The Effect of French and Raven Power on knowledge Acquisition, Knowledge Creation and knowledge Sharing: An Empirical Investigation in Lebanese Organizations

Silva Karkoulian
Lebanese American University
Yasmine Osman
Lebanese American University

Abstract

Documents show that the kinds of French and Raven powers promoting the development of knowledge acquisition, creation, and sharing are not enough recognized. This study extends the power literature of French and Raven to organizations of Lebanon and gives an empirical proof of knowledge acquisition, creation and sharing. The regression analysis conducted in this study shows that expert power is directly related to acquisition, creation and sharing of knowledge, this relationship being significant.

Introduction

In the second half of the twentieth century, knowledge management proved to be a recent management reform due to the fast modifying environment. Managers were encouraged to consider and treat their employee's knowledge as a crucial source for the success of their organizations (Huseman & Goodman, 1999; Stewart, 1997; Sveiby, 1997).

Many scholars have focused their attention on knowledge management. Grant (1996) argues that applying a lot of effort to evolve new technology and knowledge is an important source of an organizational competitive advantage. These new knowledge and technology added to the organization have become more complicated in the current technological revolution. Consequently, in order to adapt to this complexity, the knowledge and skills acquired by the employees should be combined and shared, or in other terms, they should be managed. Knowledge management and creation could be completed through several tactics. Gold, Malhorta and Segars (2001) mentioned that the structure of an organization has a significant role in controlling technology. Besides, this structure must be managed in order to stimulate employees to share their knowledge and collaborate around regular limits of organizations which would lead to knowledge creation.

The perception of managers towards power greatly influences how power is utilized and the extent that the managers are being empowered (Tjusuold & Sun, 2005). Consequently positive power perception and use would lead to more managerial success and organizational progress (Yukl, Falbe & Yun, 1993). Managers use diverse leadership power foundations in work settings (Erkultu & Chafra, 2006). Furthermore, According to French and Raven (1959) power has five important foundations which are namely, coercive, reward, legitimate, expert and referent. Despite of the organizational type, one of the key functions of an organization is to transmit opportunities, information or knowledge and work regulations from a superior/leader to a employee/subordinate (Koslowsky & Stashevsky, 2005).

Even though a considerable amount of research on knowledge management, power, and the implication of power on managing knowledge have been made (Vinding, 2002), significantly not much of attention has been delivered to the issues associated with the dimensions of power, and knowledge management, which are essential for knowledge acquisition, knowledge creation and knowledge sharing (Yukl, 1994).

The purpose of this paper is to uncover valuable ways which provoke and support knowledge management by the exercise of power in an organization focusing mainly on knowledge acquisition, knowledge creation and knowledge sharing. Moreover, to the researcher's knowledge this assumption has not been challenged or affirmed by any research. This article gives an empirical examination of the French and Raven Power and Knowledge Management association within the organizations based in Lebanon. It examines thoroughly the effectiveness of these five forms of power along with their influence on knowledge acquisition, knowledge creation and knowledge sharing.

The remaining part of the paper is structured as such: the second section is an overview of power, the third section is a brief review of knowledge acquisition, knowledge creation and knowledge sharing, and the fourth section presents the methodology followed by the analysis and results in the fifth section. Finally, we present the study of the observations and our conclusions in the sixth section.

Literature Review

Overview of Power

One of the main issues in any organization is power (Rahim & Afza, 1993). It can be an extremely important tool in the success or failure of an organization. The term power often evokes mixed and passionate reactions with many observers viewing power as a sinister force. Lord Acton said that "power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely" (Kreitner & Kinicki, 1998, p.322) and this can be observed in today's society. Nevertheless, power is common place in modern organizations and should be employed as managers need to affect those they are dependent on. Their power ought to be recognized and developed so that they harmonize and sustain the subordinates' work because powerlessness weakens the effectiveness of an organization (Kreitner, 2002).

Power has been described as "the last dirty word. It is easier for most of us to talk about money than it is to talk about power. People who have it deny it, people who want it try not to appear to be seeking it, and those who are good at getting it are secretive about how they get it" (Kanter, 1979, p.65).

"Power refers to a capacity that A has to influence the behavior of B so that B acts in accordance with A wishes" (Robbins, 1998, p.396). However, Mintzberg (1983) criticizes Robbins definition and describes it as narrow because power in relation to changing someone's behavior is a result of power effecting outcomes.

According to McClelland and Burnham (1976), acquiring and maintaining power is, at the social level, one of the most motivating organizational processes. As one might expect, power is a central concern of most employees (Gioia & Sims, 1983), and it has also been examined by scholars from various aspects (e.g. Grimes, 1978; McClelland, 1975; Pfeffer, 1981).

Payne and Cangemi (1998) argue that the concept of power is both fascinating and challenging. It gives rise to many questions like what kind of people hold power, in what form it is manifested and when and how they should use it?

The answers to these questions could be explained and understood by French and Raven's (1959) definition of power. Around four decades ago, in a popular classification for social power, French and Raven (1959) mentioned that power is the result of five distinct foundations: legitimate, reward, forcing, expert and referent power bases. McShane and Glinow (2005) defined reward power as "a person's ability to control the allocation of rewards valued by others and to remove negative sanctions". Managers have a reward power to the level that they reach compliance by either assuring or providing rewards (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2004). Legitimate power is when members of an organization agree that persons are able in some functions to comment or ask about some others behaving in a way or another (McShane & Glinow, 2005). The bounds of this legitimacy are defined partly by the formal nature of the position involved and partly by informal norms and traditions. Kreitner and Kinicki (2004) argued that coercive power is present wherever there is a threat of punishment. Hence, the ability to apply punishment either physically or psychologically is known as coercive power, and the more negative the sanctions a person can bring to bear on others, the stronger is her or his coercive power (McShane & Glinow, 2005). McShane and Glinow (2003) defined expert power as "the ability to influence others by possessing knowledge or skills that they value". The more important the information the fewer the alternative sources for getting it, the greater the power. Referent power is when managers have employees identifying with them, are similar to them, or respect them (McShane & Glinow, 2005). It often involves trust, similarity, acceptance, affection, willingness to follow, and emotional involvement (Mintzberg, 1983; Moorhead & Griffen, 1992; Moorhead & Griffen, 1998; Owens, 1998). The position of power holder is a source for reward, legitimate and coercive power; these power bases are mainly present and received because of the authority that he/she is assigned in the organization. On the contrary, expert and referent powers are derived from the attributes of the individual holding power. Hence, these people's own characteristics are the main source bringing these kinds of power to the organization.

Power can be used in many ways in an organization, but because of its potential for misuse it is important that managers fully understand the dynamics of using power. If people perceive that their leader is not using his or her power appropriately, they may develop strong feelings of distrust (Moorhead & Griffin, 1998). When a leader tries to exert power it results in several possible outcomes (Stewart, 1989). These outcomes are dependent on the leader's base of power, how that base is operationalized, and the subordinates individual characteristics (e.g. personality, traits or past interaction with leader) (Moorhead & Griffin, 1998). Many researchers have shown interest in investigating the outcomes that may result when the leader tries to exert power. Politis (2005) found that expert power and knowledge acquisition are positively related. Rahim (1989) concluded that the three bases being legitimate, expert and referent power were directly related with compliance and satisfaction, while the remaining, reward and coercive power bases might be related with resistance. Approximately four years later Rahim and Afza (1993) found that referent and expert power foundations were directly associated with the commitment to an organization. In addition, legitimate and referent power foundations were similarly linked with behavioral compliance. Johnson and Short (1998) found that expert and legitimate power bases have the strongest effect on the teacher's empowerment whereas legitimate and reward power were related to the teachers' compliance. Coercive power was negatively associated with the teacher's empowerment (Rahim & Afza, 1993).

Kipnis and Schmidt (1988) argued that the manager's effective use of power behavior leads to the most favorable performances. In a managerial context, power can be two folded, on one pole, it is positive power, i.e. it is the ability to make a change happen, and on the other pole negative power is the ability to block or subvert a change. In this situation, power could be understood by the management's aptitude to manipulate the behavior, purposes, approaches, convictions, feelings, or values of subordinates (French & Raven, 1959).

Overview of Knowledge Acquisition, Acquisition, Knowledge Creation, and Knowledge Sharing

Knowledge management is "the way companies capture, transfer, create and leverage their intellectual assets" (Yao, et al, 2007, p.51). According to many economists and business theorists knowledge management is a crucial competitive advantage for the modern firm (Kothuri, 2002). KM is argued to be the merging of human resource management and information management. Hence, it is associated with every process combined with identifying, acquiring, creating, sharing and using information and knowledge (Livonen & Huotari, 2000).

Consequently, Knowledge management is not only concerned with managing knowledge, it is directly linked to managing and creating a corporate culture that enables and encourages the sharing, appropriate utilization and creation of knowledge which provides a corporate strategic competitive advantage. In addition, developing new knowledge in an organization is made easy by having a clear understanding of the knowledge that exists within the organization, the forms it exists in, and the nature of processes involving it (Kothuri, 2002).

The identification of knowledge needs comes as a first step in the knowledge management process. (Bouthillier & Shearer, 2002). Knowledge acquisition is considered as the second step in the process. It involves knowledge fetching from some external sources into an organization. Mykytyn et al. (1994) defined knowledge acquisition as the attainment of new knowledge directly from domain experts. Hence, the acquisition of knowledge is achieved by extracting information from top performers. However, this knowledge must be preserved and shared in order to maintain the success of the organization (Kothuri, 2002). Knowledge sharing is defined as the flow of knowledge through the organization (Yang, 2004). To encourage knowledge sharing within the organizations the management need to increase the opportunities for employees to propose new ideas and thoughts (Lin and Lee, 2006). Knowledge sharing practices should be an essential part of day-to-day dialogue (Riege, 2005). The third step in the knowledge management process is the creation of knowledge. Several ways exists that ensure knowledge creation. On one pole, creation could be accomplished by combining internal knowledge with other internal knowledge, hence creating a new knowledge. On the other pole, information could be analyzed to create new knowledge (Bouthillier & Shearer, 2002). After knowledge is acquired and created, knowledge storage is required so that no data is lost, which makes knowledge storage the fourth step in the knowledge management process. Knowledge sharing is the fifth step involving knowledge transferring from either one individual or group to another individual or group (Bouthillier & Shearer, 2002). Employees are encouraged to share their knowledge in order to combine present

knowledge that creates innovating solutions to business obstacles and difficulties (Yun & Allyn, 2004). Recent technology and knowledge adding value to organizations became harder. This needs knowledge and skills combination and sharing that many employees possess. Many tactics are used by firms in order to manage knowledge and create it (Yun & Allyn, 2004).

Knowledge Management necessitates having a clear vision and control in the management of how employees' sharing of social knowledge occurs in a firm. This should also be applied to the knowledge whose exposure could socially impact those people who believe in it. In this context stands the power relations involvement in the management of knowledge: power relations constitute fundamentals of the processes and mechanisms defining and determining with whom and how knowledge is shared (Huseman & Goodman, 1999). In other terms, power relations determine what kinds of knowledge can be shared (Ekbia & Kling, 2003). Assuming that managerial power and knowledge management have connected characteristics, the following hypotheses are defined:

HI: knowledge acquisition will be positively correlated with the five kinds of power.

HII: knowledge creation will be positively correlated with the five kinds of power.

HIII: knowledge sharing will be positively related with the five kinds of power.

HIV: There is a causal direction from various kinds of power to knowledge sharing.

This paper seeks to investigate which kind of power might intensify knowledge management in the Lebanese organizations where people understand power to be an important issue.

Methodology

The researcher chose to focus in this study on the professionals in the Lebanese firms. The survey conducted in 2006, between January and June, has questionnaires distributed around 15 organizations (banks, financial institutions and telecommunications). An overall of 500 surveys were circulated having a total response rate of 60% hence 300 employees were part of our sample. We stimulated participants to answer the full load of questions in the surveys, assuring them absolute anonymity.

This study used interpretive paradigm in the aim to use scientific investigation for the researcher to fully realize the way this interpretation of real facts is directed at a certain time and place. In addition, the study compares it with what is directed at other times and place (Cohen & Manion, 1994). The questionnaire consisted of 5 entries collecting demographic and personal data and 32 questions using a Likert scale of five points: 1 referring to Strongly Agree, 2 to Agree, 3 to Undecided, 4 to Disagree, and 5 to Strongly Disagree.

The first 20 items (Likert scale) were compiled to measure French and Raven's managerial power and were assessed using the Nesler, et al. (1993) modified version. Accordingly, knowledge acquisition, knowledge creation and knowledge sharing were measured using 12 items (4 for each) from revised OECD questionnaire (2002).

Each answer has a point value and the score of the respondent is defined by adding the point values of every statement in such a way that represents valid and reliable differences among individuals. This questionnaire was collected for the purpose of measuring the 300 employees' perception regarding the supervisors' power bases – reward, legitimate, coercive, expert and referent being the independent variables, and their effect in nurturing knowledge acquisition, knowledge creation and knowledge sharing being dependent variables. Each dependent and independent variable had four broad spectrum questions that cover distinct characteristics in every single dependent and independent variable. Every set of four questions had its results inserted in the SPSS and turned into average of a single value.

A reliability test was conducted on the whole dependent and independent variables, the result being the standardized item alpha of 0.889 showed as total reliability. The researchers intended to provide the participants with a verbal preface by defining the five French and Raven powers and which one is most likely to provide ways to acquire, create and share knowledge and to construct intellectual capital. While piloting the questionnaire, validity was checked by asking those who read the questionnaire whether or not the questions asked were likely to serve the purpose of the research. The check for validity led to the little amendments in the questionnaire.

A Pearson correlation was carried out to test the association among the 3 dependent variables (knowledge acquisition, creation and sharing) with the five independent variables (the various forms of power). Subsequently, in order to test the study hypotheses, we conducted repeated linear regression step wise analyses. Accordingly, by computing separate regression equations, the importance of the association was formulated between the defined variables; that is if there was any association.

Results

The purpose of this study is to examine the association between French and Raven Power with the three principle variables consisting of knowledge acquisition, knowledge creation and knowledge sharing in the Lebanese organizations.

Characteristics of Scales

Table 1 point out the subscale, number of entries, means, standard deviations, and correlation of the independent and dependent variables.

Forming Regression Equation with Knowledge Acquisition:

Using knowledge acquisition as the dependent variable, a regression analysis was conducted with legitimate, reward, coercive, expert and referent powers used as the independent variables. The analysis of these results generated the next equation. The results obtained are presented below:

Equation I:

Knowledge acquisition = $1.919 + 0.057$Reward P $- 0.221$ Coercive P $+ 0.616$ Expert P (1)

$$0.005 \qquad\qquad 0.000 \qquad\qquad 0.000$$

Sig. level = 0.05, F = 560.181 sig = 0.000, R2 = 0.905

Equation I partly supported HI. The factors that emerged to be significant are reward power, coercive power and expert power bases in relationship with knowledge acquisition. Both reward and expert power showed to possess an important positive correlation with knowledge acquisition, while coercive power showed negative relationship. These results imply that 90.5% of knowledge acquisition variations could be attributed to these kinds of power while the remaining 9.5% are not explained.

Forming Regression Equation for Knowledge Creation:

The regression analysis carried out with knowledge creation being the dependent variable resulted in the following equation:

Equation II:

Knowledge Creation=1.131 + 0.749 Legitimate P – 0.488 Coercive P + 0.481 Expert P (2)

0.000   0.000   0.000

F = 84.847 sig = 0.000, R2 = 0.591

Equation II partly supported H2. The factors which emerged to possess important relationship along with knowledge creation are legitimate, coercive and expert power. Hence, the regression equation consists of these elements. Nevertheless, legitimate power and expert power established positive correlation with knowledge creation, while coercive power showed a negative relation. This indicates that 59.1% of knowledge creation variation could be attributed to these kinds of power. The remaining 40.9% are not explained.

Forming Regression Equation for Knowledge Sharing:

The regression analysis ran with knowledge sharing showed the following results:

Equation III:

Knowledge Sharing = 3.02 – 0.493 Legitimate P + 0.667 Expert P + 0.097 Referent P (3)

0.000   0.000   0.008

F = 256.075 sig = 0.000, R2 = 0.813

Equation III partly supported H3. The factors that emerged to be significant are legitimate, expert and referent power bases in relation with knowledge sharing. However, while expert power and referent power were positively correlated with knowledge sharing, legitimate power was negatively correlated. Hence, the regression equation consists of the following elements.

This indicates that 81.3% of knowledge sharing variation could be attributed to these kinds of power. The remaining 18.7% are not explained.

Path Analysis

Based upon the above regression equations and as an extension of regression analysis, the researchers were interested in examining more closely the factors that might be causing the knowledge sharing practice in the Lebanese organizations. For this purpose, path analysis was used. A set of additional regression equations was built to help in the creation of the path model

These are the following:
Sharing = f (power, acquisition, creation)
Acquisition = f (power)
Creation = f (power, acquisition)

The envisioned model is shown in Figure 1, and the path coefficients were derived from the regression coefficients and error variances.

The model in Figure 1 contains five kinds of power namely, reward, legitimate, coercive, expert and referent power (independent variables) and knowledge acquisition, creation and sharing (dependent variables).

Figure 1 displays results and supported HIV, Expert power had positive effect on knowledge acquisition (γ = 0.203**), knowledge acquisition had positive effect on knowledge creation (γ =0.971**) and knowledge creation do have a positive effect on knowledge sharing (γ = 0.121**).

Discussion

The primary goal of this paper is to participate with additional testing to empirical research validating the significance of managerial power on knowledge management (knowledge acquisition, knowledge creation and knowledge sharing).

HI, HII, HIII and HIV concluded that expert power proved to have a positive correlation with knowledge acquisition, creation and sharing, where Figure 1 showed a bold path from expert power to knowledge acquisition then knowledge creation and to knowledge sharing. To a large extent the results of our regression analysis are in accord with those of earlier studies. Some of the above findings are partly aligned with Politis (2005) where expert power was positively related to knowledge acquisition. Johnson and Short (1998) found a positive relationship between expert, legitimate power and empowerment, where knowledge is power (Yukl et al., 1993). They also found a negative association between empowerment and coercive power. Also, the results are aligned with those of Rahim and Afza (1993) who found a positive relationship between referent and expert power with commitment.

Knowledge acquisition proved to be significantly attributed positively to expert power. The acts of reading, of thinking, of listening to someone or even observing (Politis, 2005) require an appropriate and enhancing organizational culture and leadership style. This clearly explains the results of the regression analysis. Like any knowledge management initiative, knowledge acquisition requires having managers who can know their people and can determine the behaviors that need to be changed or reinforced. Coercive power cannot be logically expected to

be used in a knowledge driven economy. Its negative impact will most probably lead to a decline in knowledge acquisition. The negative highly significant regression coefficient of the coercive power variable demonstrates this expectation. As the coercive power in an organization increases, the opportunity for good communication, understanding and trust would decrease, thus resulting in a significant decrease in knowledge acquisition. It is not surprising to find that coercive power has always had a negative impact in most organizations (Politis, 2005). This kind of power will lead to feelings of intimidation, resulting in uncooperative employees who would participate, the least, if any, in the process of knowledge acquisition, and would most probably be involved in other processes, like information filtering for example. Making knowledge available in the organization in order to attain strategic advantages has become very essential in the knowledge era.

Although determined and explained by legitimate power, still knowledge creation is negatively related (with high significance) to coercive power. This is logical since such kind power will most probably block the creativity, produce ill feelings and sense of resentment which would forbid employees from positively contributing to the origin with new ideas, systems, designs or procedure. Building on one's own tacit knowledge, learning from the past experiences, learning from others, and using all of this to generate innovative products, services, ideas, systems and methodologies are the pillars of knowledge, creation and major characteristics of the learning organizations. Organizations can also realize knowledge sharing and transfer by means of some educational events, like seminars, workshops and lectures (Pai, 2006). For this to take place, a culture of empowerment and flexibility and an atmosphere of trust and positive reinforcement should prevail in the organization. This, of course, demands a proper use of the right power dimensions, i.e. expert power. Managers with expert power can contribute positively to the process of knowledge creation. They are well aware of the various aspects of their domain area, can identify the tacit knowledge among their employees, unlock it and guide them in order to release their power of innovation. They themselves can add to the knowledge base of their organizations of making use of the various information sources available to them, past experiences, and the research and development activities. Surprisingly, the regression analysis showed a direct high significance in the association between legitimate power along with knowledge creation. It seems that in the Lebanese culture, where the power distance is high (Hofstede's, 1991), employees can be guided to knowledge creation (maybe with consultants and information technology). Though organizational policies and management level power without the need for management-employee trust based relationship.

A hierarchical organization cannot contribute positively to knowledge sharing. Making decisions, making use of information, thinking of strategies, and setting policies and procedures are processes that take place at the top or by managers, leaving no space for knowledgeable employees to share their knowledge. Another positive and highly significant relationship is found between knowledge sharing and referent power – an employee's desire to feel that his manager is a role model to be followed. Such committed followers will most probably feel motivated to share their knowledge with each other and their "referent" leader. Trust and collaboration are expected in such a working environment, leading to enhanced levels of knowledge sharing. Legitimate power has a positive and significant relationship with knowledge creation while negatively correlated with knowledge sharing. Referent power has also a positive and significant correlation only with knowledge sharing. Nevertheless, coercive power has a negative correlation with knowledge acquisition and creation.

Having expert power correlated positively with the three variables, knowledge acquisition, creation and sharing, was the most important finding of this study. In other words, the more willingly managers and leaders exercise expert power the more there will be knowledge acquisition, creation, and sharing in the Lebanese organizations.

At this point the following recommendations could be made: expert power should be used to ensure that knowledge can be acquired, created and shared in the Lebanese organizations. The managers/leaders should be a friend of power. They should sustain a spirit of inquiry, self-examination, and readiness to entertain new ideas and launch on new educational revitalization (Dodds, 1962). The leader should be committed to work cooperatively with people and to look for ways of collaboration with others rather than simply expecting them to follow him blindly (Saguinis, 1995, p.66). The leader of today should not only require a belief in worker teams and employees empowering, but must also be able to handle many different relationships with people such as cooperation, sharing, collaboration and team work. It is not good just for the leader to assume that people will follow him because "he is the boss", he must make his followers understand why they are doing it and this will be the result of expert power. Understanding that power is expandable was found to leave managers open to the conclusion that they and the employee have cooperative goals where they succeed together (Tjusuold & Sun, 2005).

The implication of this study is that managers can be more effective in knowledge management by improving their personal power foundations; for instance, expert power (House, Wright & Aditya, 1999). As previously mentioned, by encouraging subordinates to be fully participative, leadership would be providing a learning culture.

Limitations, Potential Contributions, Managerial Implications and Conclusion

Limitations

An important limitation of this study was the sample size, the researchers overlooked the knowledge preserving variable and the relationship found in this study was correlational rather than causal.

Potential Contributions

This study contributes to the previous power and knowledge management literature as it tests empirically the association between French and Raven power (1959) and knowledge management via knowledge acquisition, knowledge creation and knowledge sharing in Lebanese organizations. At this level, the researchers propose that Lebanese managers/leaders exercise expert power.

Managerial Implications

There are numbers of implications of this study for managers using expert power which results in enhancing knowledge acquisition, knowledge creation, and knowledge sharing. First and foremost, this current study contributed to the body of knowledge by conducting an assessment of the effectiveness of the types of power on knowledge management.

Our eight variables model developed and validated can be used by managers to enhance their knowledge sharing capabilities or practices within their organizations. Furthermore, our findings provide guidance on how managers may use expert power to influence knowledge acquisition, knowledge creation, and knowledge sharing. Empirical evidence suggests that as expert power increases, knowledge acquisition, knowledge creation, and knowledge sharing also increase which result in more coordination, cooperation, and participation among employees and managers within an organization.

Conclusion

It appears that expert power plays a critical role in organizations. This study demonstrates that only the expert power has a significant impact on knowledge acquisition, creation and sharing. The regression analysis showed how the various kinds of power can explain the variation in each knowledge management practice. This study clearly reflects the notion that an employee's interaction with his manager is influenced by his perception of the latter's power (Aguinis, Nesler & Quig, 1996). The path analysis could help the researchers build a causational model between the power dimensions and knowledge management practices in general and knowledge sharing in specific.

Finally, The researchers recommends additional qualitative and quantitative research in a wide variety of sectors e.g. educational institutions, technological or any field/organizations where power is regarded as being very necessary for enhancing knowledge management, whereas building intellectual capital, a crucial factor that retains competitive advantage.

References

Bouthilier, F., & Shearer, K., (2002). Understanding Knowledge Management and Information Management: The need for an empirical perspective. *Information Research*, 8(1).

Cohen, L., & Manion, L. (1994) *Research Methods in Education* (4 th ed.). London: Routeledge.

Dodds, W. H. (1962). The Academic President-Educator of Caretaker. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Ekbia, H., & Kling, R., (2003). *Power Issues in Knowledge Management*. CSI Working Paper No. WP- 03-02, accessed January 15, 2006, [available at https://scholarworks.iu.edu/dspace/html/2022/164/WP03-02B.html]

Erkutlu, H. V., & Chafra, J. (2006). Relationship between leadership power bases and job stress of subordinates: example from boutique hotels. *Management Research New*s, 29(5), 285- 297.

French, J.R.P., & Raven, B.H. (1959). *The basis of social powe*r, in Cartwright, D. (Eds), Studies in Social Power, University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research: Ann Arbor, MI, 150-67.

Gioia, D.A., & Sims, H.P. (1983). Perceptions of managerial power as a consequence of managerial behavior and reputation. *Journal of Managemen*t, 9(1*),* 7-24.

Gold, A.H., Malhotra, A., & Segars, A.H. (2001). Knowledge management: An organizational capabilities perspective. *Journal of Management Information System*s, 18(1), 185-214.

Grant, R.M. (1996). Prospering in Dynamically-competitive Environments: Organizational Capability as Knowledge Integration. *Organization Scienc*e, 7(4), 375-387.

Grimes, A.J. (1978). Authority, power, influence, and social control: a theoretical synthesis. *Academy of Management Revie*w, 3(4), 724-737.

House, R., Wright, N. & Aditya, R.N.(1999). *Cross Cultural Research on Organizational Leadership: A Critical Analysis and a Proposed Theor*y. Working Paper 99-03. in P.C. Earley and M. Eros (eds) New Perspectives on International Industrial/Organizational Psychology, pp. 535-625. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Huseman, R. C. & Goodman, J. P. (1999). *Leading with Knowledge: The nature of competition in the 21st centur*y. London: Sage Publishers.

Johnson, P.E. & Short, P.M. (1998). Principal's Leader Power, Teacher Empowerment, Teacher Compliance and Conflict. *Journal of Educational Management and Administratio*n, 26 (2), 147- 159.

Kanter, R.M. (1979). Power Failure in Management Circuits. *Harvard Business Revie*w, 57(4), 65-75.

Kipnis, D. Es. & Schmidt, S. M. (1988). Upward-influence styles: Relationship with performance evaluations, salary and stress. *Administrative Science Quarterl*y, 33(4), 528-570.

Kothuri, S. (2002). Knowledge in organizations: Definition, creation, harvesting, accessed January 15, 2006, [available at http://www.gse.harvard.edu/~t656_web/Spring_2002_students/kothuri_smita_knowledge_in_orgs.htm]

Kreitner, R. & Kinicki, A. (1998). *Organizational Behavio*r. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Koslowsky, M., & Stashevsky, S. (2005). Organizational Values and Social Power. *International Journal of Manpowe*r, 26(1), 23-24.

Lin H.F., & Lee G.G. (2006). Effects of Socio-Technical Factors on Organizational Intention to Encourage Knowledge Sharing. *Management Decisio*n, 44(1), 74-88.

Livonen, M. & Huotari, M. L. (2000). *The impact of Trust on thePractise of Knowledge Managemen*t. In: Proceedings of the 63 rd ASIS Annual Meeting. Chicago, IL, November 12-16, 37, 421-450.

McClelland, D.C. (1975). *Power: The inner experience.* New York, NY: Irvington.

McClelland, D.C., & Burnham, D.H. (1976). Power is the great motivator. *Harvard Business Revie*w, 54(March/April), 100-110.

McShane, S.L & Von Glinow, M. A. (2003) *Organizational Power and Politics* (2nd ed.).

Organizational Behavior. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Higher Education Irwin.

McShane, S.L & Glinow, M. A.V. (2005) *Organizational Power and Politics* (3rd ed.).

Organizational Behavior. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Higher Education Irwin.

Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Power in and around organization*s. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Mykytyn, P.P., Mykytyn, K., & Raja, M.K. (1994). Knowledge acquisition skills and traits: a self-assessment of knowledge engineers. *Information and Managemen*t, 26(2), 95-104.

Moorhead G. & Griffin R.W. (1992). *Organizational Behavio*r. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Moorhead G. & Griffin, R.W. (1998). *Organizational Behavior: Managing people and Organization*s. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Nesler, M.S, Aguinis, H., Quigley, B.M. & Tedeschi, J.T. (1993). The Effect of Credibility on Perceived Power. *Journal of Applied Social Psycholog*y, 23(17), 1407-1432.

Newstrom, J.W., & Davis, K. (1997). *Organizational Behavior: Human Behavior at Work* (10 th ed.). New York, NY: MacGraw-Hill, Irwin.

OECD (2003) Knowledge Management Practices : Questionnaire.

Owens, G.R. (1998). *Organizational Behavior in Education* (6 th ed.). London: Allyn and Bacon, a Viacom Company.

Pai J.C. (2006). An Empirical Study of the Relationship Between Knowledge Sharing and IS/IT Strategic Planning (ISSP). *Management Decisio*n, 44(1), 105-122.

Payne, E.K., & Cangemi J.P. (1997). Power and the esteemed professorate. *Educação e filosofia* . 11(21-22), 181-202.

Pfeffer, J. (1981). *Power in Organization*s. Marshfield, MA: Pitman Publishing.

Politis, J.D. (2001). The relationship of various leadership styles to knowledge management. *The Leadership and Organization Development Journa*l, 22(8), 354-418.

Politis (2005). The Influence of managerial Power and Credibility on Knowledge Acquisition Attributes. *Leadership and Organization Development Journa*l, 26(3), 197-214.

Rahim, M.A. (1989). Relationship of Leader Power to Compliance and Satisfaction with Supervisors: Evidence from a National Sample of Managers. *Journal of Managemen*t, 15(4), 545-556.

Rahim, M.A. & Afza, M. (1993). Leader Power, Commitment, Satisfaction, Compliance and Propensity to Leave a Job Among U.S. Accountants. *Journal of Social Psycholog*y, 133(5), 611-625.

Riege A. (2005). Three-Dozen Knowledge-Sharing Barriers Managers Must Consider. *Journal of Knowledge Managemen*t, 9(3), 18-35.

Robbins P.R., (1998). *Organizational Behavio*r. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Saguinis, S. (1995). How Tomorrow's Best Leaders are Learning their Stuff. *Fortun*e, 27, 64-71.

Stewart, T.A. (1989). New Ways to Exercise Power. *Fortun*e, 6 November, 48-53.

Stewart, T.A. (1997). *Intellectual Capital: The New Wealth of Organization*s. New York, NY: Bantam Doubleday/Currency Dell.

Sveiby, K. E. (1997). *The New Organizational Wealth: Managing and Measuring Intangible Asset*s. London: Berrett Koehler.

Tjosvold, D., & Sun, H. (2006). Effects of power concepts and employee performance on managers' empowering. *Leadership and Organization Development Journa*l, 27(3), 217- 234.

Vinding, A.L. (2002). Interorganizational Diffusion and Transformation of Knowledge in the Process of Product Innovation. Alborg University.

Yang, Y-T. (2004). Job-related knowledge sharing: comparative case studies. *Journal of Knowledge Management.* 8(3), 118-26.

Yao,L.J., Kam, T.H.Y. & Chan S.H. (2007). Knowledge Sharing in Asian Public Administration Sector: The Case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Enterprise Information Managemen*t, 20(1), 51-69.

Yukl, G.A. (1994). *Leadership in organization* (3 rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Yukl, G., Falbe, C.M., & Youn, J.Y. (1993). Patterns of Influence Behaviour for Managers.

*Group and Organizational Managemen*t,18(1), 5-28.

Yun, S., & Allyn, M., (2004). Causes of knowledge sharing behaviors: Motivational/Functional Approach, accessed May 23, 2006, [available at: http://frontpage.montclair.edu/allynm/Mgmt_505_Brookdale_Summer_2005/ IABE%202005,%20Yun%20&%20Allyn,%20Knowledge%20Sharing.doc] 26

Table 1: Means, Standard Deviation and correlation of Independent and Dependent Variables

	Mean	S.D.	Rew	Legit	Coer	Exp	Ref.	K. A	K. C	K. S
Rew	3.708	0.656	1							
Legit	3.968	0.59	0.264**	1						
Coer	3.69	1.059	.138*	.797**	1					
Exp	2.95	1.353	0.102	.605**	.824**	1				
Ref	2.975	0.606	-0.08	.139*	.142*	0.072	1			
K. A	3.191	0.693	.129*	.475**	.663**	.932**	0.051	1		
K. C	3.661	0.727	0.097	.575**	.511**	.676**	0.097	.661**	1	
K. S	3.569	0.866	-0.01	.317**	.621**	.862**	0.102	.920**	.591**	1

Notes:

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Figure 1

γ = path coefficient

p<0.01, sig @0.001