

Variables	Mean	St. dev	K-S	sig
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 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.

Table 2. Mean and standard deviation of employees' job satisfaction and job performance

Variables	Mean	St dev	K-S	Sig
Job Satisfaction	3.92	0.73	1.31	0.056
Job Performance	4.20	0.95	1.42	0.051

According to Table 2 which indicates mean and standard deviation of job performance (4.20) was more than of mean of job satisfaction (3.92).

#### Testing the Hypotheses

There was a relationship between power bases of federations' presidents with employees' job performance and job satisfaction.

Table 3. Pearson correlation coefficients for the relationship between total sport power bases and employees' job performance and job satisfaction

Variables	Mean	Sig
Job Satisfaction	0.155	0.008
Job Performance	0.158	0.007

In Table 3, Pearson correlation coefficients demonstrate a significant relationship between power bases of federations' presidents with employees' job performance and job satisfaction ( $P < 0.01$ ). 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 and job satisfaction.

Table 4. Pearson correlation coefficients for the relationship of each sports power bases with employees' job performance and job satisfaction

Variables	Job Satisfaction	Job performance
Reward	.057	-.094
Coercive	.062	.134*
Referent	.246**	.100
Expert	.180**	.255**
Legitimate	.150*	.078

Table 4 demonstrates Pearson correlation for job performance, job satisfaction and power bases. 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 legitimate powers but no significant relationship with reward and coercive ones. Power bases of federations' presidents (reward, coercive, legitimate, referent and expert) were proper predictors for factors of employees' job satisfaction and job performance

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 ( $R^2$ ) and regression analysis.

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

Components	B	St co	t	R <sup>2</sup>	Sig
Referent	0.222	0.441	4.95	0.065	0.001
Legitimate	-0.113	-0.240	-2.69	0.023	0.007

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

$$\text{Job performance} = 0.113 (\text{legitimate}) - 0.222 (\text{referent}) + 5.179$$

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.

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

Components	B	St co	t	R <sup>2</sup>	Sig
Referent	0.126	0.352	77.4	0.060	0.001
Reward	-0.061	-0.168	-27.2	0.017	0.024

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

$$\text{Job satisfaction} = 0.061 (\text{reward}) - 0.126 (\text{referent}) + 3.46$$

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.

#### 4. Discussions

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 (17, 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 job performance and job satisfaction 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) while the findings of Mozafari and Tabaeyan (2004), Nourbakhsh and Mohammadi (2004), Ramezanejad et al. (2010), Burk and Wilcox (1977), Batman (1996), Lee (2008), Karimi (2004) and Rahim (1989) did not approve that.

The relationship between power bases of sports federations' presidents with employees' job performance and job satisfaction 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 (17, 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 (17, 18, 13). 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 Ramezanejad et al. (2010), Mozafari and Tabaeyan (2004), Batman (1999) and Lee (2008) (35, 30, 5, 23). They were not confirmed by the findings of Sheridan and Verdenburgh (1978), Thamhain and Gemmill (1974) and Student (1968). 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); however, the results of Ramezanejad et al. (2010), Bachman et al. (1966), Sheridan and Verdenburgh (1978) and Verhost (2004) did not confirm them. 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 and in correct and timely manner due to the existence of technical, knowledge and expert, precise recognition of objectives, obstacles and challenges, sensible judgment in the evaluation of affairs, 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 (17, 16). These results were also observed in the findings by Dunne (1978), Ramezanejad et al. (2010), Burk and Wilcox (1977), and Elangovan and Jia Lin Xine (2000). Rahim (1989) found that increase in job satisfaction can be only achieved by referent and expert powers and had a negative relationship with legitimate power. 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 legitimate power. Moreover, Cope (1972) reported a very low positive relationship between all three power bases and criterion variable of job satisfaction.

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. The interpretation of this important finding that referent power is a proper predictor for the relationship with job performance and job satisfaction 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 performance and job satisfaction in the positive direction. 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. 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 performance and job satisfaction.

##### **5. Suggestions Based on the Results**

The findings of this study showed a positive relationship between power bases of sports federations' presidents with employees' job performance and job (both from the viewpoint of the employees). Also, referent power was a more proper predictor for job performance and job satisfaction. 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 would be useless and generate tension in a long run. Considering the positive relationship between coercive power and job performance and the positive relationship between legitimate power on the one hand 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 performance and job satisfaction is the referent and expert powers of the manager.

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

#### References

- Bachman, J. G., Bowers, D.G., & Marcus, P.M. (1968). Bases of supervisory power: A comparative study in five organizational Setting. *Journal of personality and social psychology*. 7/6:231-246.
- Bachman, J.G., Smith, C. B., & Slinger, J. A. (1966). Control, performance and satisfaction: An Analysis of structural and individual effects. *Journal of personality and social psychology*. 4: 127-136.
- Barksdal, Michael M. (2008). Power and Leader effectiveness in organizations: A Literature Review. Master of Business Administration thesis. Naval Postgraduate school. Montgomery, California
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of Leadership: Theory, research & managerial application*. (3 Ed). New York: Free Press.
- Batman, C.L. (1999). Relationship among empowerment, organizational Health and principal effectiveness. University of Missouri Columbia.
- Burk, R. J., & Wilcox, D. S. (1971) Bases of supervisory power and subordinate job satisfaction. *Canadian journal of Behavioral sciences*. 3 : 183 – 193
- 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. 399-429.
- Chen, J.C. (2004). 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.
- Cope, R.G. (1972). Bases of Power Administrative preferences and Job satisfaction: A situational approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 2: 457 – 465.
- Defet, Richard L., (2003). *Organizational theory and design*. Second vol., Tehran, Office of Cultural Research, 104- 126
- Dunne, F. J., Stahl, M. J., & Melhart, L. J. (1978). Sources of project and functional managers in matrix organizations. *Academy of management journal*. 21: 135 – 140.
- Elangovan, A.R & Jia Lin Xine. (2000). Effects of Perceived Power of Supervisor on Subordinate Work Attitude. *Leadership Organization Development Journal*. 21/6:319-328.
- Feizi, T. (2007). *Fundamentals of Organization and Management*. Tehran, Payam Nour Publications. 303- 305.
- Gholipour, A. (2007). *Management of organizational behavior (individual behavior)*. SAMT publications. 1st vol., 114- 128.
- Gupta, B. & Sharma, N.K. (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
- Hersey, Paul, Kennet H. Blanchard & Dewey E. Johnson. (2005). *Management of Organizational Behavior*. Eight Edition, USA, Prentice Hall Press.
- Hilland, P., Yousp, M. (1999). *Essential points for managers*. Translated by Ashraf Al-Oghalai, Tehran, Vesghy Publications, 1<sup>st</sup> edition, pp. 15
- Ivancevich, J. M. (1970). An analysis of control, bases of power. *Management Journal*, 13: 427 – 436.
- Karimi Torqabeh, E. (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.
- Klocke, U. (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*.
- Lawler, E.E. (1990). *High Involvement Management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Locke, E. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Edited by M. Dunnette. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally
- Lee, K., (2008). Bases of Power and Subordinates' Satisfaction with Supervision. The Contingent Effect of Educational Orientation. *International Education Studies*, 1/2:3-13.
- Lutans, F. (1995). *The Practice of Supervision and management*. McGraw Hill Press. 87.

25. Mahdavi, A. (2001). Power play in the organization. *Management Development*. 24 & 25: 21- 24
26. Monduate, L., Francis, J. (2004). Power, Authority and Leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 5:48-38.
27. Morehead, G., Grifflin, A.W. (2005). *Organizational behavior*. 9<sup>th</sup> edition, Tehran, Morvarid Publications, pp. 311
28. Morrise, M.H., Davis, D.L., Allen, J.W., Avilla, R.A. & Chapman, J. (1991). Assessing the relationships among performance Measures, Managerial Practices, and satisfaction. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, Vol. XI (summer),25-35.
29. Moshabaki, A. (2006). *Management of organizational behavior*. Tehran. Tarjomeh Publications, pp. 296.
30. Mozafari, S.A.A., Tabaeyan S.A. (2004). Relationship between power bases and effectiveness and performance. *Motor and Sports Sciences*. 4, 123- 139
31. Nourbakhsh, M. (2004). Relationship between management styles and power sources in the presidents of Iranian faculties of physical education. *Movement*, 19: 109- 124.
32. Ramezanejad, R., Hemmatinejad, M.A., Banar, N., Fallah, M. (2010). The relationship between methods of imposing power by trainers and satisfaction of women athletes in Mazandaran Province. *Olympic Journal*, No. 1, 18<sup>th</sup> year, pp. 119- 136.
33. Rahim, M.A., Antonioni, D., Psenika, C. (2001). A Structural Equation Model of leader power, Subordinates, Styles of handling conflict and job performance. *The international Journal of conflict management*. 12/ 3: 191-211
34. 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
35. Ramezani, Nobakht, Z., Khabiri, M. (2012). Use of Model of managerial Roles to Evaluate Sport Federations managers of Iran. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research* 10 (5): 559-564
36. Rice, L. Margaret, Bishop, H., Acker-Hocevar, M., Pouners, B. (2005). Power And Leadership Practices By The Superintendent: What Do They Mean To Leaders And Followers? *WWW. National FORUM Journals .com*. 143-154
37. Russell, B. (1938). *Power, A New Social Analyses* .London, Rutledge classics Press. 80, 56.
38. Sheridan, J. E., Verdenburgh, D. J. (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.
39. Slocum, J.W. (1970). Supervisory influence and The Professional employee. *Personal journal*. 49:484 – 488.
40. Spector, P. (1997). *Job Satisfaction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
41. Stoner, James A. F. R., Edward Freeman, Daniel R. Gilbert (2003). Second vol., Tehran, Published by Office of Cultural Research, 302- 312.
42. Student, K.R. (1968). Supervisory influence and work group Performance. *Journal of Applied psychology*. 52: 188 – 194.
43. Thamhain, H. J., Gemmill, G. R. (1974) .Influence styles of Project managers: some project performance correlates. *Academy Of management journal*. 17: 216 – 224.
44. Thompson, G., Vecchio, R. (2009). Situational Leadership: a Test of Three version. *The Leadership Quarterly*. 20/4: 837-848.
45. 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.
46. Tworoger, T., Preziosi, M. Robert, C. (2004). *Leadership Effectiveness and Power Bases Perceptions*.www.aapp.net
47. Verroom, V.H, & Jago, A. G. (1988). *The New Leadership .Managing Participation in organizations* .Englewood Cliffs, NJ.Prentice Hall.
48. 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](http://www.Redova.com).
49. Vries, R.E., Roe, R.A., & Tallieu, T. C. B. (1998). Need of Supervision: It is Impact on Leadership effectiveness. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*.Dec.486-501.
50. Yuki, G.A. (1994). *Leadership in organization*.3ed.London: prentice hall.
51. French, Vandal, Sicily, H. Bell. (2000). *Change management in organizations*. Tehran. Eshraghi Publications. 311
52. Wann, D., Linda A, Metcalf, Keri, Brewer, R., Whiteside, H.D. (2000). Development of the Power in Sport. *Sport Behavior*. 23/ 4: 230-245.
53. Weiss, H.M. (2002).Deconstructing Job Satisfaction: Separating Evaluation, Beliefs and Affective Experiences. *Human Resource Management Review*. 12: 173-194
54. Zare, H., Rajaipour, S., Jamshidian M., Molavi, H. (2008). *Learning organization as a model for today's world*. 1st edition. Published by Jahad Daneshgahi, Isfahan 42- 56.

9/6/2012