



Relationship between leadership power bases and job stress of subordinates: example from boutique hotels

Leadership power bases and job stress

285

Hakan V. Erkutlu and Jamel Chafra

School of Applied Technology and Management, Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey

Abstract

Purpose – To examine the influence of leadership power bases on subordinates' job stress at boutique hotels.

Design/methodology/approach – A total of 400 subjects (20 managers and 380 non-managerial employees) participated in this study from 20 boutique hotels. Participants were told that the study was designed to collect information on the leadership power bases used by first line managers and on the job stress levels of employees in the hospitality workforce. The Rahim Leader Power Inventory and Spielberger and Vagg's Job Stress Survey were used to assess leadership power bases and job stress, respectively.

Findings – There are significant relations between leader power bases and subordinates' job stress. The findings support the suggestion in the literature that positional power bases stimulate job stress in the hospitality industry.

Research limitations/implications – The study has several limitations that could be future research topics, such as hotels' source of funding, demographic characteristics of the participants, etc. There is a question about the generalizability of these findings to other hospitality organizations such as four or five-star hotels.

Originality/value – This paper explores an aspect of leadership in the hospitality industry that is often neglected. Organizations that actively consider leadership approaches and wish to nurture and develop their leaders and managers will need to be mindful of the leadership power bases.

Keywords Leadership, Stress, Hotels, Management power, Hospitality management, Job satisfaction

Paper type Research paper

1. Introduction

Hospitality organizations are under pressure to improve their performance, to anticipate change, and develop new structures. Effective leadership is therefore essential to ensure that change leads to increased efficiency and profitability (Pittaway *et al.*, 1998; Zhao and Merna, 1992; Slattery and Olsen, 1984). Although researchers cannot assume that better leadership leads to better business performance, some understanding of the relationship between leadership and business performance is required. Leadership as a subject has been somewhat neglected within hospitality research (Pittaway *et al.*, 1998; Mullins, 1992).

The hospitality industry tends to be labor intensive and has increasingly harsh environmental demands imposed upon it. Leadership skills may help organizations to utilize the available human resources more effectively and to deal successfully with environmental pressures.

Leadership can be defined as a social influence process. It involves determining the group or organization's objectives, encouraging behavior in pursuit of these objectives, and influencing group maintenance and culture (Yukl, 1994). It is a group



phenomenon; there are no leaders without followers. Effective use of leader behavior will increase the effectiveness of both the leader and the organization.

Managers use different leadership power bases in work settings. This study investigates the extent to which employees' job stress is related to the leadership power bases at boutique hotels in Turkey.

Boutique is a term to describe intimate, usually luxurious or quirky hotel environments. Boutique hotels differentiate themselves from larger chain/branded hotels and motels by providing personalized accommodation and services/facilities. Typically, boutique hotels are furnished in a stylish, sometimes themed manner. With 3-100 rooms, most of them are smaller than mainstream hotels, but they are usually equipped with telephone and wireless internet, air conditioning, minibars, and cable/pay TV. Guests are attended to by 24-h hotel staff. Many boutique hotels have on-site dining facilities, and the majority offer bars and lounges which may also be open to the general public.

Although boutique hotels are becoming more popular in the hospitality industry, there is no study of the influence of leadership behaviors on both organizational and leader effectiveness at such hotels. That is why boutique hotels were the focus of this study. It is expected that the results of this study might be a starting point for researchers and practitioners who are interested in effective leadership styles in these types of hotels.

First, the construct of leadership bases of power, highlighting definitional issues and extending these issues to the workplace is explained. Second, job stress, which is the dependent variable of this study, is discussed. Third, predictions about work-related individual outcomes such as employee job stress within and across supervisor and subordinate domains are derived.

2. Conceptual background and hypotheses bases of a leader's power

Power does not arise spontaneously or mysteriously. Rather, it comes from specific and identifiable bases. The two major types of power are position powers and personal powers (Rahim *et al.*, 2001; Bass, 1960; Etzioni, 1961; Rahim, 1988; Yukl and Falbe, 1991; Yukl, 1994; Elangovan and Xie, 2000; Ward, 2001). Position power is based on rank in an organizational structure and is given by superiors. Personal power is based on a person's individual characteristics and is in part given by subordinates.

Position powers

A person's position in an organization provides a base for the exercise of this type of power. The major kinds of power that are attached to a position include legitimate power, reward power, and coercive power (French and Raven, 1959; Ward, 2001; Yagil, 2002).

Legitimate power: This is sometimes called formal authority and is based on perceptions about the obligations and responsibilities associated with particular positions in an organization. In the work setting, such power is intended to give a manager a designated right to expect compliance from employees. Both parties agree that the subordinates are obligated to respond to those requests.

Reward power: Reward power is derived from control over tangible benefits, such as a promotion, a better job, a better work schedule, a larger operating budget, an increased expense account, and formal recognition of accomplishments. Reward power is also derived from status symbols such as a larger office or a parking space.

Coercive power: This is the power to discipline, punish, and withhold rewards; it is important largely as a potential, rather than an actual type of influence. For example, the threat of being disciplined for not arriving at work on time is effective in influencing many employees to be punctual.

Personal powers

Personal powers are attached to a person and thus stay with that individual regardless of position or organization. Personal powers are especially valuable to leaders because they do not depend on the actions of others or of the organization. The two major bases are expert power and referent power (French and Raven, 1959; Ward, 2001; Yagil, 2002).

Expert power: A major base of personal power in an organization stems from expertise in solving problems and performing important tasks. Because many people do not have specific knowledge, expertise becomes a potential base of power. The potential is translated into actual power when other people depend on, or need advice from, those who have that expertise.

Referent power: Referent power is the ability to influence others based on personal liking, charisma, and reputation. It is manifested through imitation. There are numerous reasons why we might attribute referent power to others. We may like their personalities, admire their accomplishments, believe in their causes, or see them as role models.

Job stress

Stress is a pervasive and essential part of life. It is defined as the reaction of individuals to demands (stressors) imposed upon them. Stress plays a positive role by triggering the mobilization of adaptive responses (Selye, 1976). Contrary to popular belief, stress can be associated with both pleasant and unpleasant events (Levi, 1972) and only becomes problematic when it remains unresolved because of lapses in the individual's adaptive capacity. When this happens, the individual becomes disorganized, disoriented and therefore less able to cope; stress related health problems may result. Selye (1974) refers to distress in order to differentiate these situations, although this distinction has not always been applied in the general usage of the term. Accordingly, in the following analysis, stress refers to situations where the well-being of individuals is detrimentally affected by their failure to cope with the demands of their environment.

Among life situations, the workplace stands out as a potentially important source of stress purely because of the amount of time that is spent in this setting. However, the stress-inducing features of the workplace go beyond simply the time involved. With the financial security and opportunities for advancement of individuals being dependent upon their performance, the pressure to perform makes the work situation potentially very stressful. Furthermore, events in the workplace affect social relations both within and beyond that environment. Conversely, relationships in the non-work situation can impinge on the individual's ability to cope in the work environment (Hart and Wearing, 1995; Kelley, 1993; Near *et al.*, 1983).

The relevance of workplace stress to well-being has been recognized (Cooper *et al.*, 1988), but little attention has been given to the incidence of this problem in the service industry, despite the growth of this sector, and the obvious relevance of stress to fluid situations where much depends on inter-personal relations (Law *et al.*, 1995). Even less attention has been given to work-induced stress specifically in the hotel industry (Brymer *et al.*, 1991; Zohar, 1994; Faulkner and Patiar, 1997).

Four main considerations make the incidence of work-related stress highly relevant to hotel management. Firstly, the emphasis on face to face contact with guests and the real time nature of service delivery means that workers are required to respond promptly (Dann, 1990), and they are "subject to a mass of competing, often contradictory or conflicting demands and expectations from a multiplicity of sources" (Hales and Nightingale, 1986, p. 10). Secondly, if workers are unduly stressed and therefore unhappy, this will be reflected in their dealings with guests, and the quality of the service provided will suffer as a consequence (Brymer, 1982; Zohar, 1994). Thirdly, high stress levels have the potential to result in high levels of staff turnover and this will, in turn, result in higher training costs and problems in service quality maintenance. This can be a particularly significant problem in a labor-intensive industry such as the hotel industry. Finally, as employers, hotel managers have a moral obligation to protect the welfare of their staff by adopting management practices that reduce their employees' exposure to situations where stress may become a problem.

Subordinate's job stress and leadership power bases

Karasek's (1979) job demands-control model offers a theoretical basis for exploring the relationship between perceived supervisor power and subordinate stress. This model hinges on the psychological role that personal control plays in determining how individuals respond to their jobs and work demands. According to the model, job demands thrust the employee into an aroused state. If the employee has high personal control over work, the arousal will likely be released in the normal execution of the job. On the other hand, if the arousal is accompanied by a perception of low personal control, the arousal cannot be appropriately channeled into a coping response and, thus, leads to negative psychological and physical consequences. A review by Ganster and Schaubroeck (1991) suggests that there is a growing consensus regarding the importance of perceived personal control for employees' health and well-being.

With regard to position powers, It was hypothesized that perceived supervisory legitimate, reward, and coercive power would be positively related to subordinate stress because they are likely to evoke a sense of lack of personal control at work. Not only is the subordinate highly dependent on the supervisor (Emerson, 1962), but also the administration of the reward or punishment by the supervisor lies beyond the subordinate's direct control. The perceived lack of control and the anxiety associated with the need to satisfy the supervisor are likely to provoke subordinate stress (Ganster and Schaubroeck, 1991; Kahn and Byosiere, 1992; Elangovan and Xie, 2000). Therefore, perceived supervisor reward and coercive power will be positively related to subordinate stress. Similarly, perceived legitimate power of the supervisor would be positively related to stress, because the subordinate is reminded of responsibilities to be fulfilled and realizes that his or her performance will be monitored and evaluated. The constant focus on duties and evaluation will likely increase subordinate stress.

H1. Positional power bases of the supervisor will be positively related to subordinate stress.

Expert power and referent power of the supervisor, on the other hand, were hypothesized to have a negative relationship with subordinate stress. Perceiving one's supervisor to be high on expert and referent power can be seen as similar to having a strong social support system at work: the subordinate would consider the supervisor's expertise to be a source of work support (e.g. resource for clarifying issues and tackling difficult problems) while the supervisor's personal appeal and likeability would induce

a sense of interpersonal support. Several researchers have noted the significant benefits of having strong social support in dealing with stress (e.g. Cohen and Wills, 1985; Kahn and Byosiene, 1992). Strong social support helps people cope positively with stressful events by acting as a buffer against stress as well as contributing to their psychological and physical well-being. More specifically, expert power of the supervisor serves to reassure the subordinate in terms of reducing job uncertainty, handling task complexity, enabling role, and goal clarity (Busch, 1980), thus leading to lower stress. Referent power of the supervisor increases the attraction and acceptance of the supervisor by the subordinate thus enhancing the pleasantness of the work and lowering stress. Previous research has showed that expert power and referent power are positively correlated with subordinate affect (Podsakoff and Schriesheim, 1985), and expert power is negatively associated with subordinate job tension (Sheridan and Vredenburgh, 1978).

H2. Personal power bases of the supervisor will be negatively related to subordinate stress.

3. Methods

Sample

The sample was drawn from 20 boutique hotels located in all seven geographical regions of Turkey. These were randomly selected from the list of 498 boutique hotels in the country in 2005 (Turkish Bureau of Statistics, 2005). Ten of them were foreign-owned, six were locally owned, and four were joint ventures. Eight boutique hotels were in cities and 12 were in resorts. They ranged in size from 22 to 112 employees and 8 to 68 guest rooms.

This study was deliberately completed in the summer months (July and August) because it is the busiest time for the hospitality industry in Turkey. Data collected in the low season might not be representative of the workload or stress level experienced by management in a boutique hotel. There were some difficulties in getting the data; it was not possible, for example, to survey all the staff at one hotel in a single visit. Given the number of hotels studied, the data collection required numerous site visits.

Members of the research team visited the selected hotels on three occasions (for each of the three shifts). Managers and non-managerial employees were gathered during work time in one room where a six page questionnaire was administered. Managers and their subordinates completed the questionnaires in different periods to prevent biases.

Participants were told that the study was designed to collect information on the leadership power bases used by first line managers and on the job-stress levels of employees in the hospitality workforce. They were given confidentially assurances and told that participation was voluntary. The questionnaires were collected immediately. A total of 400 subjects (20 first-line managers from the boutique hotels in the study – one from each hotel and their direct subordinates – 380 employees) participated in this study. Incomplete questionnaires reduced the sample size to 363 subjects (20 managers and 343 non-managerial employees).

Measures: independent variable

Leader power. This variable was measured by using the Rahim Leader Power Inventory (RLPI) (Rahim, 1988); this is a multi-item measure containing 35 questions

on a five point Likert scale with factorially independent subscales designed to measure the five supervisor power bases.

Both construct validity and criterion-related validity were evaluated by Rahim (1988). Construct validity was evaluated using factor analysis. Results supported the five independent dimensions of the power bases. Factors 1 through 5 were, respectively, called as expert, referent, reward, coercive, and legitimate bases of leader power. The five subscales have intercorrelations ranging from 0.12 to 0.58. Rahim reported that these results were consistent with earlier studies (Warren, 1968; Ivancevich, 1970).

Rahim (1988) also evaluated the criterion-related validity of RLPI. The relationship between the five power bases and subordinate compliance with the supervisor's wishes was evaluated using multiple regression analysis. With respect to leader power base, subordinate compliance was evaluated favorably by Warren (1968), Dunne *et al.* (1978), and Thamhain and Gemmill (1974) and for this measure by Rahim (1988).

Measures: dependent variables

Job stress. Spielberger and Vagg's (1999) Job Stress Survey was used to assess job stress. Respondents rate the intensity of 30 common workplace stressors on a nine-point scale by comparing each stressor to an event perceived as producing an average amount of stress (i.e., "Assignment of disagreeable duties"), which has been assigned the midpoint value of 5. Then, respondents report on a scale of 0 to 9+ days how often each stressor has occurred in the past 6 months.

The Job Stress Survey consists of three scales. The job stress index (JS-X) measures an individual's overall stress level; the job stress severity (JS-S) represents an individual's average intensity rating for the 30 stressors; and the job stress frequency (JS-F) indicates the average frequency of occurrence for the 30 stressors within the past 6 months. In addition, the survey has six subscales:

- (1) the job pressure index (JP-X) assesses the combined intensity and frequency of ten stressor events reflecting pressures directly related to the job's structure, design, or duties;
- (2) the job pressure severity (JP-S) measures an individual's average level of intensity of the ten stressors associated with job pressures;
- (3) the job pressure frequency (JP-F) indicates the average frequency of occurrence of the ten stressors related to job pressures;
- (4) the lack of organizational support index (LS-X) measures the combined intensity and frequency of occurrence for ten stressor events related to organizational policies or other people involved with the organization;
- (5) the lack of organizational support severity indicates the average level of intensity an individual perceives in regard to the ten stressors related to lack of organizational support; and
- (6) the lack of organizational support frequency reflects the average frequency of occurrence of the ten stressor events involving lack of organizational support. Spielberger and Vagg reported coefficient alphas ranging from a low of 0.80 for the JP-X and the LS-X to a high of 0.89 for the JS-S and the JS-F.

In this study, subordinates' job stress was evaluated utilizing the scale of the JS-X from the Job Stress Survey.

Measures: control variables

It is important to control for factors that have been shown or hypothesized to influence either the independent or dependent variables of interest in organizational behavior investigations. After reviewing the literature, individual factors as education, age, and tenure as variables that have been significant predictors of employee job stress were identified (Lang and Lee, 2005; Elangova and Xie, 2000; Xie, 1996; Xie and Johns, 1995).

4. Results

A total of 363 subjects (20 managers and 343 non-managerial employees) participated in this study. The majority of sample members were male (72 per cent for non-managerial employees and 90 per cent for managers) and the average position tenure was 1.92 years for non-managerial employees and 2.98 years for the managers. Eighty three per cent of non-managerial employees and 100 per cent of the managers held graduate degrees.

Table I presents descriptive statistics and correlations for the variables in the model. Tables II-IV present the results of the hierarchical regression analysis. The variables were entered into the regression equation in two steps: the control variables in the first step and the independent variables in the second.

Hypothesis 1, which states that positional power bases of the supervisor will be positively related to subordinate's job stress, received strong support (Table II, Step 2 for JS-X). The R^2 result of 0.66 indicates that 66 per cent of the observed variability in the dependent variable subordinate job stress is explained by the independent variables, the leadership power bases. Evaluation of the Beta coefficients indicated that all independent variables were significant predictors of subordinates' job stress. Predicted value of dependent variable, subordinate's job stress, increased 13, 12, and 25 per cent when the values of coercive, legitimate, and reward power bases increased by 1 ($p < 0.05$, $p < 0.01$, and $p < 0.001$, respectively) for the JS-X.

Hypothesis 2, which states that personal power bases of the supervisor will be negatively related to subordinate stress, was also supported (Table II, Step 2 for JS-X). Predicted value of dependent variable, subordinate's job stress, decreased 41 and 20 per cent when the values of referent and expert power bases increase by 1 ($p < 0.001$). Partial correlation analysis indicated that the negative relationship between independent variables and subordinate's job stress was strongest for referent power ($r = 0.32$, $p < 0.001$).

Tables III and Tables IV are the results of hierarchical regression analyses for the subscales of the Job Stress Survey; the JP-X and the lack of support index (LS-X). Of the observed variability for job pressure 65 per cent was explained by the independent variables, the leadership power bases; for the lack of support variable, it was 64 per cent. Evaluation of the Beta coefficients indicated that all positional and personal power sources were significant predictors of the job pressure and the lack of support variables.

5. Discussion

In this study, the effect of leadership power bases on subordinates' job stress was focused. It was founded that job stress was affected by leadership powers. All the components of the positional power bases are positively related to subordinate's job stress, whereas the personal powers are related negatively. These findings are consistent with previous research (Karasek, 1979; Ganster and Schaubroeck, 1991; Kahn and Byosiere, 1992; Elangovan and Xie, 2000; Cohen and Wills, 1985; Busch, 1980; Podsakoff and Schriesheim, 1985; Sheridan and Vredenburgh, 1978).

Table I.
Descriptive statistics
and correlations

	Mean	s.d.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	
Education	2.81	0.53																	
Age (years)	21.42	0.67	-0.10*																
Tenure (years)	2.90	1.66	0.03	-0.01															
Reward power	2.70	1.37	-0.01	0.06	0.00														
Coercive power	2.78	1.46	-0.09*	-0.01	-0.07	0.29**													
Legitimate power	2.76	1.19	0.01	-0.05	-0.07	-0.12*	0.49**												
Referent power	2.76	1.53	0.04	-0.04	0.00	-0.18**	-0.84**	-0.53**											
Expert power	2.90	1.57	0.05	0.00	0.07	0.12*	-0.55**	-0.50**	0.65**										
JSS	4.55	3.30	-0.05	0.02	-0.12*	0.31**	0.67**	0.44**	-0.71**	-0.52**									
JSF	4.74	3.28	-0.06	-0.01	-0.06	0.29**	0.67**	0.46**	-0.73**	-0.63**	0.72**								
JSX	29.31	29.30	-0.07	0.01	-0.09*	0.29**	0.72**	0.51**	-0.78**	-0.60**	0.91**	0.88**							
JPS	4.59	3.40	-0.08	0.03	-0.12**	0.30**	0.65**	0.42**	-0.68**	-0.51**	0.97**	0.70**	0.88**						
JPF	4.76	3.38	-0.07	0.00	-0.06	0.26**	0.68**	0.48**	-0.74**	-0.64**	0.70**	0.99**	0.87**	0.68**					
JPX	29.66	30.52	-0.07	0.02	-0.10*	0.28**	0.71**	0.51**	-0.77**	-0.61**	0.88**	0.87**	0.98**	0.89**	0.87**				
LSS	4.42	3.07	-0.04	0.02	-0.12*	0.33**	0.66**	0.42**	-0.69**	-0.50**	0.98**	0.72**	0.90**	0.95**	0.70**	0.87**			
LSF	4.76	3.18	-0.05	-0.01	-0.06	0.28**	0.67**	0.45**	-0.73**	-0.62**	0.71**	0.99**	0.87**	0.69**	0.99**	0.86**	0.72**		
LSX	28.12	27.53	-0.06	0.02	-0.10*	0.30**	0.71**	0.49**	-0.76**	-0.60**	0.89**	0.88**	0.98**	0.87**	0.96**	0.92**	0.88**		

Notes: $n = 363$; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$

Variables	Step 1	Step 2
Education	-0.06	-0.02
Age	0.01	-0.01
Tenure	-0.09	-0.06
Referent power		-0.41***
Expert power		-0.20***
Reward power		0.25***
Coercive power		0.13*
Legitimate power		0.12**
R^2	0.01	0.66
Adjusted R^2	0.00	0.65
F	1.48	87.77***
ΔR^2	0.01	0.65***

Notes: * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

Table II.
Results of the
hierarchical regression
analyses for job stress
(JS-X)

Although similar researches were conducted on the relationship between leadership power bases and job stress of subordinates; none was applied to the hotel sector, let alone boutique hotels. Therefore, this study is a modest contribution to the leadership field applied to tourism industry.

In this study, referent power has the highest negative correlation with the three dependent variables: job stress, job pressure, and perceived lack of support. Subordinates' job stress can be decreased if they perceive their managers as change agent who are good role models, who can create and articulate a clear vision for an organization, who empower subordinates to achieve at higher standards, who act in ways that make others want to trust them, and who give meaning to organizational life. This in turn may lead to higher managerial and organizational effectiveness.

On the other hand, relying on mostly positional power bases such as coercive or legitimate powers may increase subordinate's job stress in the organization. Positional power bases may not provide desired results in organizations for a number of reasons. Some of these are unreliable performance appraisal systems, subjectively administered rewards, and poor managerial skills in showing employees the pay-for-performance link. In addition, managers provide rewards that are not perceived by the followers to

Variables	Step 1	Step 2
Education	-0.06	-0.03
Age	0.02	0.00
Tenure	-0.10	-0.07
Referent power		-0.39***
Expert power		-0.21***
Reward power		0.24***
Coercive power		0.13*
Legitimate power		0.13**
R^2	0.01	0.65
Adjusted R^2	0.01	0.64
F	1.78	82.32***
ΔR^2	0.01	0.63***

Notes: * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

Table III.
Results of the
hierarchical regression
analyses for job pressure
(JP-X)

Table IV.
Results of the
hierarchical regression
analyses for lack of
support (LS-X)

Variables	Step 1	Step 2
Education	-0.05	-0.01
Age	0.02	-0.01
Tenure	-0.10	-0.07
Referent power		-0.40***
Expert power		-0.22***
Reward power		0.26***
Coercive power		0.12*
Legitimate power		0.10*
R^2	0.01	0.64
Adjusted R^2	0.00	0.64
F	1.55	81.08***
ΔR^2	0.01	0.63***

Notes: * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

be meaningful or important. A small pay increase, a personal letter from the boss, or a job transfer may not be what the employee wants. Until managers understand the employees' desires and administer rewards in a timely manner that emphasizes the pay-performance link, there is likely to be confusion, uncertainty, and minimal transactional impact in leader-follower relationships.

In summary, if an organization wants to succeed in a rapidly changing business environment, it is better for managers to use personal power sources than positional powers. Managers who demonstrate these behaviors will increase the success of their organization.

Study limitations and recommendations for future research

The study has several limitations that could be future research topics. First, some characteristics of the hotels may have affected the findings, such as their source of funding. Whether they had foreign or local funding may have affected their organizational culture, which in turn could influence their leadership styles. Second, the surveys were completed in the summer months, a very busy season for tourism in Turkey, with high stress levels for managers and high workloads for subordinates. Third, demographic factors might have affected the results. To illustrate, most of the participants were young with job tenure under three years. Moreover, most of the samples chosen came from males genderwise, which would strongly open a debate of whether such results would be obtained if gender composition was different. Finally, there may have been a self-selection bias among the subordinates who participated in this study since participation was voluntary.

The findings of this study highlight the impact of leadership power bases on subordinate's job stress in boutique hotels; there is a question about the generalizability of these findings to other hospitality organizations such as four or five-star hotels. Would a five-star hotel with a history of business difficulties produce similar results? Probably, an organization's environmental and historical contexts play a role in the relationship between leadership behaviors and effectiveness (Burke and Litwin, 1992). Future field studies could address this question.

Longitudinal research could help to clarify how the relationship between leadership power bases and job stress changes over time. Undoubtedly, changes would occur in how leadership powers and job stress intertwine through such various stages in the life cycle of an organization as growth, decline, mergers, etc.

6. Conclusion

Managers use various leadership styles to influence subordinates and to get things done in organizations. Behaving in ways that motivate and inspire those around them, paying attention to each individual's needs for achievement and growth, creating a supportive organizational climate, recognizing individual differences in needs and desires, encouraging a two-way exchange in communication, and actively listening to subordinates' concerns and opinions are all examples of personal power sources that are relationship-oriented. On the other hand, giving orders without listening to subordinates' ideas, punishing and withdrawing rewards or promotion are examples of positional powers that are task oriented. Relying either on the laissez-faire style of leadership by taking a "hands off, let-things-ride" approach or on a task-oriented style of leadership by saying "I am the superior to these employees and can punish them if they disobey" may cause negative effects in organizations. According to the research including mine on leadership behaviors, these approaches may lead to high job stress, low satisfaction and commitment in subordinates, sabotage and a high turnover rate. However, using mostly personal power sources may result in positive effects such as low stress levels, high satisfaction and commitment, high motivation, and high productivity levels in subordinates.

Leadership is at the heart of effective management. Whether intentional or unintentional, the actions and attitudes of those in positions of authority affect the actions and attitudes of employees. This study has provided compelling evidence for the importance of continuing the efforts to understand the nature of the leadership behaviors-effectiveness connection. If we are to succeed in our efforts to build healthy, sustainable organizations, we must continue to invest in the development of leaders who use mostly personal power bases and who understand and respect the people that are at the heart of their success.

Organizational success in a changing business environment depends on determining which leadership power is effective at a given managerial level and on taking corrective measures when leadership behavior does not match organizational requirements.

References

- Bass, B.M. (1960), *Leadership, Psychology, and Organization Behavior*, Harper and Brothers, New York, NY.
- Brymer, R.A. (1982), "Stress and your employees", *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 22 No. 4, pp. 6-12.
- Brymer, R.A., Perrewe, P.L. and Johns T.R. (1991), "Managerial stress in the hotel industry", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 47-58.
- Burke, W.W. and Litwin, G.H. (1992), "A causal model of organizational performance and change", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 523-45.
- Busch, P. (1980), "The sales manager's bases of social power and influence upon the sales force", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 44 No. 3, pp. 91-101.
- Cohen, S. and Wills, T.A. (1985), "Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 98 No. 2, pp. 310-57.
- Cooper, C., Sloan, S. and Williams, S. (1988), *Occupational Stress Indicator Management Guide*, Nfer-Nelson, Windsor.
- Dann D. (1990), "The nature of managerial work in the hospitality industry", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 9 No. 4, pp. 319-34.

- Dunne, E.J., Jr., Stahl, M.J. and Melhart, L.J., Jr. (1978), "Influence sources of project and functional managers in matrix organizations", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 21, pp. 135-40.
- Elangovan, A.R. and Xie, J.L. (2000), "Effects of perceived power of supervisor on subordinate work attitudes", *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 21 No. 6, pp. 319-28.
- Emerson, R.M. (1962), "Power-dependence relations", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 27 No. 1, pp. 31-41.
- Etzioni, A. (1961), *A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations*, Free Press, New York, NY.
- Faulkner, B. and Patiar, A. (1997), "Workplace induced stress among operational staff in the hotel industry", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 99-117.
- French, J.R.P. and Raven, B. (1959), "The bases of social power", in Cartwright, D. (Ed.), *Studies in Social Power*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, MI, pp. 150-67.
- Ganster, D.C. and Schaubroeck, J. (1991), "Work stress and employee health", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 17 No. 2, pp. 235-71.
- Hales C. and Nightingale M. (1986), "What are unit managers supposed to do? A contingent methodology for investigating managerial role requirements", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 3-11.
- Hart, P.M. and Wearing, A. J. (1995), "Occupational stress and well-being: a systematic approach to research, policy and practice", in Cotton, P. (Ed.), *Psychological Health in the Workplace: Understanding and Managing Occupational Stress*, The Australian Psychological Society, Carlton, pp. 185-216.
- Ivancevich, J.M. (1970), "An analysis of control, bases of control and satisfaction in an organization setting", *Academy of Management Journal*, December, Vol. 13 No. 4, pp. 427-37.
- Kahn, R.L. and Byosiere, P. (1992), "Stress in organizations", in Dunnette, M.D. and Hough, L.M. (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Consulting Psychologists, St Alto, CA, pp. 571-650.
- Karasek, R.A. (1979), "Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 24 No. 2, pp. 285-310.
- Kelley, S.W. (1993), "Discretion and the service employee", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 69 No. 1, pp. 104-26.
- Law, J., Pearce, P.L. and Woods, B.A. (1995), "Stress and coping in tourist attraction employees", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 16 No. 4, pp. 277-84.
- Lang, J.C. and Lee, C.H. (2005), "Identity accumulation, others' acceptance, job-search self-efficacy, and stress", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 26, pp. 293-316.
- Levi, L. (1972), *Stress and Distress in Response to Psychosocial Stimuli*, Pergamon Press, Oxford.
- Mullins, L.J. (1992), *Hospitality Management: A Human Resource Approach*, Pitman, London, pp. 28-56.
- Near, J.P., Smith, C.A., Rice, R.W. and Hunt, R.G. (1983), "Job satisfaction and non-work satisfaction as a component of life satisfaction", *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 13, pp. 126-44.
- Pittaway, L., Carmouche, R. and Chell, E. (1998), "The way forward: leadership research in the hospitality industry", *Hospitality Management*, Vol. 17, pp. 407-26.
- Podsakoff, P.M. and Schriesheim, C.A. (1985), "Field studies of French and Raven's bases of power: critique, reanalysis, and suggestions for future research", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 97 No. 3, pp. 387-411.
- Rahim, M.A. (1988), "The development of a leader power inventory", *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, Vol. 23, pp. 491-503.

-
- Rahim, M.A., Antonioni, D. and Psenicka, C. (2001), "A structural model of leader power, subordinates' styles of handling conflict, and job performance", *International Journal of Conflict Management*, Vol. 12, pp. 191-211.
- Sclye, H. (1974), *Stress without Distress: How to Survive in a Stressful Society*, Hodder and Stoughton, London.
- Selye, H. (1976), *The Stress of Life*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
- Sheridan, J.E. and Vredenburg, D.J. (1978), "Usefulness of leadership behavior and social power variables in predicting job tension, performance, and turnover of nursing employees", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 63 No. 1, pp. 89-95.
- Slattery, P. and Olsen, M.D. (1984), "Hospitality organizations and their environment", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 3, pp. 55-61.
- Spielberger, C.D. and Vagg, P.R. (1999), *Job Stress Survey. Professional Manual*. Psychological Assessment Resources, Odessa.
- Thamhain, H.J. and Gemmill, G.R. (1974), "Influence styles of project managers: Some project performance correlates", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 17, pp. 216-24.
- Turkish Bureau of Statistics. (2005), *Hospitality Organizations in Turkey (No. 4430.0)*, DIE, Ankara.
- Xie, J.L. (1996), "Karasek's model in the People's Republic of China: Effects of job demands, control, and individual differences", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 6, pp. 1594-618.
- Xie, J.L. and Johns, G. (1995), "Job scope and stress: Can job scope be too high?", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 38, pp. 1288-309.
- Ward, E.A. (2001), "Social power bases of managers: emergence of a new factor", *The Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 141, pp. 144-7.
- Warren, D.I. (1968), "Power, visibility and conformity in formal organizations", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 33, pp. 951-70.
- Yagil, D. (2002), "Substitution of a leader's power bases by contextual variables", *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior*, Vol. 5, pp. 383-99.
- Yukl, G. and Falbe, C.M. (1991), "Importance of different power sources in downward and lateral relations", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 76, pp. 416-23.
- Yukl, G.A. (1994), *Leadership in Organizations*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Zhao, J.L. and Merna, K.M. (1992), "Impact analysis and the international environment", in Teare, R. and Olsen, M. (Eds.), *International Hospitality Management*, Pitman, New York, pp. 3-30.
- Zohar, D. (1994), "Analysis of job stress profile in the hotel industry", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 219-31.

Further reading

- Lockwood, A. and Jones, P. (1989), "Creating positive service encounters", *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, February, Vol. 29 No. 4, pp. 40-50.

About the authors

Hakan V. Erkutlu is Assistant Professor in the School of Applied Technology and Management at Bilkent University. His research focuses on leadership in organizations. Hakan V. Erkutlu can be contacted at: erkutlu@bilkent.edu.tr

Jamel Chafra is a senior lecturer in the School of Applied Technology and Management at Bilkent University. His research focuses on tourism management.