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Leadership is a people business. It offers an immense opportunity to lead people toward change, toward the organization’s vision and toward enhanced opportunity for the leader’s personal and professional growth and development. It also presents a unique challenge to guide, promote and have a positive influence and effect on the growth and development of subordinates.

In order for subordinates to grow however, a relationship of trust must exist between the leader and subordinate. Trust is not readily given to any leader; trust must be earned. Trust in the leader inspires confidence and faith in him/her and encourages trusted subordinates to take risks, to embrace change, to contribute and create, to do more than is required, and to find great satisfaction in the work at hand. Trust motivates an associate to explore, to think, to try, to hand in there beyond the call of duty – in short, to grow intellectually and psychologically and in the desire to handle more responsibility.

Leaders affect others so they will function well or fail; so they will accept and even accomplish seemingly impossible tasks. Distrust can have some serious consequences for the leader and the organization.
When subordinates distrust the leadership, they usually quit; about 20% will leave the organization and go elsewhere. They have voted with their feet. The remaining 80% usually quit and stay! In the view of many, these employees have retired on the job and one often hears such individuals exclaim, “That’s not my job!” Do these remaining “quit and stay” employees trust their leaders? I don’t think so. Employees usually enter a company as a new hire with great optimism, excitement, enthusiasm and desire to work and contribute. Few if any become hired with the attitude “I can’t wait to hurt this company”. Or “I’ll just do enough to get by”. Employees here refer to anyone in a subordinate position, which certainly includes subordinate managers. How did they get this way? They lost their trust and confidence in their leaders. They decided they wanted no conflict or confrontation with their leaders, so they decided to do just enough to get by – just enough to stay out of trouble with their supervisors.

Some important questions are “How do employees get this way?” “What did they experience that caused this change in attitude?” “Where did we go wrong?”

Leaders need to understand people first and foremost and their needs. If people are to contribute to the organization’s success, they must be encouraged, they must be trusted, they must be appreciated, and they must be respected – in short, they must feel good about themselves. This is a basic human need, as important as oxygen says Dr. Nathaniel Branden, an individual who specializes in the study of self-esteem.
The basic need of all humans is to *feel important, to feel significant*. How the subordinate is treated by the leader contributes greatly to his/her feelings of competence and confidence. Feeling competent and confident encourages subordinates to risk, to do more, to embrace the unknown, to welcome change, and to accomplish the seemingly impossible. If leaders given subordinates space and acknowledgement through praise and appreciation of their *effort* and *improvement*, without a doubt lofty goals will be attained, and often in record time.

Why don't leaders act in ways that beget the above mentioned desirable behaviours from subordinates? Often, they feel so responsible for the success or failure of their unit within the organization they simply do not see the results of their own behaviour and influence on their employees. On the contrary, quite naturally, they want success so badly — *and want to avoid failure with even greater intensity* — they simply take over and take command of their employees every activity, sometimes every action. In short, they *micro-manage*. Few leaders ever consider the consequences of micro-managing. Apparently, it feels good to the leader who is micro-managing but *distressing* to the micro-managed subordinate. Somehow, few leaders see this or understand this, it seems.

**Effects of Micro-Managing**

In a survey done by the author, the *effects* of micro-managing were uncovered. The *disastrous consequences* of micro-managing are below.
Micro-Managing:

- **Create Self-Doubt** - It causes employees to lose confidence in their own competencies, in their own abilities.
- **Lowers Self-esteem** - It promotes a feeling of being unimportant, of being unworthy, of not being able to handle tasks without close supervision.
- **Suggests a Lack of Trust** - The employee feels he/she is obviously distrusted so henceforth the associate is not so willing to take risks – to think outside the box. In short, the employee decides to play it safe, thereby losing valuable creative capability for the organization.
- **Is It Efficient?** - How can it be? Employees are doing less so as not to create errors, to follow the "letter of the law", to do it the boss's way – even if it’s wrong. The end result is no risk, no creativity, less work accomplished, lower motivation, fear of humiliation for making a mistake, and entirely too much time taken to accomplish tasks.
- **Poses the Question, “Why Am I Here?”** - Employees begin to wonder, “What am I doing here?” They often feel they have been short-changed. Usually they want some freedom to think and do; instead, they get muzzled, constricted and confined. Inevitably, many begin to wonder, “Is this the right place for me?” Results: They again vote with their feet and leave or quit and stay. The very best eventually leave.
Two types of others stay, the very dedicated (a small number) or the mediocre. The organization, in time, becomes loaded with less than desirable qualitative personnel; certainly personnel with less than desirable qualitative personnel; certainly personnel with less than desirable qualitative thinking. In this case: *Thinking becomes destiny!*

- **Hinders Personal and Professional Development** – One of the leader’s most important responsibilities is to promote the development of subordinates. How does a subordinate grow and develop when distrust, lack of appreciation and constriction of thinking permeate the culture? The answer is obvious. *Growth is limited or non-existent. It does not take a rocket scientist to figure out what this means to an organization’s future.*

- **Creates the Desires to Please the Leader** – Few employees want confrontation with their leaders, so they make sure they please him/her to the fullest extent possible. They have come to understand there is safety in pleasing the leader, so they avoid anything, any information/data that is negative as best they can to please those in charge. They actually seek out and look for ways to do things that will please the leader rather than doing *what’s right.* **Result:** No or limited independent thinking. Instead, there is a tendency to structure information in such a way the leader will approve and accept it. Going “soft” and “carefully” and “slowly” – to the point
of avoidance – with unpleasant data or results now becomes the standard of the day. **Further result:** The leader is only going to hear information subordinates perceive she/he is ready to hear/accept; hence, important but negative information is skewed or is hidden – and often buried.

- **Discourages Independent Thinking:** Since employees now are centered and focused on pleasing the leader, independent thinking is far too risky. Agreement with the leader is of utmost importance and independent thinking can get one “marked” in a micro-managed culture. The organization now has lost the use of a valuable commodity – brains; creative, independent, curious, dedicated, inspired, motivated brains. These brains are now used to “psych out” the boss, give him/her what’s perceived to be desired and stay out of trouble. Sadly, brain-power is now sitting around the entire organization wasted... wasting... atrophying.

- **Creates Dependent Employees:** When observing all the above behaviours, how do we expect to create leaders? **We do not create leaders through micro-managing.** **We create followers,** people who have learned to go with the flow, who are overly cautious, say little, offer little, feel the leader out – then give what is perceived to be acceptable, volunteer little, consistently ask for direction then follow it exclusively, play safe, stay away from the lime light, avoid making decisions to get the leader to make them so
ultimately he/she is the one who is blamed should there be failure, avoid sticking one's neck out and never, never go outside the box. Real progressive thinking and behaving, no?

Conclusion

Leaders are usually doing the best they can to achieve a company's goals. However, few of them ever take stock and reflect on how they lead their subordinates and the consequences of how they lead. The most common concern and complaint of associates, especially subordinate managers, is being micro-managed by their leaders. Associates micro-managers are probably a company's most under-rated and under-utilized asset.

This article is written with the desire of raising the awareness level of leaders at all levels of the organization to the pitfalls and negative consequences of micro-managing.
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The word power, like the word money, or the word sex, evokes different responses from different people. Most likely, however, the word power is perceived as something sinister: "bad," "not good," "negative" – something with which one should not become involved, something to be avoided. When we hear from a significant American politician that power is the ultimate aphrodisiac – greater than sex – it is not wonder the concept is perceived with such awe, and fear. Yet power is very desirable and must be attained to some significant degree if we are to be successful in life. Power is essential for an individual to acquire if he or she is to be successful in leading an organization.

I have been a consultant over the past 30 years to more than 400 organizations world wide (including China) and, in this capacity, have interacted with tens of thousands of employees (over 100,000), from factory floor sweepers to supervisors and department heads to vice presidents, presidents, CEOs and CFOs. Working with this array of individuals over the last three decades has given me some insight into the concept of power I would like to share with individuals interested in organizational behaviour and leadership.
Power and Authority Are Different

First, I would like to clarify, from my observations and experience, an important distinction between authority and power. To my way of thinking they are not the same; they are fundamentally different. Authority is the legitimate right of the leader to force, make, require, demand, or coerce people to do what he or she (the leader) wants them to do. Power, on the other hand, is the leader's capacity to influence others, to move others, to motivate others, to entice others, to persuade others to attain specific goals or engage in specific behaviours. Authority is given by an organization, or it can be forcefully taken; power can never be taken. It is granted by subordinates, colleagues, or even one's supervisors. It must be earned. Power can never be assumed nor taken for granted; it is earned every single day.

Authority is given to an individual, usually in some type of hierarchal organization, and is often referred to by many writers as position power (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988). Since I want to keep the concept of power distinct from the concept of authority, I will simply refer to the legitimate (legal/organizational sanctioned) designation of the right to coerce (or reward) others to attain organizational goals as authority. The organization and its leadership has decided how much authority goes with each position in the hierarchy. So we will call the legitimate right to force others to do things, or suffer the pain of punishment should they refuse, position authority, for all positions in a hierarchy do not have the same amount of authority. Surely there is a difference in
position authority of that of a supervisor versus that of a department head versus that of a factory manager. Yet all have been designated a certain amount of authority in their organization’s hierarchy, with the concomitant right to use some kind of force to back them up to obtain desired outcomes, should such coercion be necessary.

Apart from the organization distributing position authority, authority can be forcefully taken and imposed upon others. For example, when a general invades a particular territory, defeats it and captures it, he and his subordinate leaders now set themselves up as the legitimate authorities, set the rules and assign a certain amount of position authority to their lower level subordinate leaders. In this situation initial authority was taken – stolen or robbed if you will – but nonetheless is still there and violaters will be prosecuted or even executed – an extreme from of coercion. Position authority will be respected, regardless of the organization and regardless of how it was obtained, because once the organization establishes itself and distributes the authority now vested in its cascading positions, these positions and the authority vested in the holders of these positions have the force of law – the organization’s laws/codes. For example, does anyone question the authority of a policeman, should one stop a speeding automobile? Who would say to the officer, “What right do you have to stop me?” The authority inherent in his organization (law enforcement), passed down to him by his superiors, gives him position authority with which only a fool would argue. He has the authority to jail the
individual on the spot and that authority is observable immediately in three ways: 1) his authoritative vehicle 2) his authoritative uniform) his weapon (usually a side arm).

Consistent Use of Position Authority and Its Problems

In spite of the above treatise on authority, and how effective it can be in coercing others to accomplish the tasks a leader needs or wishes to accomplish, my observations are the best leaders I have been associated with over these past 30 years shy away from the use of the position authority they in fact have. They use this authority only as a last and final option, when all other options have been exhausted and failed. Rather, they develop power and learn how to use power skillfully. And, from historical observations and fact, it appears the use of power far exceeds the capability and effectiveness of authority in goal attainment. The power I wish to refer to is personal power. Personal power, to me, is defined as that power which is developed, generated, and sustained through various types of admired and/or desired behaviour. Power is influence potential (Hersey & Blanchard, pp.202-203). It is a key resource a leader must develop, then retain, if he or she is to be truly successful, in the sense that employees willingly give the organization 100% performance toward goal attainment because they choose to give it. It is rare employees will be so motivated working with a leader who uses strictly position authority to entice employees to attain group or organization goals. On the contrary, authoritarian
leadership usually develops two types of employees who quit the organization: those who quit and leave if they can), and those who quit and stay. The latter are most difficult to truly motivate and hence learn many types of “tricks” to deal with the authoritarian leadership. They:

- lie to protect themselves
- fabricate reports
- cut corners
- blame others for their mistakes
- “set up” fellow colleagues to look good themselves.
- develop a covert operation to “spy” on others and report their observations to the leadership.
- look for favours from the leadership for being loyal.
- develop poor morale
- take no risks
- experience much interpersonal conflict
- produce only what is required – no more
- refuse to take chances – hence creativity, for all practical purposes, is dead
- often seek revenge, should the opportunity present itself, on other employees, or the leadership.
- trust virtually no one
- produce products of less than adequate quality
- have difficulty adhering to forecasted schedules
• develop high scrap rates – which they often conceal or even bury (the scrap)
• move against the organization and its leadership, should the opportunity present itself.
• assist a competitor in an effort to strike back at their own organization
• never volunteer anything – and ridicule those who do
• have personal agendas, usually dysfunctional to the organization’s goals and purposes.

The above mentioned qualities have been found in numerous groups of employees with whom I have worked, usually working under a tough, authoritarian leader. Usually employees with these behaviours choose to become unionized (where unions are permitted) – so as to become affiliated with a strong organization that will protect them, much to the chagrin of the organization’s leadership who, in general, usually are strongly opposed to allowing a third party, such as a union, to enter the fray. But, once the employees have decided on such an organization to protect them, there is very little an organization can do to stop it. It becomes a fact of life, a fact to which the organization and its leadership must accept and adapt. What leaders apparently forget is the need for unions or other types of interventions are created by an organization’s leadership (Cangemi, Rice & Kowalski, 1989). If employees are treated with dignity, respect and equality, there would be no need for some type of intervention. In effect, outside
interventions are the creation of an organization's leadership. However, few, very few organizations and their leaders, in my experience, ever will accept this axiom. They prefer to blame such an occurrence on "lazy employees", "not very smart individuals brought into the company", "bottom of the barrel people we employed", "bad stock". It is a rare organization's leadership who would admit, "We created the situation by placing Mr. X in the leadership position in that location. We knew he was tough, and we just let it go. We have dealt with the situation now. But it's too late. We messed up! We should have listened to the people. We should have acted sooner. This is our fault". Authoritarian leadership heavily depends on legitimate coercive capability inherent in the leader's position. The literature abundantly makes clear authoritarian coercive leadership behaviour is the least valued of the part of employees; indeed it is considered to be the seedbed for the development of hate and hostility toward the coercive leader (Hersey & Blanchard, pp. 208-217).

A Leader's Personal Power Can Develop Into A Formidable Force

Why would a leader choose coerciveness as the dominant leadership behaviour when personal power will get him or her and the organization what they need, and with positive, productive attitudes along the way? What authority did Mahatma Gandhi have when he spearheaded the move to rid India or the British? None! But he developed substantial personal power and hence his followers were willing to be led by him, no
matter the consequences. The same with Martin Luther King, Jr. What authority did he have when he decided the time had come for the United States to treat its minorities with equality? None! Yet he acquired enormous personal power whereby his followers were willing to be led by him, again regardless of the consequences. And yet he did succeed, without authority and only with the development of personal power. He moved an entire nation, the United States, to pass legislation to ensure equality of opportunity and justice for all citizens of the United States. Consider the following. The past president of the United States, Richard Nixon, lost personal power but still retained the authority of his position till the day he left office. Until the day he resigned the presidency of the United States, he had the authority to call out the army, the air force and so on, and they would have obeyed. But he lost the respect of the nation; he lost power, personal power, and was forced to resign. The message seems clear: leaders need to learn about, understand, and develop personal power with organizational stakeholders and their tenure as leaders will have far greater productivity and success. As stated earlier in this article, power is the capacity to influence others to action. Since leadership is a people business, the acquisition of power, personal power, it an absolute necessity, unless the leader is prepared to push, punish and force people to attain desired goals. It has already been stated and validated what the results will be should this form of leadership be used on as consistent basis.
Eight Bases of Personal Power

Leaders develop personal power in organizations by developing the following power bases: expert power, legitimate power, referent power reward power, coercive power (this will be explained), information power, connection power, and charismatic power (Cangemi, 1992; French & Raven 1959, Hersey & Blanchard 1988, Fuqua, Payne & Cangemi, 1997, Mintzberg, 1983; Yukl & Falbe, 1991).

A leader develops expert power when others in the organization perceive he or she has specific talents, knowledge, capability, information and so on, that are considered valuable and desirable. Legitimate power is acquired when others in the organization perceive the leader as appropriate to his position. This is not the same as position authority, whereby the organization grants the authority. Rather, in this type of legitimate power, employees and others perceive the individual as the one who should be listened to and followed by reason of his knowledge, experience, status, education and so on. For example, let us say the head janitor of a company has, on his own time, spent years studying experimental psychology and was quite conversant on the subject. Let us likewise say a group of graduate students were awaiting a new Ph.D. in experimental psychology to discuss some recent significant research on the effects of stress on corporate executives. To continue, the janitor, being well versed in this particular area, begins to share his knowledge, which, by the way, is entirely accurate, and review the literature with the students. After 15 minutes of listening to the janitor, in walks the new Ph.D. in
experimental psychology. Who is going to be listened to with greater concentration: the janitor or the Ph.D.? The janitor lacks two bases of power, which the Ph.D. is perceived to have: expert power and legitimate power. The professor is perceived to have the knowledge (expert power) and has legitimate power (he is a professor - the one with legitimate credentials, experience, and so on who can occupy that post). Janitors usually cannot occupy such a post, regardless of their knowledge. So, it is not difficult to see the professor will get the students' undivided attention, even if the janitor presented the exact same information because, in this instance, he lacks the appropriate bases of power: he is not perceived to have expertise nor does he have sanctioned legitimacy, such as a Ph.D. in the appropriate area.

A leader acquires referent power over time. When people identify with the leader's behaviour: his long experience, his standing in his profession and amongst his colleagues, the professional offices he holds or has held, his accomplishments, the respect he receives from various quarters because of his wisdom, his seniority, his trustworthiness, his personal traits and lifestyle, his skill with people, and his honesty and ethics, this leader has acquired referent power, which is a kind of reverence others hold for him. The popes of the Roman Catholic Church have survived quite well on essentially referent power over the centuries. So have priests, ministers, rabbis, grandfathers, sages and so on.
Reward power is observed in a leader through the attention, approval, and encouragement he gives to subordinates. This does not preclude the use of material rewards such as days off, a bonus, a promotion and so on. Doling out material rewards falls more into the province of position authority. However, when the rewards are psychological and emotional in nature, then reward power as personal power is in effect. In this case, the leader with both position authority and personal power has an enormous amount of power.

Coercive power is acquired when the leader rejects, distances himself, acts impersonally, is cold, harsh, critical, or disapproves a subordinate personally or his performance/behaviour. This is not to be confused with the coerciveness that comes from position of authority, which is bequeathed by the organization. This coercive power is in the perception of the subordinate and must be used sparingly or otherwise subordinates will learn to fear the leader who consistently behaves this way. This fear could eventually turn to hate if the leader is not careful or is unaware of what is occurring with subordinates. An interesting point made by Hersey and Blanchard (1988) and by Machiavelli (1950): if the leader is perceived to have coercive power through his position authority and as part of his personal power but never sanctions anyone, then the leader loses the respect of his subordinates and hence power, which means they would be unwilling to follow directives except when being threatened with punishment through his legitimate position authority. The message seems clear: the leader who loses the respect of his people
loses power, personal power- and so must resort to force to compel people to attain organization directives. Research shows this is the least desirable strategy for goal attainment and the least successful (Student, 1968; Rahim, 1989; McCall & Lombardo, 1986; Mintzberg, 1983; Cangemi, 1992; Kowalski & Cangemi, 1985).

Here is a case in which I was personally involved which clarifies the above situation. A company president had position authority but was about to lose the respect of his work force and hence lose personal power. This was a factory of about 700 employees divided into three Sections: A.B.C. Section B depended on production in Section A and Section C depended on production in Section B. The company president had been advised the department leader in Section A utilized a tough, bullying, autocratic leadership style and, as a result, there was concern on the part of the president the employees of Section A might develop low morale or other problems. The president decided he wanted an outsider's perception of just how serious were the problems in Section A. The author of this article was solicited to work with the president and the employees of Section A to provide feedback. As the consultant for this project, however, I decided it would be more appropriate to work with all the employees and not just those of Section A. My concern was to determine just what effect this dictatorial leader might have had on the entire factory, if any, and not just on his employees in Section A. Focus groups on problems within the three departments of the company were held. The question was asked, "What do you think could make this company a better place in which to
work, a more successful organization, a place where employees would enjoy coming to work each day?" To the surprise of this author, lack of respect for this bullying leader was not the real issue – not anymore. The time for that had passed. The issue in the perception of the majority of employees of all the groups, both hourly paid and staff personnel on salary, was their eroding respect, with potential loss of personal power (and hence no power, only position authority remaining) for the company president and his immediate staff. Employees throughout all three sections of the plant perceived the company president was well aware of the dictatorial style of this Section A leader and likewise perceived the president lack the courage to use the coercive capability that came with his leadership position to modify the behaviour of this manager. In other words, the president failed to remedy a bad situation when sanctions against this Section A leader legitimately were called for but were not applied. Hence, the problem was no longer this bullying leader in Section A; the problem had now shifted to the company president. He was now perceived as impotent and his employees, to include his subordinate managers, were losing respect for him, which means he was about to lose personal power. This was now a more grave situation than that created by his authoritarian subordinate leader in Section A. When sanctions are called for, it is clear, if they are not delivered, employees lose respect for the leader, consider him impotent and neglect his directives – with the consequence often being the organization begins to fall apart. The axiom here is, concerning position
authority and coercive capability: use it or lose it. What happened to the bully in Section A? The President regained his respect and personal power: he fired him!

Information power is developed on the part of the leader who others perceive possesses valuable information – or has access to it.

The leader is perceived to have connection power when it is believed he/she has access to important persons or associates. A leader is considered to have connection power also when, through influential associates and powerful connections, resistance to the position authority and personal power of others is usually successful.

Charismatic power is accorded the leader who is perceived to act with sincerity, trustworthiness, expertise, and dynamism. Indeed, this leader has what might be called “presence”. People connect with him; they literally “feel” him as though his words were meant for them alone (Srivasta et al, 1986).

These eight bases of personal power are important for leaders to become familiar with, develop to the fullest extent possible, and use skillfully. Indeed, power is not an undesirable word; it is something desirable and must be understood, sought and utilized for the leader’s personal success and the organization’s goal attainment.

Personal Power Can Be Lost

There are some important points to remember once personal power has been attained. The way power was granted to a leader by subordinates or others,
power can be taken away just as easily. Power is volatile. It must be earned through appropriate, intelligent, skillful behaviour every day. It can be lost through just one careless act. Power can never be taken for granted.

Some ways, I have observed, leaders have behaved and lost personal power and hence had to rely on position authority to deal with subordinates, are:

- **a deliberate lie** – especially one that affected a group or group member’s livelihood, family, status, career, location and so on.

- **An irresponsible act** – such as driving drunk and getting involved in a serious accident, perhaps killing an innocent citizen and then being apprehended and caught. For example, recently a diplomat from the country of Georgia (of the former USSR), stationed in Washington, D.C., was driving through the city at high speeds while inebriated, got into an accident and killed a young girl. He immediately sought to leave the United States, utilizing his diplomatic immunity and position authority. Surprisingly, the president of Georgia ordered him to remain in the United States until the situation is cleaned up and stated he might rescind his diplomatic immunity (and position authority) and require him to stand trial for his behaviour. This, to me, is an example of the loss of respect, and hence personal power in the perception of the president of Georgia toward this diplomat.

- **an ugly marital split up** that destroyed family relationships and is known by the community at
large and received much attention from the press.

- a foolish anti-social act that led to the need for authorities to become involved or that led to even brief incarceration. For example, recently a corporate executive flying first class was refused additional alcoholic beverages because it was felt he had already drunk too much. This leader became so enraged he removed his pants publicly and defecated in clear view of all the passengers. This one single act undoubtedly destroyed whatever personal power this leader had acquired over the years prior to this.

- immoral behaviour that brought much attention and criticism on the leader and his organization. The number of sexual harassment cases in the United States today is testament to the moral violations of women – with loss of power to the leaders apprehended.

- unethical behaviour, especially behavior leading to personal gain at the expense of others and/or the organization.

- ruthless, brutal behaviour perpetrated on employees or others.

- physically abusing others to solve problems, including one's family.

- personal habits that generally led to socially disrespected activity, such as alcohol abuse, gambling abuse, drug abuse, sexual addiction and so on (Cangemi, 1992).

- incarceration for a crime with the accompanying publicity.
• accusations by the government of illegal acts or other behaviour considered unbecoming of a citizen.

This list is not all-inclusive. Surely other examples can be added to it. The message to leaders seems clear: leaders must guard and protect the power they have been given and understanding it can be rescinded when who granted it decide they are no longer worthy of respect regardless of their other impeccable qualities (such as education, family status, title, wealth and so on).

Conclusion

Power is an important concept in leadership and organizational behaviour. The most successful leaders, in my 30 years of observing and working with a wide range of leaders and their subordinates and colleagues in many parts of the world, seem to have understood the value of personal power and, consciously or unconsciously, have developed significant personal power bases, eight of which were identified in this article. They have learned to use these power bases to win over the respect of subordinates, who in turn became open to their influence and directives and were willing to follow their suggestions and recommendations for organizational goal attainment, success, and survival - and with positive attitudes. Leaders must embrace the concept of personal power. The most successful learn to use it skillfully, understand it is volatile and can be lost, and never take it for granted. Employees, in turn, show great respect for such a leader, which then converts to personal
power, allaying the need to use consistent position authority and hence coercion and force of accomplish organizational goals. Leaders who understand power do not rely on the authority of their position to create highly motivated, focused and directed work forces, who in turn are highly productive, self-monitoring, and of high quality – the dream of all leaders. They rely on the personal power they develop with subordinates and others in their organizations.
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