

Chapter 2

The Power of Change and the Need to Change Power: Changing Perception of Power in the Organizational Setting

Roni Laslo-Roth

Overview

Power and social influence are integral aspects of relationships between individuals, social groups, and nations and are major topics in the fields of philosophy and social science. In the last 30 years, there has been growing interest in applying interpersonal influence theory to organizational settings, specifically on the power relationships between managers, subordinates, and peers (Higgins, Judge, & Ferris, 2003). As Kotter (1977) stated 40 years ago, power dynamics exist in all management process because managers depend on their workers to get jobs done. In order to be effective, managers need to make their supervisors, colleagues, and subordinates comply with their requests, support their ideas, and implement their decisions. Indeed, an important element in the organization success is effective managers, and a crucial part of a manager's work involves influencing others (Elias, 2007). The ability to successfully influence others depends primarily on the manager's choice of influence tactic, as some tactics are more effective than others in different situations (Laslo-Roth & Schwarzwald, 2016; Tal, Schwarzwald, & Koslowsky, 2015).

Exercising power over others while maintaining a satisfying relationship in the workplace is a challenging task. Managers need to obtain the cooperation of subordinates, colleagues, and supervisors while juggling with schedules and quality requirements. In the traditional hierarchy, managers supervised employees by using their rank, knowledge, and privileges to reward or punish their subordinates (Schwarzwald, Koslowsky, & Ochana-Levin, 2004). The world, however, is changing, and where change is occurring, workers' expectations from the workplace change along with it.

Today's employees have different values and expectations about work (Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010). Some organizations are now employing the most highly

R. Laslo-Roth (✉)

School of Behavioral Sciences, Peres Academic Center, Rehovot, Israel

e-mail: ronilaslo@gmail.com

educated workforce ever, and these individuals are fully cognizant of their value and the scope of their employment opportunities. This means that organizational success depends largely on its ability to retain these knowledge workers, who have higher salary expectations, have a greater need to participate in organizational decision-making, and are aware of their rights, including being treated fairly and with respect (Dupre & Day, 2007). According to a recent Gallup survey (Gallup, 2016), only 29% of US millennials (born since 1982 and entered the workforce since 2004) are “engaged” (enthusiastic and committed) to their workplace. Worldwide, only 13% of the millennials are engaged at their work. Gallup’s survey also found that work engagement is tightly coupled with businesses productivity, safety incidents, absenteeism, customer ratings, and profitability. Thus, the major challenge facing managers when aiming to influence their subordinates is how to best walk the thin line between employee needs and organizational needs as incongruence between the individual and the organization is inherent (Clegg, Kornberger, & Pitsis, 2015). When using more traditional, harsh influence strategies, they may achieve immediate compliance but lose the employee to another organization. When using softer, friendlier tactics, they may preserve a good relationship with employees but at the expense of immediate compliance, which can defeat organizational goals (Tal et al., 2015).

In contrast with traditional power perceptions, which derived from the manager’s hierarchical position in the organization, new perceptions of power emphasize managerial power that derives from personal and interpersonal skills and backed up with organizational harsh means. Effective managers need to be able to share their vision with subordinates and use smart power, the combination of soft and harsh means adapted to the situation and to their employees’ personality and personal needs.

This chapter starts in describing the centrality of power and influence tactics in the organizational settings, then summarizes the changes in the organizational environment and its effect on conceptualization and practice of power and social influence in organizations, and, finally, discusses the resulted challenges involved in integrating these changes into the harsh reality of organizational environment and effective management.

Defining Power and Social Influence

Power is a familiar concept in daily life and is considered to be one of the key features affecting the relationships between individuals, groups, and nations in theory and in practice (Simon & Oakes, 2006). In 1938, the philosopher Bertrand Russell stated: “The fundamental concept in social science is power, in the same sense that energy is the fundamental concept in physics... The laws of social dynamics are laws which can only be stated in terms of power” (Russell, 1938, p. 10). Philosophers and social scientists have continued to view power as an integral part of all human relationships and the cornerstone of all human endeavors (Keltner, Gruenfeld & Anderson, 2003; Roberts, 2003).

Power theories distinguish between two closely related concepts, namely, power and social influence (Raven, Schwarzwald, & Koslowsky, 1998). Weber defined power as “the possibility of imposing one’s own will upon the behavior of other persons” (Weber, 1954, p. 323). Social influence is defined as “the power of Actor A over Actor B, or the amount of resistance on the part of B which can be potentially overcome by A” (Emerson, 1962, p. 32). In other words, power is the maximum potential influence possible to exercise over others in a given situation. Social influence, on the other hand, is the actual force that the agent employs to change the other’s opinions, attitudes, and behaviors (Dépret & Fiske 1999; French & Raven, 1959; Keltner et al. 2003; Lewin, 1951). For example, when managers use information to sway their employees in a bid for greater compliance, social influence is brought into play even when employees do not comply with the managers’ request. A manager’s power lies in the ability to use different resources when attempting to persuade (including threats to fire, cut salaries, etc.).

The use of power raises a number of crucial questions. What kinds of resources can be mustered by a powerholder to influence another? How do powerholders choose their influence tactics and with which outcomes? One of the most popular frameworks to explore these questions is French and Raven’s typology (French & Raven, 1959; Raven, 1965, 1993; Raven & Rubin, 1983).

Power Tactics, the Choice Process, and Outcomes

When an employee refuses to comply with a manager’s request, what can a manager do to achieve compliance? According to the Interpersonal Power Interaction Model (IPIM) (Raven, 1993), powerholders can use 11 possible tactics to achieve compliance. French and Raven’s (1959) original power taxonomy was made up of five types of influence tactics to which Raven (1965) added a sixth tactic: reward, coercive, legitimate, expert, referent, and information power. In response to criticism of this conceptualization (e.g., Kipnis & Schmidt, 1983; Podsakoff & Schriesheim, 1985; Yukl, 1981), Raven (1992) formulated the IPIM, in which he defined 11 power bases and delineated factors involved in the process of tactic choice:

1. Impersonal coercion – the powerholder’s ability to punish the target or prevent him or her from obtaining the desired rewards. For example, a manager may threaten a subordinate with termination if he or she does not comply with a certain request.
2. Personal coercion – threat of disapproval or dislike. For example, a manager may ignore an employee who does not comply with instructions.
3. Impersonal reward – the powerholder’s capacity to give the target an incentive. For instance, a supervisor may promise a monetary reward to a subordinate in exchange for extra hours that are not part of the job description.
4. Personal reward – the promise to express liking or approval. For example, a manager may flatter an employee for doing a good job to achieve compliance.

5. Expert power – the perception of the influence agent as a source of knowledge and expertise on a specific subject. For example, managers may accept the advice of consultants because they are perceived as having high-level expertise in their field.
6. Referent power – the powerholder's charisma depends on having the target identify with the influence agent. For instance, employees who view their managers as role models will tend to comply with requests in order to be more similar to their managers.
7. Information power – providing convincing reasons or supporting evidence to achieve compliance. For instance, managers who want their employees to cooperate with organizational change take the time to explain the reasons for the change and the benefits derived from it.
8. Legitimacy of position – This draws on the powerholder's formal authority, i.e., perceptions associated with the duties and responsibilities linked to the position in the organization. For instance, subordinates may comply with a supervisor's request because the manager has a right to ask them to do their work in a certain way.
9. Legitimacy of reciprocity – demanding compliance in return for a favor. For example, a manager who allocates additional resources to employee projects expects these employees to take on additional projects in return.
10. Legitimacy of equity – demanding compliance as compensation for damage. For example, managers may insist on workers doing things their way to make up for missed deadlines.
11. Legitimacy of dependence – highlighting the weakness or distress of the powerholder to achieve compliance. For instance, a manager may ask employees for help because the manager is on a tight schedule or lacks specific skills.

Several studies have shown that these 11 power bases can be divided into two categories reflecting two types of distinct influence strategies: soft tactics (information, expertise, referent, legitimacy of dependence) and harsh tactics (coercion and reward in their various forms, legitimacy of position, reciprocity, equity) (e.g., Elias, 2007; Raven et al., 1998; Schwarzwald et al., 2004). Soft tactics are based on personal resources and traits such as intelligence, knowledge, and skills that cannot be taken away from an individual. These tactics often involve a friendlier and more democratic stance because they allow greater freedom of decision for the target of influence. In contrast, harsh tactics are based on social or organizational resources and the role or position of the powerholder in the organization or society and may be taken away from the individual. Harsh strategies are more autocratic, emphasize the advantage of the influencing agent over the target, and can curtail the target's freedom of action (Koslowsky, Schwarzwald, & Ashuri, 2001). This differentiation between harsh and soft tactics is not limited to the IPIM model and can apply to several other power theories as well (Kipnis & Schmidt, 1985; Yukl, 1989).

According to the Koslowsky and Schwarzwald (2009) conceptualization of the IPIM, the influence agent's choice of influence tactic depends on the cost/benefits associated with compliance/non-compliance by the influence target. Specifically,

when choosing an influence tactic, powerholders take into account the relative availability of these power tactics (their “tool box”), its cost (time, efforts, prestige), efficacy (speed, quantity, quality of the compliance behavior), and its social acceptability in the work unit (whether this influence tactic adheres to norms, role expectations, and/or stereotypes). For example, when managers want immediate compliance, coercion is very effective. However, the cost associated with coercion is the damage to the manager-employee relationship that may undermine future cooperation with these employees. The cost is even higher when coercion violates company norms, as is the case in some hi-tech firms where coercion is less acceptable. Nevertheless, sometimes coercion is acceptable only for some populations in the company, but not for others. Some hi-tech companies possess “bro culture” where women and those not in the “in-group” are subject to coercion and mistreatment. For example, in March 2017, Susan Fowler, an engineer who used to work at Uber, claimed, in her blog (Fowler, 2017), that her complaints to HR regarding her manager harassments were dismissed because of the manager’s high abilities. Not only that, her manager threatened to fire her for reporting things to the HR. The cost of coercion tactics in this case was the damage to the company reputation inside and outside the organization.

However, soft tactics can also have a cost. While managers can preserve good relationships with their employees by relying on friendlier tactics such as providing information to achieve compliance, supplying a rationale takes time, and the cost here is expressed in the length of time needed to convince and then achieve compliance.

Power in Organizations

Social power is an important factor in accounting for organizational outcomes (Treadway, Breland, Williams, Cho, Yang, & Ferris, 2013). Within the interpersonal networks through which managers relate to others, managers are expected to exercise power over their employees, superiors, and even at times their peers in the organization as well as outside. In other words, effective managers influence the behavior of others through interpersonal networks to successfully achieve their goals (Pierro, Raven, Amato, & Belanger, 2013). It is important to note that individuals do not necessarily use the same influence strategy in all situations. For example, managers may use harsher tactics in the case of a highly important task but using softer tactics in a less important task (Tal et al., 2015). Moreover, different individuals may choose different influence tactics when faced with similar situations. Research has shown that personality traits such as the big five (extroversion, agreeableness, neuroticism, openness to experience, and conscientiousness) affect the choice of conflict management styles (Antonioni, 1998). Conscientiousness, openness, and agreeableness have a positive relationship with soft means; Extraversion has a positive relationship with soft and harsh means, while agreeableness and neuroticism have negative relationships with the use of harsh means. The success of these attempts depends to a great extent on the manager’s ability to choose a tactic wisely.

Several organizational factors and individual differences have emerged as determinants of managerial choices of influence tactics. These include the relative power of the parties, the target (employee, manager, or peer), the objective, the political skill of the influencer, and the manager's personality (Falbe & Yukl, 1992; Ferris, Perrewe, Anthony, & Gilmore, 2000). For example, individuals in higher organizational ranks are perceived as using a greater variety of power tactics to gain compliance in conflict situations (Koslowsky & Schwarzwald, 1993). Studies have also shown that organizational status is related to compliance as a function of the type of influence tactic. Coercive power is more effective in getting employee compliance when used by middle- than by lower-level managers. On the other hand, legitimacy, expertise, and persuasiveness were cited as the most important reasons for compliance to the requests of peers with the same rank in the organization (Yukl & Falbe, 1991).

The outcomes of different influence tactics in the organizational setting have also been examined in research as we will describe. Managers applying soft tactics correlated positively with subordinates' job satisfaction, in contrast to harsh tactics, which correlated negatively (Koslowsky et al., 2001; Raven et al., 1998). The efficacy of influence tactics in obtaining compliance was also shown to be a function of influence tactic. Managers who treated employees in a friendlier way using soft tactics obtained greater compliance from their employees than managers using harsh tactics both in organizations that carry out complex tasks (hospital medical teams, hi-tech firms) as in organizations that carry out simple tasks (department store, manufactory facility) (Schwarzwald et al., 2004). Findings on the effect of manager choice of influence tactics on employee performance indicate that soft as compared to harsh tactics enhanced subordinates' performance (Pierro, Kruglanski, & Raven, 2012). In another study, expert and information power increased whereas coercion decreased organizational commitment and job satisfaction. These relationships were mediated by procedural justice, which reflects employee perceptions of whether their interactions with authorities can be described in terms of respect, dignity, and fairness. (Mossholder, Bennett, Kemery, & Wesolowski, 1998).

All the above suggests that soft tactics may have more advantages than harsh tactics as regards employee long-term satisfaction and performance. Nevertheless, under certain conditions, a harsh tactic may be more appropriate. When safety or time is a factor, or when dealing with employees who have certain personality traits, harsh tactics can be considered more effective (Pierro et al., 2012; Tal et al., 2015).

However, recent changes in the organizational environment have affected the nature of power relationships. Some Asian countries such as China and India have developed rapidly because of the openness of new opportunities created by the internet. Globalization factors (including lower costs, less regulated business environments, and moving hazardous production elsewhere) shifted production to developed countries and left more advanced countries concentrating on production of services including financial services, instead of goods. This shift created changes in both parts of the world as in the developed countries farm workers became factory workers, and in more advanced countries, many of the workforce become knowledge workers.

The possession of a large amount of knowledge by workers, especially in more advanced countries, made organizations become more depended on their knowledge

workers. While computers replaced middle-class workers and reduced their expertise power (Friedman, 2016), organizations are more depended on higher-class workers who operate and possess knowledge on those computers. At the same time, world process of democratization and individualization encouraged the perception of the centrality of the individual, which resulted in decreased organizational commitment. The Gallup survey from 2016 found that in comparison to 45% of non-millennial workers, 60% of millennials report that they are open to different job opportunities and 36% of them report that they will look for a new job in the next 12 months compared with 21% of non-millennials who say the same. Although seeking new job opportunities is typical for early career stages, managers report more difficulties in retaining millennials (Hershatter & Epstein, 2010).

This made organizations deal with the challenge of applying power over employees without losing them to another organization. Millennials have new expectation from their managers and their workplace and expect managers to treat them in a softer and more democratic way. This influences the power relationships between them as traditional ways of influence are less efficient and more costly than in the past. Managers now need to find other ways aside from the traditional harsh and soft strategies to obtain compliance and respect from their employees. To help explain why managers now find themselves at this crossroad, it is useful to examine the impact of a number of global changes.

The Changing World and the Resulting Managerial Challenges

The world is changing and with it organizational structures, needs, and demands. Organizations are microcosms of the world and hence a reflection of the world. According to the open system approach (Katz & Kahn, 1978), organizations are not closed systems; rather, the environment shapes organizations and is influenced by them. Therefore, changes in the environment, such as advances in technology, globalization, democratization, and individualism, will also manifest in organizations. For example, according to a recent study by McKinsey Global Institute (MGI) in 2015, the digitization and automation of jobs is still in its early stages. This future digitization will require a massive change in organizational structures, influence practices, and HR strategies. This section examines how global changes have led to decreased managerial power and how managers can deal with these new challenges when trying to influence their employees.

Technology Development and Power

As new technologies emerge, the ways people do things changes. Over time, technology has become less costly and faster. As a result, people or systems can process massive quantities of information, share and access data effortlessly, and communicate globally. This has affected organizational culture, needs, and processes.

Advances in technology have also impacted on workforce characteristics. In comparison to the past, a larger proportion of the workplace population today are not just machine operators but rather skilled professionals who need to keep abreast of new technologies. They represent the new generation of knowledge workers who produce, apply, and distribute knowledge while dealing with new creative problems (Florida, 2005). Workers in traditional hierarchical organizations prefer to comply with soft tactics, but still respect harsh traditional tactics (Schwarzwald et al., 2004). Knowledge workers, on the other hand, have information and expertise power over their managers and are measured by their job outcomes. Therefore, they often expect their managers to treat them as equal partners, demand more autonomy and freedom in decision-making, and do not like being told what to do (Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010). This has created a challenge for the managers who need to influence them.

The rapid technological advances in communication systems have also changed the geographical limitations of the workplace in our lives. The traditional workers become more aware to their job possibilities when using the internet to explore geographical distance jobs that were not visible to them in the past. Knowledge workers are no longer restricted by long distances to the workplace but instead can communicate online, work in virtual teams, and have flexible work arrangements. A recent survey (Global Leadership Summit, 2014) on an audience of 600 business leaders at the Global Leadership Summit in London found that most of the executives think that remote work will soon be normal for at least 50% of the workforce. Another study that was conducted 10 years ago showed that knowledge workers spend 40% of their work time at the office, 30% in their home offices, and 30% in other places such as coffee shops, etc. (Burke & Ng, 2006), but actual office time has probably decreased even more since then. Simon Slade, CEO and cofounder of Affilorama noted: "By allowing employees to work remotely, you can hire the best of the best while not limiting yourself by geographical restrictions. At Doubledot Media, 19 of our 28 employees work remotely, and I have seen no difference in job satisfaction or work performance. If anything, my remote employees' production rate is higher because they are better equipped to avoid distractions" (Patel, 2017).

The ease and availability of communication channels have also reduced the power distance between employees and senior management. Power distance is a cultural value which reflects the degree to which members of a society expect and agree that power should be stratified and concentrated at higher levels of an organization or society (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004). Cultures differ in the way people perceive power relationships (as between managers and employees) and accept inequality in power distribution. Individuals in high power distance cultures perceive an unequal distribution of power as legitimate and show high respect to authority. Individuals in low power distance cultures expect more equality in power distribution, demand to participate in decision-making, and do not hesitate to question authority.

When employees have open access to high management-level information, through intranet and emails, this can make them viable actors in organizational decisions. These changes have reduced the role of middle-level management as arbitrators and have upended the traditional hierarchical organization by reducing the professional

distance between hierarchal levels, although culture may still play a role (Farh, Hackett, & Liang, 2007). As Burke and Ng (2006) noted: “The ‘information is power’ formula has shifted the relative power of managers to subordinates and workers, as knowledge networks have placed information in the hands of everyone” (pp. 91).

A study that confirmed the effect of perceived professional distance on compliance found that hospital nurses who perceived their supervisors as having a similar experience and education were less inclined to comply with their supervisors’ demands, in comparison to nurses who perceived their supervisors as superior to them as regards these criteria (Koslowsky et al., 2001). Perceiving managers as a source of knowledge affected these employees’ inclination to comply with their requests. When employees perceive their managers as equal to them in knowledge, expertise, or experience, it is harder for the manager to exert power. Thus, managers need to find different ways to enforce their authority over workers while preserving them in the organization.

Globalization and Power

Even in a changing political climate, it is likely that the progress in technology will lead organization to be more international and the workforce to be more geographically distributed. This constitutes a difficult challenge for managers: not only do they need to manage employees who are physically distant from them, but they also need to adapt to the different norms and values of their employees’ cultures (Frank & Meyer, 2002).

Influencing employees in distant locations has become increasingly commonplace in organizations as a result of digital communication media and globalization. Some of the main challenges include preserving managers’ ability to influence their employees when face-to-face interactions are few and far between. There can also be complications when supervising remotely located workers. Managers may resent delegating power to employees who may threaten their previous expectation of control. To date, there are few studies on long distance management. However, one study indicated that management practices such as team-based rewards create goal, task, and outcome interdependence, which improve the effectiveness of virtual teams, teams that are working on interdependent tasks but geographically distributed (Hertel, Konradt, & Orlikowski, 2004). Another study that was made on virtual teams (Malhotra, Majchrzak, & Rosen, 2007) found six practices that promote effective management: establish and maintain trust between the manager and their remote employees, create understanding of diversity advantages, manage virtual work-life balance, use technology in monitoring the team performance, enhance visibility of the team members, and enable the team members to grow and benefit from the team.

A geographically dispersed workforce also poses a cultural challenge to managers. Cultural values can profoundly affect individuals’ attitudes, behavior, and performance. When managers exercise power over employees from other countries,

this can lead to miscommunication that may damage the relationship since influence tactics that are more efficient and socially acceptable in one culture can be considered damaging and offensive in others (Fu & Yukl, 2000).

In a cross-cultural study (Fu & Yukl, 2000), managers from the United States and China, working in a large multinational company, rated the effectiveness of different influence tactics for several typical situations. Significant differences were found between the Americans and the Chinese. American managers rated rational reasons and the exchange of favors as more effective, whereas Chinese managers rated legitimization of stance, getting help from another worker and using gifts as more effective. The investigators were able to predict the nationality of the managers according to their use of influence tactics in 94% of the cases. These findings are consistent with value differences between the two cultures, i.e., a preference for a direct approach in the American culture and a preference for an indirect approach in the Chinese culture (Hall & Hall, 1988).

A basic difference between the American and Chinese cultures is their communication style. High context refers to societies where people preserve a close relationship over a long period of time, which make them intuitively know what to do from years of interaction. For this reason, many aspects of cultural behavior are not made explicit. Low context refers to societies where people tend to have many relationships for shorter durations of time. In these societies, people are less familiar with each other, and communication occurs predominantly through explicit statements in text and speech and thus is categorized as low-context cultures (Hall & Hall, 1988). In the United States, which is a low-context culture, messages are transmitted directly between managers and subordinates. However, in China, which is a high-context culture, messages are embedded in the context of the exchanges, and subordinates need identifying cues from the environment and to respond to subtle cues without direct influence from their managers (Fu & Yukl, 2000; Hall & Hall, 1988).

Trompenaars (1994) conducted a 10-year study on responses of over 15,000 managers from 23 countries in order to examine culture dimensions and their importance. He identified five relationship orientations of the way people in different cultures relate in the workplace: universalism/particularism, individualism/communitarianism, neutral/emotionalism, specific/diffuse, and achievement/ascription. Managers and employees from cultures, which differ highly in those dimensions, tend to treat each other in stereotype ways that narrow their perceptions and their range of behavior. Managers' ability to fine-tune their behavior to different norms and cultural codes when attempting to influence employees is critical to their success and, more importantly, to the quality of the long-term relationship with the influence target.

Democratization and Power

In the last few decades of the twentieth century, many nations became more democratic, and the values of freedom, equality, and the "power of the people" were increasingly championed (Harrison & Freeman, 2004). In many countries,

participation in decision-making is increasingly considered a fundamental social right in the workplace that has value in and of itself (Stohl & Cheney, 2001). Organizations have followed this trend and apply processes that give more decision-making and management power to a broader worker base (Harrison & Freeman, 2004).

This claimed empowerment of workers is strengthened as advances in data transfer technologies encouraged organizations to favor more decentralized organizational structures because there are far too many decisions to be made quickly which cannot always come from the top (Burke & Ng, 2006; Morgan, 2013). This has made organizational hierarchies looser and decision-making power more decentralized, giving lower-level employees new power in decision-making (Clarke & Butcher, 2006; Huzzard and Ostergren, 2002; Morgan, 2013). The increased power of knowledge employees has many advantages including the fact that these employees enjoy having a voice and the ability to influence the organizations in which they work. This leads to greater organizational commitment and better implementation of organizational decisions (Busck, Knudsen, & Lind, 2010). The power to influence also enhances people's sense of responsibility and creativity and allows employees to develop new skills. A study conducted on 15 organizations in the oil and gas, banking, and telecommunication sectors found that increasing employee participation in decision-making had a positive impact on employee job satisfaction, commitment, and productivity (Bhatti & Qureshi, 2007).

However, empowered processes can provide employees with a sense of exaggerated power that may also create disadvantages. Lower-level employees may make decisions that are not beneficial to the organization as a whole because they may not see the bigger picture or lack enough experience and knowledge. Poor decisions may lead to huge cost drains from lost customers, downtime, and wasted materials or damaged equipment. For example, at Wells Fargo, employees opened additional customer accounts without the customers' permission to meet their performance quotas. This critical decision cost over 5000 employees their jobs, and the bank was fined \$185 million by various regulators. Signing customers up for online banking without telling them harmed Wells Fargo. It undermined customer loyalty and did not lead to greater bank revenues since customers did not use the facilities they were unaware they possessed. Workers chose to exercise their power and autonomy in a tactic that was worthless but easy to meet (Egan, 2016).

Another disadvantage of applying democratic processes in the workplace is they are time-consuming, which can undermine efficiency and delegitimize the tools of formal managerial authority, which are necessary in an emergency. When immediate action is required, as in safety matters or in fast changes of market needs, managers do not always have the time needed to persuade employees. They may choose faster ways, as coercion and legitimation of stand, in order to achieve compliance from employees. Employees, from their perspective, may have a harder time recognizing the distinction between management and employee status, as differences in expertise and knowledge between them decrease. Therefore, employees may have trouble in accepting harsh means as legitimate and may perceive these means as socially unacceptable and offensive (Harrison & Freeman, 2004).

Managers' ability to influence people over whom they have little or no formal authority is especially difficult in organizations that have altered their hierarchical structure to incorporate a more democratic decentralized structure with self-managed and cross-functional teams. In traditional organizations, harsh influence tactics are more efficient, but they may be less efficient in complex modern organizations where they should be more subtly applied (Schwarzwald et al., 2004).

An extreme example of this democratic trend in organizations is illustrated by the online shoe and clothing shop Zappos. In May 2013, a small pilot group at Zappos started using "Holacracy," a self-organization platform designed to empower everyone in the company and give each employee a role in decision-making. This replaced the traditional top-down control paradigm with a new way of achieving control by distributing power. "Holacracy" was then rolled out to the entire company in January of 2014. CEO Tony Hsieh explained that "Holacracy" could help companies grow because "Research shows that every time the size of a city doubles innovation or productivity per resident increases by 15 percent. However, when companies get bigger, innovation or productivity per employee generally go down. Therefore, we are trying to figure out how to structure Zappos more like a city, and less like a bureaucratic corporation. In a city, people and businesses are self-organizing. We're trying to do the same thing by switching from a normal hierarchical structure to a system called Holacracy, which enables employees to act more like entrepreneurs and self-direct their work instead of reporting to a manager who tells them what to do." (Zapposinsights, 2016).

However, the Holacracy advantages are not restricted to service organizations. "The Morning Star company" is an example of the successful use of flat organizational structure in production companies in which a self-managed tomato processor built on a foundational philosophy of self-management where "professionals who initiate communication and coordination of their activities with fellow colleagues, customers, suppliers and fellow industry participants, absent directives from others" (morningstarco, 2017).

Individualism and Power

In recent decades, the role of the individual has become increasingly crucial in national and global cultures. This is the continuation of a long historical process that has been strengthened by the emergence of a more global polity and the weakening of the historical power of the nation state. People's perception has been that the cornerstone of society is the individual rather than corporate bodies or social groups are gaining momentum. This shift has redefined individual roles such that what individuals do in society is taken into account. The individual is now recognized as an extra-social cosmos, a central unit on its own, with elaborate personal needs and preferences. These long-term processes have accelerated recently, in tandem with the weakening of the distinctive identity of nations and states (Meyer, 2002). This perception has also affected the role employees attribute to their jobs.

Today, many individuals, especially well-educated youngsters in rich countries, have differing values and expectations about work. Employees have a good grasp of their value and their employment possibilities. Some have higher salary expectations, a greater need to participate in organizational decision-making, engage in searches for meaning and self-growth, and are aware of their legal rights to be treated fairly and with respect (Dupre & Day, 2007).

According to BCG survey (Boston Consulting Group, 2014) on 203,756 respondents from 70 countries, the most important elements that make people happy in their job are appreciation and good relationships in the workplace. Job stability and salaries were only in the seventh and eighth place. SHRM's recent Employee Job Satisfaction and Engagement Report (The Society for Human Resource Management, 2016) reveals that in 2016 "Respectful treatment of all employees at all levels" was rated as the most important factor in determining job satisfaction by employees, more than pay, benefits, or job security. Sixty seven percent of all employees ranked respectful treatment as "very important," compared to 63% who preferred compensation, 60% who said the same of benefits, and 58% who said the same of job security. According to the Gallup Report (2016), opportunities to learn and grow at work are highly important to millennials when seeking out new jobs or deciding to stay in current roles. As qualitative factors becoming more important in work preference, organization needs to change their retaining strategies.

The managerial challenge stemming from these changes is how to exercise managerial power while preserving good relationships with employees and preventing them from leaving the organization. This means balancing between employees' needs and the organization's needs. When using more traditional, harsh influence strategies, managers may get immediate compliance, but lose the employee to another organization. When using softer, friendlier tactics, managers may preserve a good relationship with their employees, sometimes at the expense of immediate compliance, which can be detrimental to the organizational goals. Studies have shown that power tactic preferences and compliance are related to the meaning of the conflict for the organization. For example, a study on bank managers found that managers are more demanding in tasks that are classified as highly significant but using softer tactics in a less significant task (Tal et al., 2015).

Environment Change and Power Challenges

As a result of global changes, organizational ways of doing things have also evolved. This has generated new managerial challenges. Advances in technology, globalization, democratization, and individualization have all led to the need to change the way managers influence employees. Knowledge workers, working in different countries and with flexible work arrangements, view themselves as valuable assets to the organization and expect managers to treat them with respect and give them autonomy in decision-making (Dupre & Day, 2007). Managers thus need to juggle

pleasing employees, keeping them in the organization and sticking to schedule and quality demands. This is not an easy task. Previous influence tactics that once were efficient and acceptable to employees have lost their effectiveness in the changing organizations. The demands on and from managers are higher and require them to have better honed interpersonal skills.

Toward a New Perception of Power

The dilution of power in organizations has forced managers to reassess the problem of securing employee commitment and employee retention without losing their ability to influence (Sparrow & Cooper, 1998). In terms of the IPIM theoretical framework, all four cost/benefit implications associated with compliance/non-compliance by subordinates have changed. The increased cost and the lesser efficacy and social acceptability of harsh tactics such as legitimization of position and coercion now make these less useful to managers. Millennials perceive harsh tactics as nonnormative and highly offensive and often refuse to comply with them (Hershat & Epstein, 2010), and employment legislation often provides employees with protection against harsh treatment. However, the devastating effect of the use of harsh tactics goes beyond the damage to the manager-employee relationship. In an age where technology broadens occupational choice and employees expect managers to treat them with more respect, using harsh tactics can cause employees to leave the organization. Nevertheless, the problem is not restricted to harsh tactics alone. The relative availability of soft tactics such as expertise and information power is also declining. Managers overseeing knowledge workers who sometimes possess more knowledge than they do cannot always use these tactics on their expert, educated workers (Koslowsky et al., 2001).

Malone (2004) claims that the managerial challenge here is to move from a perception of power as “command and control” to one of “coordinate and cultivate.” Coordinate refers to the ability to organize the work that needs to be done and clearly define the relationships between tasks. Cultivate refers to the manager’s ability to understand what workers want, help them recognize their weaknesses and strengths, and promote a cooperative relationship between groups so that they are more efficient.

We claimed that managers not only need to understand the definitions and relationship between tasks but also need to communicate this bigger picture in a clear manner to their employees. In other words, they need to “coordinate and communicate.” In addition, the challenge managers face goes beyond recognizing employee’s needs; they also need to act accordingly. The implementation of flexibility in influencing employees is by using “smart power,” a combination of harsh and soft tactics as a means of meeting employees’ needs and situations. The next two sections will define and explain the new mindsets and new skills needed on the part of managers: “coordinate and communicate” and “smart power.”

Coordinate and Communicate

“Coordinate,” refers to the manager’s ability to organize work through shared goals. “Communicate” refers to manager’s ability to explain those goals effectively to employees. Organizations and managers facing the challenge balance the need for compliance with the need for greater organizational democracy in which lower-level employees have power and opportunity to act autonomously. When managers “coordinate and communicate,” organizational vision and values, cultural mechanisms operate as binding agents and allow empowerment to coincide with organizational purpose and process (Clarke & Butcher, 2006). In this sense, managers’ most effective source of power lies in their ability to communicate the bigger picture to their employees, not only by providing them with information regarding their specific task at hand but also by clarifying the meaning and significance of their work in the dynamic net of organizational missions and roles. Employees have to know what their responsibilities are, how their work affects other groups in the organization, and what their role is in the company as a whole.

This requires new skills from managers. First, in order to succeed on such a challenging mission, managers need to see the bigger picture themselves. They need to be able to see more than what their organizational unit needs. In other words, they need to have system thinking, i.e., the ability to see the organization as interrelated where every action taken by one organizational unit has an impact on the other organizational units (Senge, 1998). Managers do not only need to see the bigger picture but also must have high communication skills that enable them to clearly define the role of the employee in the organizational vision and show flexibility in communication with different employees. For example, although one employee may understand his role in the organizational intentions after one email from the manager, other employees may need further explanations and face-to-face meetings to realize the interfirm effects of different modes of action. Here, managers need to communicate “high-class” macro information on the interrelations between tasks, rather than “low-class” micro information focused on the task itself.

The disadvantage of this influence tactic is that it is time-consuming. However, if managers consistently provide a clear vision and clarify the relationships between different roles in the organization, the time requirement gradually drops. Further, if managers consistently provide employees with the bigger picture, they begin to be perceived as experts who understand the multiple demands and effects of the task. In this case, employees will trust the manager’s expertise, and compliance will be achieved more rapidly.

Smart Power

Smart power refers to the misperception that soft power alone can produce compliance (Nye, 2009). In the previous sections, it was argued that the employees today expect managers to treat them with respect and more as equal partners. In this sense,

the soft tactics are more appropriate as they express an approach that is more acceptable and preserves good employee-manager relationships. However, soft power alone is not the answer because managers also need to preserve their authority when needed. “Smart power” involves applying a combination of harsh and soft power tactics according to the situation. While harsh tactics achieve rapid compliance, soft tactics preserve good relationship with the employees. A combination of the two tactics can help managers enjoy the advantages of each. This requires managers to be able to understand different situational elements and different employees’ needs and to be able to show flexibility by adapting and changing their managerial style accordingly. When employees are aware that their managers can implement harsh organizational tactics but choose to use personal soft means instead, it can lead to more organizational commitment.

Organizational commitment is the “psychological link between an employee and his or her organization that makes it less likely that the employee will voluntarily leave the organization” (Allen & Meyer, 1996, p. 252). Commitment is split into affective (organizational attachment, identification, and involvement), continuance (obligation to remain part of the organization), and normative commitment (estimated costs of leaving). Of these, the affective component has repeatedly been shown to be a consistent predictor of a range of outcomes and behaviors in organizational settings (Blau et al., 2008; Paglis & Green, 2002; Sturges, Guest, Conway, & Davey, 2002). Affective commitment develops through work experiences that “fulfil employees’ needs to feel comfortable within the organization and competent in the work role” (Allen & Meyer, 1996, p. 4).

Therefore, managers’ ability to understand what workers want and their efforts to help them recognize their weaknesses and strengths and by treating them as individuals with different needs and desires can increase their organizational commitment. Managers’ influence lies in their ability to satisfy the unique needs of each employee, strengthen the employee’s identification with the organization (organizational commitment), and by extension increase the employee’s tendency to comply with their requests (Koslowsky et al., 2001). Studies have confirmed the impact of employee needs on the effectiveness of influence tactics (Pierro et al., 2012). The effect of different types of influence tactics depends on the employee’s personality traits. For example, employees high on the need for closure (the need for a firm answer) were shown to react by increased performance when exposed to harsh power tactics, whereas those low in the need for closure (high tolerance for inconclusive answers and uncertainty) reacted by increased performance when exposed to soft tactics.

This requires new abilities from managers. In order to identify employee needs, managers must possess high emotional intelligence which involves the ability to make accurate appraisals of expressions of emotion in themselves and in others, the ability to regulate emotions in themselves and others, and the ability to use feelings to motivate, plan, and achieve goals (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Managers must also be cognitively open to new information, show flexibility in treating employees differently, and demonstrate creativity by finding solutions that satisfy both employee and organizational needs.

Although affective commitment and job satisfaction are positively related to soft tactics and negatively to harsh ones (London & Howat, 1978; Tal et al., 2015), it should be noted that the success of the soft strategy might actually be improved by the additional use of harsh methods, so long as the opinion change that was achieved through the soft influence is not undermined. Using “smart power” is an important determinant of managers’ ability to influence their surroundings, as using soft power alone is less effective when it is not backed up by the eventuality of implementing harsher means. In a study (Emans, Munduate, Klaver, & Van de Vliert, 2003) of 145 police officers who were asked to report their tendency to comply with use of power by their supervisor (harsh/soft), a significant interaction effect between the two influence styles was found. Supervisors whose compliance-gaining repertoires included both harsh and soft tactics were most likely to elicit compliance with their requests. This finding thus suggests that the use of harsh influence styles can contribute to effective management, not because the harsh strategy effective in itself, but because it reinforces the impact of soft power strategies. Hence, managers must be able to use multiple approaches in their attempts to influence.

Practical Suggestions

The managerial style of influence described above leads to some practical suggestions on the ways in which managers can effectively influence their surroundings. First, managers need to have a grasp of the bigger picture. When the targets, missions, and relationships between them are clear to the manager, information and expertise becomes an important means of influence. Think of this as driving in the highway. It is very easy to take the wrong turn when driving in high speeds. However, if you have a reliable, trustworthy guide directing you to the right direction, you will learn to trust them and to listen to their instruction. Nevertheless, when the guide is not reliable, leading you in inefficient paths or constantly changing their directions, you will learn not to listen to them. In a world that changes quickly it is very easy to make wrong decisions, which are not beneficial to the employee and to the organization. When the manager has a clear map of the roads that leads to organizational and employees’ objectives, the employees learn to trust directions and are more inclined to comply with the managers guidelines.

Another mechanism to direct employees in the right directions is using frequent feedback, especially concerning the understanding of the “road map” of the organizational goals, missions, and interconnections between them. Managers should give feedback as a routine matter and see it as an integral part of their job. When an employee makes the wrong turn, fast recognition of the problem and redirection is important. Not only that, but millennials seek clear feedback on performance. Because millennials, in Western societies, seem to have been programmed from their earliest moment to seeking approval, they have a higher need for structure and reassurance which is expressed in the workplace in millennial excessive seek for guidance and direction (Hershatter & Epstein, 2010). This need, for feedback, is far

from being satisfied. According to the Gallup report (2016), only 19% of millennials report receiving routine feedback and only 17% claim the feedback they do receive is meaningful.

Feedback also makes millennials feel more commitment to their workplace (Hershatzer & Epstein, 2010). In a world where a key factor in organization success is its “employees’ engagement,” it is important that managers will create trusting relationships with their employee and to strengthen employees’ organizational commitment. The Gallup Report (2016) demonstrated that the business with higher employee engagement (top 25%) is 17% more productive, suffers 70% fewer safety incidents, experiences 41% less absenteeism, has 10% better customer ratings, and is 21% more profitable in comparison to business with low employee engagement (bottom 25%). When employees are engaged and committed to the workplace, they are more inclined to comply with the managers’ requests.

Organizational commitment is also a function of the manager ability to be sensitive to the employee’s needs. Managers need to be open-minded and flexible in their behavior in order to be able to react to different employees’ needs. When dealing with conflict, managers should not let themselves be stuck on the first influence strategy that comes into mind. Time should be allotted to explore several possible modes of influence, their appropriateness to a given situation, and their fit to employee personality style. Different people react differently to a variety of influence tactics. Some react better to harsh tactics like rewards or legitimization of positions, and others respond better to tactics as information or expertise.

Finally, managers should not be restricted to one tactic alone. They should be aware of the possibility of combining soft and harsh tactics. When managers use harsh tactics exclusively, they may create antagonism. When managers use soft tactics exclusively, they may lose their legitimization of position. As Roosevelt stated in Roosevelt 1900: “Speak softly and carry a big stick, you will go far.” In order to influence effectively managers can use soft tactics, backed up by the ability to use harsh tactics if necessary. This requires organizations to provide managers with training in the ways to act harshly (when necessary) while making this tactic public knowledge and make sure that managers act with caution when implementing these means.

Conclusion and Future Directions

The Gallup Report (2016) revealed that only 29% of millennials in the United States (and 13% worldwide) are engaged at work and 60% of the millennials report that they are considering different job opportunities. The decrease in the centrality of one’s job in people’s lives and at the same time the increased knowledge and expertise of employees have changed the balance of power in organizations and made it harder for managers to influence their subordinates.

The traditional perception of power highlighted the superiority of the manager when influencing employees (the ability to reward and punish, to impart task knowledge, and to share task expertise). On the other hand, the new perception of

managerial power emphasizes the use of macro information and expertise, coupled with the managers' possession of harsh means, as a way to achieve both task compliance and employee loyalty. Hence, to be an effective manager, even low-level managers need to hold high-quality interpersonal skills. System thinking, high communication skills, emotional intelligence, open-mindedness, and creativity are all required for this challenging mission. The ability to use smart power, to adapt to different situations, and to show flexibility in influencing employees seems to be an especially important basic skills. Future studies should test the impact of managers' use of these new power strategies and the role of high interpersonal skills on organizational outcomes and attitudes as manifested in employee work satisfaction, organizational commitment, performance, turnover, and retention.

References

- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 49(3), 252–276. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1996.0043>
- Antonioni, D. (1998). Relationship between the big five personality factors and conflict management styles. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 9(4), 336–355. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb022814>
- Bhatti, K. K., & Qureshi, T. M. (2007). Impact of employee participation on job satisfaction, employee commitment and employee productivity. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 3(2), 54–68.
- Blau, G., Andersson, L., Davis, K., Daymont, D., Hochner, A., Koziar, K., ... Holladay, B. (2008). The relation between employee organizational and professional development activities. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 72(1), 123–142.
- Boston Consulting Group. (2014). *Decoding global talent*. Retrieved from <http://internationalcommunity.dk/Files/Files/PDFer/Oktober%202014%20-%20Decoding%20Global%20Talent%20by%20Boston%20Consulting%20Group.pdf>
- Burke, R. J., & Ng, E. (2006). The changing nature of work and organizations: Implications for human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*, 16(2), 86–94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2006.03.006>
- Busck, O., Knudsen, H., & Lind, J. (2010). The transformation of employee participation: Consequences for the work environment. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 285–305. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143831X09351212>
- Clarke, M., & Butcher, D. (2006). Reconciling hierarchy and democracy the value of management learning. *Management Learning*, 37(3), 313–333. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507606067169>
- Clegg, S. R., Kornberger, M., & Pitsis, T. (2015). *Managing and organizations: An introduction to theory and practice*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Dépret, E., & Fiske, S. T. (1999). Perceiving the powerful: Intriguing individuals versus threatening groups. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 35(5), 461–480. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jesp.1999.1380>
- Dupre, K. E., & Day, A. L. (2007). The effects of supportive management and job quality on the turnover intentions and health of military personnel. *Human Resource Management*, 46(2), 185–201. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20156>
- Egan, M. (2016, September 9). 5,300 Wells Fargo employees fired over 2 million phony accounts, CNN Money. Retrieved from <http://money.cnn.com/2016/09/08/investing/wells-fargo-created-phony-accounts-bank-fees/>

- Elias, S. M. (2007). Influence in the ivory tower: Examining the appropriate use of social power in the university classroom. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37, 2532–2548. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2007.00269.x>
- Emans, B. J., Munduate, L., Klaver, E., & Van de Vliert, E. (2003). Constructive consequences of leaders' forcing influence styles. *Applied Psychology*, 52(1), 36–54. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00122>
- Emerson, R. M. (1962). Power-dependence relations. *American Sociological Review*, 27, 31–41. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00122>
- Falbe, C. M., & Yukl, G. (1992). Consequences for managers of using single influence tactics and combinations of tactics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35(3), 638–652. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256490>
- Farh, J. L., Hackett, R. D., & Liang, J. (2007). Individual-level cultural values as moderators of perceived organizational support–employee outcome relationships in China: Comparing the effects of power distance and traditionality. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(3), 715–729. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2007.25530866>
- Ferris, G. R., Perrewé, P. L., Anthony, W. P., & Gilmore, D. C. (2000). Political skill at work. *Organizational Dynamics*, 28(4), 25–37.
- Florida, R. L. (2005). *The flight of the creative class* (p. 326). New York, NY: Harper Business.
- Fowler, J. S. (2017). *Reflecting on one very, very strange year at Uber*. Retrieved from: <https://www.susanjefowler.com/blog/2017/2/19/reflecting-on-one-very-strange-year-at-uber>
- Frank, D. J., & Meyer, J. W. (2002). The profusion of individual roles and identities in the postwar period. *Sociological Theory*, 20(1), 86–105. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9558.00152>
- French, J. R. P., Jr., & Raven, B. H. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power* (pp. 150–167). Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.
- Friedman, T. L. (2016). *Thank you for being late: An optimist's guide to thriving in the age of Acceleration*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Fu, P. P., & Yukl, G. (2000). Perceived effectiveness of influence tactics in the United States and China. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 11(2), 251–266. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(00\)00039-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(00)00039-4)
- Gallup report. (2016). *How millennials want to work and Live*. Retrieved from http://www.gallup.com/reports/189830/millennials-work-live.aspx?utm_source=gbj&utm_medium=copy&utm_campaign=20160830-gbj
- Global Leadership Summit in London. (2014). Retrieved from <https://gls.london.edu/>
- Hall, E. T., & Hall, M. R. (1988). *Understanding cultural differences*. Yarmouth, U.K.: Intercultural Press.
- Harrison, J. S., & Freeman, R. E. (2004). Special Topic: Democracy in and around organizations is organizational democracy worth the effort? *The Academy of Management Executive*, 18(3), 49–53. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AME.2004.14776168>
- Hershat, A., & Epstein, M. (2010). Millennials and the world of work: An organization and management perspective. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(2), 211–223. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9160-y>
- Hertel, G., Konradt, U., & Orlikowski, B. (2004). Managing distance by interdependence: Goal setting, task interdependence, and team-based rewards in virtual teams. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 13(1), 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320344000228>
- Higgins, C. A., Judge, T. A., & Ferris, G. R. (2003). Influence tactics and work outcomes: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24(1), 89–106. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.181>
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations. The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Huzzard, T., & Östergren, K. (2002). When norms collide: Learning under organizational hypocrisy. *British Journal of Management*, 13(2), 47–59. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.13.s2.5>
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Keltner, D., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Anderson, C. (2003). Power, approach, and inhibition. *Psychological Review*, 110, 265–284. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.110.2.265>

- Kipnis, D., & Schmidt, S. M. (1983). An influence perspective on bargaining within organizations. In *Negotiating In Organizations* (pp. 303–319). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Kipnis, D., & Schmidt, S. M. (1985). The language of persuasion. *Psychology Today*, 19, 40–46.
- Koslowsky, M., & Schwarzwald, J. (1993). The use of power tactics to gain compliance: Testing aspects of Raven's (1988) theory in conflictual situations. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 21(2), 135–143. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.1993.21.2.135>
- Koslowsky, M., & Schwarzwald, J. (2009). Power tactics preference in organizations: individual and situational factors. In D. Tjosvold & B. Wisse (Eds.), *Power and Independence in Organizations* (pp. 244–261). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Koslowsky, M., Schwarzwald, J., & Ashuri, S. (2001). On the relationship between subordinates' compliance to power sources and organisational attitudes. *Applied Psychology*, 50(3), 455–476. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00067>
- Kotter, J. P. (1977). Power, dependence, and effective management. *Harvard Business Review*, 55, 125–136.
- Laslo-Roth, R., & Schwarzwald, J. (2016). Rationale and emotion in the selection of influence tactic by managers in conflict with subordinates. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 37(1), 42–70. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-04-2014-0076>
- Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science*. New York, NY: University of Chicago press: Harper & Brothers.
- London, M., & Howat, G. (1978). The relationship between employee commitment and conflict resolution behavior. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 13(1), 1–14.
- Malhotra, A., Majchrzak, A., & Rosen, B. (2007). Leading virtual teams. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(1), 60–70. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMP.2007.24286164>
- Malone, T. W. (2004). *The future of work: How the new order of business will shape your organization, your management style, and your life*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- McKinsey Global Institute. (2015). *Digital America: A tale of the haves and have-mores*. Retrieved from <http://www.mckinsey.com/industries/high-tech/our-insights/digital-america-a-tale-of-the-haves-and-have-mores>
- Meyer, J. W. (2002). Globalization and the expansion and standardization of management. In *The expansion of management knowledge: Carriers, flows and sources* (pp. 33–44). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Morgan, G. (2013). *Riding the waves of change*. San Francisco, CA: Imaginization Inc..
- Mossholder, K. W., Bennett, N., Kemery, E. R., & Wesolowski, M. A. (1998). Relationships between bases of power and work reactions: The mediational role of procedural justice. *Journal of Management*, 24(4), 533–552. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639802400404>
- Myers, K. K., & Sadaghiani, K. (2010). Millennials in the workplace: A communication perspective on millennials' organizational relationships and performance. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(2), 225–238. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9172-7>
- Nye, J. S., Jr. (2009). Get smart: Combining hard and soft power. *Foreign Affairs*, 88, 160–163.
- Paglis, L. L., & Green, S. G. (2002). Leadership self-efficacy and managers' motivation for leading change. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(2), 215–235.
- Patel, S. (2017, January 16). Employee boosts that won't break the budget. *Chicago Tribune*. Retrieved from <http://www.chicagotribune.com/business/success/inc/tca-employee-boosts-that-won-t-break-budget-20170116-story.html>
- Pierro, A., Kruglanski, A. W., & Raven, B. H. (2012). Motivational underpinnings of social influence in work settings: Bases of social power and the need for cognitive closure. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 42(1), 41–52. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.836>
- Pierro, A., Raven, B. H., Amato, C., & Bélanger, J. J. (2013). Bases of social power, leadership styles, and organizational commitment. *International Journal of Psychology*, 48(6), 1122–1134. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207594.2012.733398>
- Podsakoff, P. M., & Schriesheim, C. A. (1985). *Leader reward and punishment behavior: A methodological and substantive review*. Research in organizational behavior. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Raven, B. H. (1965). Social influence and power. In D. Steiner & M. Fishbein (Eds.), *Current studies in social psychology* (pp. 371–382). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Raven, B. H. (1993). The basis of power: Origins and recent development. *Journal of Social Issues*, 49, 227–251. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1993.tb01191.x>
- Raven, B. H., & Rubin, J. Z. (1983). *Social psychology* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Raven, B. H., Schwarzwald, J., & Koslowsky, M. (1998). Conceptualizing and measuring a power/interaction model of interpersonal influence. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28(4), 307–332.
- Raven, B. H. (1992). A power/interaction model of interpersonal influence: French and Raven thirty years later. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 7, 217–244.
- Roosevelt, T. (1900). Gambling and vice in the state capital. *The Brooklyn daily Eagle*, April 1, 1900, p. 39.
- Roberts, A. (2003). *Hitler and Churchill: Secrets of leadership*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Russell, B. (1938). *Power: A new social analysis*. London, UK: Allen and Unwin.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9(3), 185–211. <https://doi.org/10.2190/DUGG-P24E-52WK-6CDG>
- Schwarzwald, J., Koslowsky, M., & Ochana-Levin, T. (2004). Usage of and compliance with power tactics in routine versus nonroutine work settings. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 18(3), 385–402. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:JOBU.0000016713.86935.1b>
- Senge, P. M. (1998). The leader's new work. *Leading Organizations*, 439–457.
- Simon, B., & Oakes, P. (2006). Beyond dependence: An identity approach to social power and domination. *Human Relations*, 59(1), 105–139. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726706062760>
- Sparrow, P., & Cooper, C. L. (1998). New organizational forms: the strategic relevance of future psychological contract scenarios. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences/Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration*, 15(4), 356–371. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1936-4490.1998.tb00177.x>
- Stohl, C., & Cheney, G. (2001). Participatory processes/paradoxical practices communication and the dilemmas of organizational democracy. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 14(3), 349–407.
- Sturges, J., Guest, D., Conway, N., & Davey, K. M. (2002). A longitudinal study of the relationship between career management and organizational commitment among graduates in the first ten years at work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(6), 731–748.
- Tal, A., Schwarzwald, J., & Koslowsky, M. (2015). Power preference of bank managers in conflicts with subordinates. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 26(2), 126–144. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCM-01-2013-0005>
- The Society for Human Resource Management. (2016). *Employee job satisfaction and engagement: Revitalizing a changing workforce: Annual report 2016*. Retrieved from <https://www.shrm.org/hr-today/trends-and-forecasting/research-and-surveys/Documents/2016-Employee-Job-Satisfaction-and-Engagement-Report.pdf>.
- Treadway, D. C., Breland, J. W., Williams, L. M., Cho, J., Yang, J., & Ferris, G. R. (2013). Social influence and interpersonal power in organizations roles of performance and political skill in two studies. *Journal of Management*, 39(6), 1529–1553. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311410887>
- Trompenaars, F. (1994). *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding diversity in global business*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Weber, M. (1954). *Max Weber on law in economy and society* (E. Shils & M. Rheinstein, Trans.). New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Yukl, G. (1981). *Leadership in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *Journal of Management*, 15(2), 251–289. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920638901500207>
- Yukl, G., & Falbe, C. M. (1991). Importance of different power sources in downward and lateral relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 416–423. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.76.3.416>
- Zapposinsights. (2016). *Holacracy and self-organization*. Retrieved from <https://www.zapposinsights.com/about/holacracy>



<http://www.springer.com/978-3-319-69208-1>

Redefining Management

Smart Power Perspectives

Muhlbauer, V.; Harry, W. (Eds.)

2017, VIII, 184 p. 1 illus., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-3-319-69208-1