Emerging Domains in the Ecology of Influence: Implications for Coaching and Management Education

Donna L. Haeger
Cornell University

This study investigates an emergent shift in influence at the leader-member and leader-team levels using qualitative data triangulation. Findings surface in a detailed codebook and suggest that the influence construct is shifting to form two fundamental domains that differ at the leader and member levels. It is believed that the findings will have important practical implications for coaching and management education. An exploration into how influence is being experienced in teams nestled in an increasingly complex work environment may serve to challenge the traditional distinction between leader and member when it comes to who exhibits or enacts influence.

INTRODUCTION

As our workforce becomes more complex and diverse in terms of culture, gender and generations, collisions relating to influence complicate the dynamics associated with interactions among workers. Due to these growing complexities, the notion of influence should be explored further. Based on intrigue from the results of a study done by Haeger and Lingham (2013), the researcher leverages both interview transcripts and survey comments for the study that follows in order to focus on the experience of influence between leaders and members both individually and in teams. In firms endeavoring to flatten their structures and incorporate a broader span of control into management, teams are becoming a more prevalent vehicle with which to accomplish goals and objectives. "As organizations become more team oriented, research on teams continues to increase in importance" (T. Lingham, 2009: 13). There may be specifics around what a leader is expected to influence and what members themselves expect to influence today in a leader–member and leader–team setting. These definitions are new and emergent and are defined clearly in the following analysis.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The intent of this study was to understand how influence is experienced, particularly in regard to tasks and relationships at the leader–member and leader–team levels. Based on extensive review of the literature, for the intent of this study, influence was defined as the capacity to affect an outcome or have an effect on someone or something. Influence on a team is often facilitated by a leader and perceived by members as empowerment (G. Yukl, 2010, p. 170). Dolan (2002) emphasizes the need for organizations to embrace flatter structures and cultivate efficient teams as well as the need for bosses to become facilitators (Dolan & Garcia, 2002). This study is an investigation into understanding the role of influence to determine if it is shifting between leaders and members. Gaining this unique perspective could

contribute to the existing body of knowledge on leadership and supervisor subordinate relations, and to organizational practice through new ways of designing individual and team coaching programs or management education. The results of this paper suggest that influence, traditionally viewed as part of a leader's function may now cascade to all members, but in different ways. Historically, influence related research on leadership focused on trait theories or characteristics of leadership (Bass & Stogdill, 1990), based on the premise that leaders were born with traits conducive to successful leadership. Later, studies focused on leader behavior instead of leadership traits (Blake & Mouton, 1964) as a means to influence outcomes. Contingency models of leadership surfaced to explore both traits and behaviors as dictated by particular contexts and situations (Fiedler, 1964; Hersey & Blanchard, 1969b; House & Dessler, 1974; Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 1958; Vroom, 1964) and suggested adaptive approaches in leadership to influence outcomes. In the more recent past, leadership has been looked upon relationally as an interaction between the leader and worker accompanied by an approach that placed emphasis on each person as a system acting with mutual influence in an interaction (Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Green & Mitchell, 1979). The idea of mutual influence informs this paper and is an idea that warrants exploration since a common thread in most power and influence research has been to associate power and influence with leadership both at the individual and organizational levels (Clegg, 1989; Kotter, 1985). The evolution of these studies has moved from a focus on the individual leader to a view of people communing within an organizational culture that encapsulates a more complex system of human interaction (Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009). The evolution of these studies implies that our view of influence may no longer be aligned with the new paradigms. Raven (1964) defined power as potential influence and influence as having the power of motion. Kanter (1989) defined power as the ability to mobilize both human and material resources to get things done. He concluded that power comes from doing what is necessary and equates to accomplishment. Typically, research has treated power and influence as an aggregated and unidirectional construct moving from leader to member. Few studies have used an experiential approach to gain a deeper understanding of where influence resides and when it is enacted. Work done relating interactions to power and influence is seated in a context of top management teams (Finkelstein, 1992), buyer–seller relations (Dwyer, Schurr, & Oh, 1987) or between school principals and teachers (Mowday, 1978). The primary attention seems to be influence experienced from the management point of view (Pfeffer, 1993; G. A. Yukl & Heaton, 2002) rather than from a team interaction and experiential perspective. Lingham's (2009) work on team interaction quality provides one of the only investigations that breaks down an interaction study into such specific dimensions.

Research dating back 25 years focused on theories of the leader alone and moved to leader–follower perceptions and how these led to disadvantages and biases. Traditional focus placed on leader–follower models suggest that there is a cost benefit relationship when setting goals, providing direction, support and reinforcement (Avolio et al., 2009) and suggests that there is still pressure to balance emphasis on tasks versus relationships. Resulting theories from this stream of research focused on the premise that leaders can influence follower awareness and higher-order values leading to better performance (Avolio et al., 2009). This preoccupation with leader as driver of outcomes may no longer encapsulate the true nature of influence in our current work environment. Howell and Shamir (2005)suggest that the role of followers in leadership processes is broader than the role previously given them in leadership theories.

Table 1 is an overview of literature that is touched upon in support of this investigation.

TABLE 1
LITERATURE REVIEW

Study	Leadership	Leader-Member	Tasks & Relationships	Power and Influence	Influence	Teams
Avolio, B. J. (2007). "Promoting More Integrative Strategies for Leadership Theory-Building." American Psychologist: 25-33.	X					
Avolio, B. J. and B. M. Bass (1995). "Individual consideration viewed at multiple levels of analysis: A multi-level framework for examining the diffusion of transformational leadership." The Leadership Quarterly 6(2): 199-218.	X					
Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, Fred O., Weber, Todd J. (2009). "Leadership: Current Theories, Research, and Future Directions." Annual review of psychology: 421-449.	X					
Bass, B. M. and R. M. Stogdill (1990). Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications, Free Press.	X					
Bauer, T. N. and S. G. Green (1996). "Development of leader-member exchange: A longitudinal test." Academy of Management Journal 39(6): 1538-1567.		X				
Blake, R. R. and J. S. Mouton (1964). The Managerial Grid. Houston, Gulf Publishing.	X		X			
Burke, S. C., et al. (2006). "What Type of Leadership Behaviors are Functional in Teams? A Meta-analysis." The Leadership Quarterly: 288-307.	X					X
Clegg, S. (1989). Frameworks of power, Sage.	X			X		
Dansereau, F., Jr., et al. (1975). "A Vertical Dyad Linkage Approach to Leadership within Formal Organizations: A Longitudinal Investigation of the Role Making Process." Organizational behavior and Human Performance 13: 46-78.	X	X				
De Dreu, C. K. and L. R. Weingart (2003). "Task versus relationship conflict, team performance, and team member satisfaction: a meta-analysis." Journal of Applied Psychology 88(4): 741.		X	X			X
Druskat, V. U. and D. C. Kayes (2000). "Learning Versus Performance in Short-Term Project Teams." Small Group Research 31(3): 328-353.		X				X
Edmondson, A. (1999). "Psychological Safety and Learning Behavior in Work Teams." Administrative Science Quarterly 44(2): 350-383.		X				X
Fiedler, F. E. (1967). A theory of leadership effectiveness.	X					
Finkelstein, S. (1992). "Power in top management teams: Dimensions, measurement, and validation." Academy of Management Journal 35(3): 505-538.				X		
Fiorelli, J. S. (1988). "Power in work groups: Team member's perspectives." Human Relations 41(1): 1-12.				X		
French, J. R. and B. Raven (1959). The bases of social power. Studies in Social Power.				X		
Frost, T. F. and F. Moussavi (1992). "The Relationship Between Leader Power Base and Influence: The Moderating Role of Trust." Journal of Applied Business Research: 9-14.	X			X	X	
Graen, G. and W. Schiemann (1978). "Leader-Member Agreement: A vertical Dyad Linkage Approach." Journal of Applied Psychology 63(2): 206-212.	X	X				
Graen, G. B. and M. Uhl-Bien (1995). "Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective." The Leadership Quarterly 6(2): 219-247.	X		X			
Hackman, J. R. (1987). The Design of Work Teams. Handbook of Organizational Behavior. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall: 315-342.						X
Hackman, J. R. and C. G. Morris (1974). Group tasks, group interaction process, and group performance effectiveness: A review and proposed integration, Defense Technical Information Center.						X

Study	Leadership	Leader-Member	Tasks & Relationships	Power and Influence	Influence	Teams
Hare, A. P. (2003). "Roles, relationships, and groups in organizations: Some conclusions and recommendations." Small Group Research 34(2): 123-154.			X			X
Hersey, P. and K. H. Blanchard (1969). Management of organizational behavior, Prentice-Hall Englewood Cliffs, NJ.	X					
Hollander, E. P. and L. R. Offermann (1990). "Power and leadership in organizations: Relationships in transition." American Psychologist 45(2): 179.	X			X		
House, R. J. and G. Dessler (1974). "The path-goal theory of leadership: Some post hoc and a priori tests." Contingency approaches to leadership 29: 55.	X					
Kanter, R. M. (1989). "Power failure in management circuits." Harvard Business: 65-75.				X	X	
Kotter, J. P. (1985). Power and influence, New York: Free Press.				X		
Lingham, T. (2005). "Developing a Measure for Conversational Learning Spaces in Team." Case Western Reserve University unpublished: 1-135.			X	X	X	X
Lingham, T. (2009). An Experiential Approach to Team Interaction: Developing a measure to capture its diverse dimensions and aspects. Colorado Springs: 1-37.			X	X	X	X
Maslyn, J. M. and M. Uhl-Bien (2001). "Leader-member exchange and its dimensions: Effects of self-effort and other's effort on relationship quality." Journal of Applied Psychology 86(4): 697.	X		X			
Mintzberg, H. (2004). Managers not MBAs: A hard look at the soft practice of managing and management development. San Francisco, CA, Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.	X					
Mowday, R. T. (1978). "The exercise of upward influence in organizations." Administrative Science Quarterly: 137-156.					X	
Pfeffer, J. (1993). Managing with power: Politics and influence in organizations, Harvard Business Press.				X		
Pirola-Merlo, A., et al. (2002). "How leaders influence the impact of affective events on team climate and performance in R&D teams." The Leadership Quarterly 13(5): 561-581.					X	X
Raven, B. H. (1964). Social influence and power, DTIC Document.				X		
Rudolph, H. and J. V. Peluchette (1993). "The Power Gap: Is Sharing or Accumulating Power the Answer?" Journal of Applied Business Research: 12-20.	X			X		
Scandura, T. A., et al. (1986). "When managers decide not to decide autocratically: An investigation of leader-member exchange and decision influence." Journal of Applied Psychology 71(4): 579.	X	X				
Tost, L., et al. (2012). "When power makes others speechless: The negative impact of leader power on team performance." Academy of Management Journal.				X	X	
Vroom, V. H. (1964). "Work and motivation."	X					
Weiss, M. and W. Friedrichs (1986). "The influence of leader behaviors, coach attributes, and institutional variables on performance and satisfaction of collegiate basketball teams." Journal of Sport Psychology 8(4).	X				X	
Yukl, G. (2010). Leadership in Organizations Seventh Edition. Upper Saddle River, Prentice Hall Pearson Education.	X					
Zaccaro, S. J. and M. C. McCoy (1988). "The Effects of Task and Interpersonal Cohesiveness on Performance of a Disjunctive Group Task." Journal of Applied Social Psychology: 837-851.	X		X			X

TASKS

Task performance, design and complexity have been studied by researchers at length (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Berman, Wicks, Kotha, & Jones, 1999; Field, 2009; Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001; McKnight, Cummings, & Chervany, 1998). Cohen and Baily suggested that tasks can be directly manipulated by leaders to impact effectiveness of a team according to their group effectiveness framework (Jamal, 1985). From the point of view of leadership, task research has been conducted in order to isolate specific tasks required by leaders to enact the leadership role (Hackman, 1987; Maslyn & Uhl-Bien, 2001; Scandura, Graen, & Novak, 1986; Wang, Law, Hackett, Wang, & Chen, 2005) and thus ensure leadership effectiveness (Luthans, Avolio, Walumbwa, & Li, 2005). Task research has also evolved to include team dynamics that investigate different types of work teams (Hackman, 1987; Tony Lingham & Richley, 2009; Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 1997; Zaccaro & McCoy, 1988). Quite a few works more recently have focused on tasks in relation to virtual team environments or E-teams (Butler Jr, Cantrell, & Flick, 1999; Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002; Gully, Incalcaterra, Joshi, & Beaubien, 2002). Using what has already been studied as a foundation, the following research sits as complementary to this rich body of knowledge.

RELATIONSHIPS

Relationship studies to date have included observation and analysis of workers in blue collar and medical environments (Jamal, 1985; Judge et al., 2001; Luthans et al., 2005) as well as in stakeholder and organizational contexts (Berman et al., 1999; McKnight et al., 1998). Team studies on relationships have also included the manufacturing arena (Butler Jr et al., 1999) and have expanded to include trust, culture, and conflict (Amason, 1996; De Dreu & Weingart, 2003; Frost & Moussavi, 1992; Harris, Moran, & Soccorsy, 1991; Jehn, 1995; McKnight et al., 1998). Finally, team level studies focused on relationships have also investigated the impact relationships have on performance, conflict and teams as whole systems (Goleman et al., 2002; Gully et al., 2002; Jehn & Mannix, 2001). Hunter (1999) also found evidence that relationship-forging tasks have an impact on sales performance. Understanding the role of relationships during team interaction could provide current findings to suggest shifts that might be impacting critical outcomes in organizations as teams become more and more prevalent.

POWER VERSUS INFLUENCE

In 1981, Bass warned leadership researchers that power and influence are not synonymous and should not be confused as such (Frost & Moussavi, 1992). How power is used and perceived determines the resultant influence it will have. Preliminary research on power and influence was introduced in 1959 and provided a taxonomy that included referent, expert, reward, coercive and legitimate (French & Raven, 1959). Each power source is based on member perception of the leader: (a) referent power refers to the subordinates loyalty and identification with the leader; (b) expert power refers to the leader's competence, knowledge, and skills; (c) reward power is the leaders control over rewards; (d) coercive power is the leader's control over punishment; and (e) Legitimate power refers to a leader's right to prescribe behavior (French & Raven, 1959). In 1974, Raven added informational power to the list as another form of power. He recognized a leader's ability to influence agents based on access and control of information (Frost & Moussavi, 1992). The intention of this seminal work was to define types of power and explore the effects of each on the leader subordinate dyad. This is a key distinction in understanding how power and influence might affect team dynamics since the mere presence of a manager or person who is viewed as being in a position of power can result in change to the system (team) or recipient behaviors (French & Raven, 1959). This is an important issue to consider especially in a team setting.

In the past, it appears research has been done primarily with the leader in mind. This paper takes an experiential approach to exploring both leader and member reports of influence to arrive at what it means to be a leader and a member at work today. The nature of the quality of relationships cannot be fully

understood without an understanding of how influence is experienced in both non-dyadic and team level settings at work. Traditional investigations at the dyad level have been based on a view of influence residing with the leader (Dansereau, 1975; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). It is timely and significant to address this emergent shift and to provide members the possibility to express the lived experience of influence at work, within a team setting. Doing so is more aligned with current management research that highlights the need for collaboration, empowerment, and engagement on the part of members (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Kahn, 1990; Wondolleck & Yaffee, 2000).

RESEARCH DESIGN & METHODOLOGY

"Qualitative research is inquiry aimed at describing and clarifying human experience as it appears in people's lives" (Polkinghorne, 2005). This study leveraged two sets of qualitative data both non-dyadic (sample 1) and in teams (sample 2) to inform a discussion about emerging domains of influence. Details into who should influence what when it comes to leaders and members surfaced via the construction of a detailed codebook. It is believed that the findings will have important practical implications that contribute to organizations, boards, teams, and higher education institutions especially when influential relationships are present and are critical to successful work and interaction. The inquiry moving forward will be designed to dive deeper into how people experience influence in order to highlight the significance of influence and understand the shift and emergent domains present in our current work environment.

The overarching research question is: *What is the nature of influence as experienced in the current work environment and how is influence experienced by leaders and members?*

The research design was crafted based on exploration and refined analysis through triangulation of two different data sets. In the spirit of grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006) and symbolic interactionism (Blumer, 1969), the researcher conducted much of this research immersed in the experiences of participants and capitalizes on findings that have the potential to make a contribution to research through understanding new and emergent ideas about influence in the current work environment. This qualitative approach was selected for two reasons. First, it is a unique and powerful method with which to confirm thematic findings surfaced while analyzing one qualitative sample. Approaching two samples in a theoretical way to confirm these results serves to solidify the results in two different contexts. Second, this methodology sets the groundwork for future development of a quantitative measure with which to rigorously test and confirm the results, potentially making them irrefutable.

METHODS

The study explored how influence is experienced by leaders and members individually as compared to the same experience when leaders and members are working in intact teams. Triangulation in this study is used to confirm existing and surface new findings using two separate data sources in order to create rigor by increasing the ability to both interpret and confirm the findings (Thurmond, 2001). This method provided empirical confirmation and strong validation of the results. The intent was to code Sample 1 interviews and juxtapose with coding of a second dataset, Sample 2 captured at the team level. The goal was to zero in on tasks and relationships in terms of what has been studied and move to a deeper investigation that includes an experiential approach to the analysis at a more meta-level using theoretical coding.

The study complements a non-dyadic sample (1) of qualitative comments with a sample of survey comments received (2) from individuals having experiences in teams. The second sample was selected according to the "dictates of the emerging theory" (Coyne, 1997). This allowed the researcher to confirm themes that emerged in the literature (Haeger & Lingham, 2013) by theoretically coding and comparing sample 1 (non-dyadic) dataset with sample 2 (intact team) dataset.

SAMPLES

The first sample was designed as a non-dyadic investigation of perceptions of leaders and direct reports about experienced exchanges in the workplace. The sample was specifically designed and selected to remove confounds that might have been embedded in existing dyadic relationships. The non-dyadic results suggested that different experiences of influence are related to how tasks and relationships are enacted. The study leveraged semi-structured interviews to develop grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The second sample chosen for this study provides data gathered using the Team Learning Inventory (TLI) (Tony Lingham, 2005b) for 70 intact teams. This second sample was chosen to be in stark contrast to the first sample in order to challenge the original thematic findings by querying dialogue where individuals had an association at work. The team level qualitative comments aimed to explore whether the emergent normative collisions around task and relationships could also be present at the team level. The data collected using the TLI aligned well with the intent of the study since it gathered information from participants relative to both social-emotional aspects of team interaction coupled with task oriented aspects (T. Lingham, 2009). The instrument itself consistently surfaces lived experiences of interactions in teams on a task and relationship continuum (Tony Lingham, 2005b).

This triangulation is twofold: (1) code Sample 1 and Sample 2 separately using theoretical coding to see how participants frame influence in terms of tasks and relationships; and (2) extrapolate the same experiences of influence by members in these two samples if present. The triangulation was intended to dive deeper into experiences of influence among workers.

This triangulation with two separate and unrelated qualitative data samples was key to the level of rigor inherent in this research. Using theoretical coding (Bernard, 2000; Charmaz, 2006; Glaser & Strauss, 1967) and the two samples, a correlated codebook was developed. The codebook was twice refined, once after expert review by six students participating in a doctoral program and again after review by three professionals in corporate America. The purpose of review was to check for face and content validity based on expert input from both practitioners and scholars as the codebook is developed. The study resulted in a refined codebook where parallels in experiences between the two samples have been extrapolated as they relate to influence.

FINDINGS

Triangulation was used to gain multiple perspectives of the same phenomenon. In this case, to increase the credibility of findings from the first study, the study underway incorporated methodological triangulation (Guion, Diehl, & McDonald, 2011). This design called for analysis by comparing interviews and survey responses. The data are usually transformed into written text for analytic use in order to move from language to meaning (Polkinghorne, 2005).

Sample 1 (non-dyadic) was text interviews and Sample 2 was sample moments (TLI team comments) gathered from structured questions standardized in a questionnaire and given to team members. Both samples were captured in different organizational settings across the United States. In order to highlight specific experiences around influence related to task and relationships, both samples were theoretically coded to determine if there is agreement about how tasks and relationships are experienced in the workplace. Text from both samples was used as a proxy for experience (Bernard, 2000) as they were from interview data and comments written by both leaders and members non-dyadic and on intact teams. The approach is a deductive one and achieves confirmation of similar experiences using the confirmatory technique of triangulation. The two samples above are strong as standalone approaches, but here the two sets of results are leveraged to confirm and illuminate the reality of the proposition (Wilson & Hutchinson, 1991). The codebook includes "qualitative datum" (Van De Ven, 2007) or sets of words that support experiences of influence based on tasks and relationships at work. The quotes are classified by specific content that link incidents between the two samples.

Reliability of the correlated quotes was established first by coding the text. Next, five doctoral students were enlisted to review and self-code as well as confirm correlation of the selected incidents.

Based on this feedback, the codebook was revised for accuracy and alignment. Doing this ensured that the meaning of the events did not contain individual researcher bias. To test the "social reality" (Van De Ven, 2007) of the claims, the codebook and codes were empirically tested to be sure the researchers' classifications coincided with practitioner perceptions of the incidents (Van De Ven, 2007). This was done by enlisting two working professionals to also review the quotes and assign meaning to the text. The codebook was then finalized. The codebook may be viewed in Table 2. The lexical dimensions are highlighted and the data or quotes capture experiences that correlate between the two samples. Table 2 represents lexical dimensions in correlating the two samples of experiences.

TABLE 2

Triangulated Codebook - Sub and Meta Categorization					
Non-Dyadic Sample			**TLI Team Comments Sample**		
Lexical Dimension	*leaders and subordinates non dyadic*		Subdimension	*leaders and members in a team environment*	
RELATIONSHIP	That's a leader that inspires by treating their folks on a personal basis	"... a leader is someone that inspires loyalty and inspires somebody to grow both professionally and personally..."	**PROMOTIVE**	"Team leader inspires members to respect each other's needs, work with efficiency, and display a positive attitude."	" Personal growth is encouraged and supported."
RELATIONSHIP	"A lot ...is tasked to the individual employee though. It's more if you wanna develop, you to take steps to make certain that you develop."		**PROMOTIVE**	"I do not feel team leadership works with each individual to develop their potential within the team. Personal development is left up to the individual."	Many team members have experience with similar projects. Strong project management tools. Support from upper leadership team members. Very organized team.
RELATIONSHIP	As for leader there is no deepening of relationship, no gatherings for bonding and therefore no trust.		**PROMOTIVE**	"...(leader) he or she needs to appreciate and embrace diversity within the team. More importantly, he or she cannot sabotage the team by talking about the other team members.	Team leadership has been effective in identifying goals, encouraging teamwork to achieve goals, maintaining a balance of objectives, and dissipating tension in the facilitation of conflict resolution.
RELATIONSHIP	"[The leader] knows what that person needs to grow both personally and professionally and tries to align things happen to make that growth happen."	Rarely does the manager look at the people that work for him as actually making him a better person by the work that they're doing, rarely do they look down and say, okay, what do I need to do to make these people grow?	**PROMOTIVE**	The team leaders create an atmosphere where the members can ask for help or input without any indication they have "failed" to do their work.	"A strong leader that fosters open communication and sharing throughout the chain of command."
TASK	"If you feel as a leader that the person should just do something because you wanted them to do it and then they don't and they challenge you, that's a recipe for disaster.'		**PARTICIPATIVE**	The team leader should enable the team, and not approach the team with the attitude "I know best" therefore just do the work.	"...leadership of individuals within the team is shared, and different team members regularly step up to lead the team through various times

					when we are struggling to maintain focus on goals or complete assignments."
TASK	"... she's in a mission-critical role right now because she's one of the cogs and the pieces of the puzzle that all the admissions have to come through her.		PARTICIPATIVE	"...could continue to relinquish more control. She has done a great job of building a solid team .....but she still carries the larger burden…"	Working together as a team and not feeling as though one person will be 'stuck' with doing most or all of the work Being more comfortable and confident to volunteer for tasks or helping.
TASK	He's concerned about keep moving forward, and I'm concerned about the customer not getting a complete order.	"They (members) understand that they have to move faster, communicate more, respond to people and so on. But that's been one of the biggest challenges that I feel is just sort of a big silly challenge. "	PARTICIPATIVE	"More involvement in actual work and less leader delegation would be better."	"We cannot learn from others project related mistakes as there aren't many discussions related to what did not work- so we are always wondering about others mistakes. We never take feedback from one team member about our project. We take feedback only from the Team leader"
TASK	"So there's some very clear expectations, in terms of how to approach the work, how to collaborate…,but beyond that, how you go about getting that done is completely on you."		PARTICIPATIVE	"Team needs to take more initiative and demonstrate personal responsibility when performing job duties instead of seeking out directions from supervisor."	There was a task leader and a relational leader, which helped to create an environment in which everyone was able to have their say and have it be heard.
TASK/REL	He wanted to try to do something to create better collaboration within our office, ... he asked each of us to send to him what ideas like some of the issues in the office, and what we'd like to have accomplished if we were to have such a retreat.	"We don't collaborate as much as we should."	PARTICIPATIVE	" There is an effective system of collaboration so that input from multiple members can be used to complete a single task."	This team had strong leadership, shared responsibility, flexibility, and heart. Members were able to share a variety of views before coming together to make a decision.
TASK/REL	" I guess I felt like everyone embraced me. I felt like people treated me as	"And if the other RN is here, which is nice, we kinda share that responsibility	PARTICIPATIVE	"...have a clearly denoted leader but still act as peers." "We formed	All member of the team could

	an equal."	of triaging the patients and helping the doctors. So it works well."		a bipolar leadership -- one member drove the task, another worked on the team health."	work better at being "equals" i.e. members that are more reserved could do better to express their opinions and members that tend to take on a leadership role could work at gathering everyone's opinion prior to drawing group session to an end.
TASK/REL	"But the way we restructured things was such that the other two managers who are managing the nurse teams can step over into her role any day that she's not available, on vacation, or so on.		PARTICIPATIVE	"The team is very organized and each member has a specific yet flexible role."	All members took a leadership role at different times are very friendly and open toward everyone.
TASK/REL	So it was more task oriented that it became integrated, but not personal. They weren't personable toward each other.	"Now if we had a different kind of relationship perhaps, really got to know them, felt comfortable around them and vice versa, then perhaps that might be okay.	PARTICIPATIVE	We are not rude to each other. We listen to each other. We allow others to take leadership roles and one person does not dominate.	When the leadership is not in the room there is much more discussion about why things won't work, as opposed to open brainstorming around what can be done and new ideas.

The codebook demonstrates a pattern of interactions that link directly to task and relationships. As can be seen, quotes have been correlated between the two samples and confirm agreement regarding experiences through tasks and relationships during successful and unsuccessful interactions. Individuals working independently and in groups seem most affected by how interactions based on tasks and relationships are experienced in the workplace. The codebook is segmented into three particular lexical dimensions: Relationships, Tasks and Task/Relationships combined. In all three instances the quotes captured correlate to one another across samples. The experiences all point to a shift in the domain of influence in terms of task and relationships. In both datasets, participants do articulate task and relationship experiences in terms of influence.

The triangulation surfaced twelve distinct and strong correlations between the two samples relative to task and relationship oriented experiences during interactions in the workplace. Theoretical coding across the two samples were developed around specific categories labeled Relationship, Task and Task/Relationship. It is interesting to note that there are clearly instances where task and relationship are enacted simultaneously to accomplish work and this has emerged in the codebook. To remain consistent, the same definitions of task and relationship as used in the literature were incorporated into the study since they were based on past research and thus maintain alignment in the literature.

The findings are compelling since they were based on *lived experiences* within both samples. The correlations are reported here and accompanied with support in the form of representative quotes from both samples. The triangulation and comparison of the data were woven together to demonstrate the strength of the findings. A full representation of supporting quotes may be viewed in Table 2 which is organized to display representative quotes grouped into the categories theoretically specified. In

compiling quotes, expressions of experiences related to task and relationships within each sample are revealed and then correlated the sets based on topic of discussion. For instance, the following representative quotes were linked and categorized due to the *relationship* nature of the experience and the fact that while each quote is from a different sample, the experiences appear to validate one another.

Non-dyadic Sample Interview: "Rarely does the manager look at the people that work for him as actually making him a better person by the work that they're doing, rarely do they look down and say, 'Okay, what do I need to do to make these people grow?'"

TLI Team Comments: "The team leaders create an atmosphere where the members can ask for help or input without any indication that they have "failed" to do their work."

Subsequently, the following representative quotes were linked and categorized due to the *task* nature of the experience and again while each quote is from a different sample, the experiences appear to validate one another.

Non-dyadic Sample Interview: "So there's some very clear expectations, in terms of how to approach the work, how to collaborate...but beyond that, how you go about getting that done is completely on you."

TLI Team Comments: "Team needs to take more initiative and demonstrate personal responsibility when performing job duties instead of seeking out directions from supervisor."

The final categorization in the triangulation was a clear coexistence of task and relationship within an experience. This emerged while validating the codebook using doctoral students and practitioner review. The following representative quotes were linked and categorized due to the *task/relationship* nature of the experience.

Non-dyadic Sample Interview: "So it was more task oriented that it became integrated, but not personal. They weren't personable toward each other."

TLI Team Comments: "When the leadership is not in the room there is much more discussion about why things won't work, as opposed to open brainstorming around what can be done and new ideas."

It is clear from this exercise that the task and relationship dynamics theorized are present at the individual and team member levels. What is also interesting is that the moments found as "lived" by the participants fit cleanly into three rather than two categories.

Further review was conducted and the quotes thematically reviewed a second time to determine if the triangulation results in terms of who has influence around tasks and relationships could be outlined more precisely. Table 3 is an expansion of the correlated codebook, with two levels of analysis of the moments captured. This deeper look into the correlated quotes is an attempt to understand where influence lies and how it is described during the experiences. Beyond the task, relationship and task/relationship groupings, two sub dimensions emerge that encapsulate the twelve correlated quote sets. They are labelled Participative Influence and Promotive Influence and appear in Table 2.

DISCUSSION

Findings show that there may be a shift in the traditional view of the domain of influence. This is demonstrated by leader and member reports of different experiences relating to the influence of task and relationship activities. It appears that influence manifests differently than previously thought and suggests that there may be a change in landscape where influence has two separate domains. Ultimately, what has surfaced is a new way to define what team leadership and what team membership mean in terms of influence. Two clear dimensions of influence emerge in the analysis. A table (Figure 2) defining the two follows:

FIGURE 1

Summary of the Dimensions of Influence	
Participative Influence	equality among members in terms of tasks and relationship related to accomplishing work
Promotive Influence	a single person to rely on to further or encourage activities or actions at a developmental level

The Participative dimension outlines how team members frame team membership today which is in terms of sharing of tasks, relationships and task/relationships experiences. This also suggests that the landscape of influence is shifting in terms of interactive experiences at work and in teams. Every quote that correlates to the Participative Influence dimension has an original categorization that involves movement toward task accomplishment. Each quote that correlates to the Promotive Influence dimension is originally categorized as relational. At both levels of analysis there is consistency in this result between and among participants.

Positive experiences reside in a work setting that is host to full equality when it comes to task accomplishment and seems to indicate shared influence on a team. This was the preferred and experienced positive state in the data reviewed. The second dimension that has emerged suggests that how leadership is defined is categorized more as a developmental function rather than that of an autocrat or director. Promotive Influence is indicative of a leader's influence. Leader influence resides at the developmental level and acts as a booster that encourages or furthers the team (or individuals) in endeavors. This includes both team promotion and that related to individual development of members.

The fascinating result of this sorting was the emergence of a relational or development focus on the part of the leader. Member influence rested in participation around task involvement and leader influence rests in developmental aspects of team promotion. This indicates a shift in influence on a team and among individuals in the work environment into two distinct domains and calls for managers and researchers to rethink traditional models of influence. It appears that member influence on a team has broadened to all task related activities and that leader influence has evolved to include a hyper focus on development from a relational standpoint. While the leader does have tasks to accomplish, the expectation is that those tasks are correlated to relational aspects of developing individuals and developing the team to the rest of the organization.

Perceived positive experiences around influence are rooted in a shift to an omni-present state where all members are influential when carrying out tasks while the leader's influence is shifting to that of a focused stimulator. A leader as stimulus is needed as a boost that moves the team and its members in a desired direction developmentally. Members of a team require a strong leader when it comes to advocating for the team and for individuals to other teams and to upper management, navigating the team toward reaching its goals by keeping the team on task, informing of schedules and championing for resources and moving the team toward accomplishment. The leader is needed for setting the tone for the culture that emerges on the team in terms of team norms by setting example and the cultivation of others to emulate said culture. And the leader is needed to act as a mediator when more expertise is required to make decisions and settle conflicts or when there is an impasse that requires settlement.

This study suggests that a leader's influential role is now rooted in developmental type relations while members are more influential in terms of task accomplishment. Members' expectations are that they have equal influence over everything task related, but not sole influence over developmental relations. In the case of development, the strength of the leader's influence is required. It was clear from the synthesis of the triangulation that people are still calling for strong leadership. It is the specific type of leader that has been defined here in terms of influence and it is evolving. The reason for the change is likely due to the notion of developmental relations as being more significant than task accomplishment when it comes to a

leaders influence from the point of view of members. Strong leadership influence is expected and needed for developmental aspects in the current work environment.

TASKS AND RELATIONSHIPS: AN EVOLVING ECOLOGY OF INFLUENCE

The foundational study in this paper was a grounded theory investigation that surfaced emergent patterns in leadership and a host of normative collisions during experienced interactions (Haeger & Lingham, 2013). It also highlighted some key commonalities in terms of what workers, regardless of rank, hold in the forefront of their minds as important when it comes to both successful and difficult interactions. When participants were asked to describe experiences around interactions at work, they consistently framed them from a task and relationship perspective. Differences emerged in terms of expectations between leaders and members. The study also surfaced agreement among individual leaders and members about collisions or misalignment between people in the workplace. The common experiences coded gravitated toward those linked to tasks and relationships.

Task and relationship dynamics have been studied at the leadership level for many years (Blake & Mouton, 1964; Fiedler, 1965, 1967; Hersey & Blanchard, 1969a) as well as at the team level more recently (Hare, 2003; Tony Lingham, 2005b; Simons & Peterson, 2000). Interactions in teams in terms of this continuum have only recently been addressed (Hare, 2003; Tony Lingham, 2005b). Task and relationship challenges clearly emerged in the first round of coding and led the research to explore experiences more deeply. The developed codebook aligns with research that highlights the fact that relationships have been defined as exchanges that benefit organizations and lead to positive outcomes for leaders and members in terms of job performance, task accomplishment and decision making (Ishak, 2005).

MANAGEMENT EDUCATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Having a shared understanding of influence in the workplace would serve to increase satisfaction levels and well as quality of work-life and productivity at the individual, team and corporate levels. Leaders who understand and embrace their own influential imperatives while also understanding and embracing member placed influential imperatives are likely to accomplish more and maximize positive relations with individuals, teams and organizational bodies in and outside of the firm.

Understanding how influence is experienced at the individual, and team levels provides organizations a roadmap for future management education, coaching and team development. The researcher's contribution to practice is to aid in making teamwork effective by understanding that there may be two domains of influence. One is a leader's realm of influence, Promotive and the other is a member's realm influence, Participative. Illuminating this shift to two domains could serve to aid management education and development programs for coaching geared toward helping leaders understand the most effective use of influence as well as inform members as to the impact properly enacted influence can have at work and in teams. Shifts are in fact occurring that can impact team success which makes it important to understand how people influence each other. Teams are how we get work done today and continues to grow in emphasis. Teams are people interacting to accomplish work and this can be a struggle as many dynamics are at play. Influence, in this researcher's opinion, is what makes interactions effective. Knowledge around how influence is experienced and enacted in the current work environment increases our understanding of how to move toward success by informing both leaders and members about the properties of influence and their role.

As teams become more prevalent in organizations, the importance of influence is evolving to become increasingly important to the leader member dynamic especially in a group setting. Understanding domains associated with influencing task and relationship activities for leaders and members could aid in cultivating the most highly functioning teams. This means members, by way of influence, could feel that team membership has been a positive experience and potentially have a beneficial impact on areas such as well-being, engagement and dedication while moving toward the completion of team goals and

objectives. "Most managers and researchers consider tangible outcomes related to team effectiveness without giving due regard to how individuals within the team perceive their own effectiveness, satisfaction and safety" (Tony Lingham, 2005a: 7).

Research suggests that one-on-one coaching while useful may not compare to the powerful benefits of coaching in a group setting, where lasting changes in leadership behavior are more likely to occur (Kets de Vries, 2010). Management education and coaching designed to align the two domains of influence is likely to serve leaders and members alike. Leaders should be coached in the developmental aspects of team performance as their key influence while also learning to understand the participative aspects of all members' influencing the team. Members too, can be coached to understand their key participation on a team and that of the leader as well. The interdependent nature of this new landscape of influence will serve to promote collaboration. Other potential positive outcomes could be an increase in trust and solidarity on an intact team, and increases in member satisfaction and psychological safety; all of which serve to maximize team effectiveness.

This study may be of interest to any organization leveraging teams such as human resources and other departments, boards of directors, top management teams, and higher education institutions to name a few. There is a potential for stakeholders to leverage findings in this study in order to develop programs aimed at improving team membership and leadership effectiveness, workplace productivity, team performance as well as individual performance, training and workforce retention in general.

CONCLUSION

Twenty-six qualitative interview results suggest that non-dyadic relationships are changing and normative collisions are occurring around domains of tasks and relationships. A second sample using 1,793 comments from intact teams are triangulated with the initial twenty-six interviews to reveal clear indication of two emerging domains of influence each of which is defined by the subjects of the study through experience of influence at the team leadership and team membership levels in the current work environment. It is hoped that such a finding could be used to inform individual and team coaching programs geared toward maximizing coaching practices

Since individuals are simultaneously members of different social systems and not all individuals are members of the same systems, their actions and the rules they choose to implement and act upon may not always seem logical to other members (Giddens, 1984). It is likely that leaders and members experience influence differently in intact teams. The literature implies a unique variety of experiences associated with these different memberships. This research is a first step in exploring whether misalignment of perceived experiences during interactions of influence when enacting tasks and relationships is affecting outcomes, as implied by Poole (1985) and Locke (1981).

The codebook indicates clear linkages in experienced interactions between members when tasks and relationships are enacted. The comparison validates agreement through the use of two separate samples of qualitative text and supports the idea that experiences through tasks and relationships is of great concern when people interact at work, in departments and in teams. It may also suggest that expectations and willingness on the part of members of a team are shifting in terms of influence. This is suggested both individually and in a team setting within organizations and is illustrated in the codebook. Three distinct domains appear to be present in the articulations of both samples. How team members frame team leadership and team membership in terms of the interactions embedded in task and relationship experiences seems to be shifting the domain of influence.

It has been established that the more aligned team members are in terms of their experiences the greater the positive outcomes of the teamwork (Tony Lingham, 2005b). In order to highlight the potential shift in how team leaders and team members experience influence, it will be necessary to establish academic quality and practical relevance of the results (Van De Ven, 2007). The triangulation results suggest that there are differing experiences of tasks and relationships in terms of influence and that how team leadership and team membership is defined could be shifting. This is illustrated in the codebook by perceived and experienced successful and difficult interactions rooted in where influence lies. To be

useful these findings must be actionable (Van De Ven, 2007). In order for them to be actionable they should be explored and validated further through quantitative analysis and the results applied to practice. The findings suggest that the traditional landscape of influence is in flux when it comes to tasks and relationships. This researcher proposes that how influence is experienced in a team setting may be evolving and that perhaps how leadership and membership is defined may also be changing in both non-dyadic and intact team settings. This proposition is supported by having first established and confirmed concern among workers of a misalignment in expectations around tasks and relationships in the foundational study referenced. Tasks and relationships are at the heart of influence since what is influenced at work is either getting work done or moving people to action. The task relationship shift in expectation on the part of all team members is clear. The results emphasized agreement between non-dyadic and team sample participants that how influence is experienced in terms of tasks and relationships is changing. This provided strong support that differences in how team leadership and team membership is defined may be in terms of how influence is experienced in the current work environment.

FUTURE RESEARCH

The integration of these findings suggests a need to review quantitative team data that captures interaction quality to determine alignment in task and relationship dimensions between leaders and members from an experiential standpoint as well as investigate the surfaced dimensions to confirm their existence. Developing and validating a scale to measure this ecology as well as studying the benefits of intervention type coaching around how workers understand influence today could serve to improve work and team outcomes in organizations. Determining whether team members and team leaders are in agreement about experiences rooted in task and relational activities and if interventions like coaching during provide more positive outcomes has surfaced as an imperative. Understanding how influence is experienced by all members on a team prompts an overarching future inquiry to see if leaders and members on intact teams experience teamwork the same or differently and what affect a gap between the two has on team outcomes. Continuation of this stream of research could be integrated if not directly impact studies in leadership styles and effectiveness (Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996). This might also surface which dimension has the greatest effect on intact teams and could be done longitudinally. Understanding the dynamics of influence at a deeper level will assist with coaching intact teams toward endurance through alignment. Knowing within which dimension the greatest misalignment is allows for a hyper focused approach to intervention exercises around influence. Finally, quantitatively confirming this changing landscape of influence on intact teams may further spark development of new coaching and management education or leadership programs as well as guidelines for teams aimed at increasing the satisfaction of all members and maximizing group effectiveness.

REFERENCES

Amason, A. C. (1996). Distinguishing the effects of functional and dysfunctional conflict on strategic decision making: Resolving a paradox for top management teams. *Academy of management journal, 39*(1), 123–148.

Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 421–449.

Bass, B. M., & Stogdill, R. M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications*: Free Press.

Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship". *Academy of management journal, 26*(4), 587–595.

Berman, S. L., Wicks, A. C., Kotha, S., & Jones, T. M. (1999). Does stakeholder orientation matter? The relationship between stakeholder management models and firm financial performance. *Academy of management journal, 42*(5), 488–506.

Bernard, R. (2000). Data management and analysis methods. In N. Densin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 769–802). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The managerial grid*. Houston: Gulf Publishing.

Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method*. Berkeley; Los Angeles; London: University of California Press.

Butler Jr, J. K., Cantrell, R. S., & Flick, R. J. (1999). Transformational leadership behaviors, upward trust, and satisfaction in self-managed work teams. *Organization Development Journal, 17*(1), 13–28.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. London: SAGE Publications, Ltd.

Clegg, S. (1989). *Frameworks of power*: Sage.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of management review, 12*(4), 637–647.

Coyne, I. T. (1997). Sampling in qualitative research. Purposeful and theoretical sampling; merging or clear boundaries? *Journal of advanced nursing, 26*(3), 623–630.

Dansereau, F., Jr., Graen, George, Hag, William, J. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations: A longitudinal investigation of the role making process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 13*, 46–78.

De Dreu, C. K., & Weingart, L. R. (2003). Task versus relationship conflict, team performance, and team member satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(4), 741.

Dolan, S. L., & Garcia, S. (2002). Managing by values: Cultural redesign for strategic organizational change at the dawn of the twenty-first century. *Journal of Management Development, 21*(2), 101–117.

Dwyer, F. R., Schurr, P. H., & Oh, S. (1987). Developing buyer-seller relationships. *The Journal of marketing*, 11–27.

Fiedler, F. E. (1964). A contingency model of leadership effectiveness. *Advances in experimental social psychology, 1*(1), 64.

Fiedler, F. E. (1965). The contingency model: A theory of leadership effectiveness. *Key Readings in Social Psychology, 2*, 369.

Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw Hill Custom Publishing.

Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*: Sage Publications.

Finkelstein, S. (1992). Power in top management teams: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. *Academy of management journal, 35*(3), 505–538.

French, J. R., & Raven, B. (1959). *The bases of social power. Studies in social power* (Vol. 150).

Frost, T. F., & Moussavi, F. (1992). The relationship between leader power base and influence: The moderating role of trust. *Journal of Applied Business Research*, 9–14.

Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. New Brunswick: Aldine Transaction.

Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2002). The emotional reality of teams. *Journal of Organizational Excellence, 21*(2), 55–65.

Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *The leadership quarterly, 6*(2), 219–247.

Green, S. G., & Mitchell, T. R. (1979). Attributional processes of leaders in leader–member interactions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 23*(3), 429–458.

Guion, L. A., Diehl, D. C., & McDonald, D. (2011). *Triangulation: Establishing the validity of qualitative studies*. Retrieved from http://edis.ifas.ufl.edu/pdffiles/FY/FY39400.pdf

Gully, S. M., Incalcaterra, K. A., Joshi, A., & Beaubien, J. M. (2002). A meta-analysis of team-efficacy, potency, and performance: interdependence and level of analysis as moderators of observed relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(5), 819.

Hackman, J. R. (1987). The design of work teams *Handbook of Organizational Behavior* (pp. 315–342). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Haeger, D. L., & Lingham, T. (2013). Intergeneratinal collisions and leadership in the 21st century. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships, 11*(4), 1–18.

Hare, A. P. (2003). Roles, relationships, and groups in organizations: Some conclusions and recommendations. *Small Group Research, 34*(2), 123–154.

Harris, P. R., Moran, R. T., & Soccorsy, J. (1991). *Managing cultural differences* (Vol. 3). Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing Company

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969a). Life cycle theory of leadership. *Training and Development Journal, 23*(5), 26–34.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969b). *Management of organizational behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall

House, R. J., & Dessler, G. (1974). The path-goal theory of leadership: Some post hoc and a priori tests. *Contingency approaches to leadership, 29*, 55.

Howell, J. M., & Shamir, B. (2005). The role of followers in the charismatic leadership process: Relationships and their consequences. *Academy of Management Review, 30*(1), 96-112.

Hunter, G. K. (1999). *Sales technology, relationship-forging tasks, and sales performance in business markets.* University of North Carolina.

Ishak, N. A. (2005). Promoting employees' innovativeness and organisational citizenship behaviour through superior-subordinate relationship in the workplace. *Research and Practice in Human Resource Management, 13*(2), 16–30.

Jamal, M. (1985). Relationship of job stress to job performance: A study of managers and blue-collar workers. *Human Relations, 38*(5), 409–424.

Jehn, K. A. (1995). A multimethod examination of the benefits and detriments of intragroup conflict. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 256–282.

Jehn, K. A., & Mannix, E. A. (2001). The dynamic nature of conflict: A longitudinal study of intragroup conflict and group performance. *Academy of management journal, 44*(2), 238–251.

Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction–job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological bulletin, 127*(3), 376.

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of management journal, 33*(4), 692–724.

Kanter, R. M. (1989). Power failure in management circuits. *Harvard Business Review*, 65–75.

Kets de Vries, M. (2010). Leadership Coaching and the Rescuer Syndrome:How to Manage Both Sides of the Couch. *INDEAD Working Paper*, 27.

Kotter, J. P. (1985). Power and influence. New York: Free Press.

Lingham, T. (2005a). Conversations as core to team experiences: A JIT measurement and mapping system to facilitate team directed learning and development. *ESADE Working Papers*, 1–51.

Lingham, T. (2005b). *Developing a measure for converstational learning spaces in team.* Case Western Reserve University Cleveland, OH.

Lingham, T. (2009). *An experiential approach to team interaction: Developing a measure to capture its diverse dimensions and aspects*. Paper presented at the INGRoup, Fourth Annual Conference, Colorado Springs, CO.

Lingham, T., & Richley, B. A. (2009). Measuring and mapping team interaction: A cross-cultural comparison of us and spanish mba students. *Cross-Cultural Management: An International Journal, 16*(1), 5–27.

Locke, E. A., Shaw, K. N., Saari, L. M., & Latham, G. P. (1981). Goal setting and task performance: 1969–1980. *Psychological bulletin, 90*(1), 125.

Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *The Leadership Quarterly, 7*(3), 385-425.

Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Li, W. (2005). The psychological capital of Chinese workers: Exploring the relationship with performance. *Management and Organization Review, 1*(2), 249–271.

Maslyn, J. M., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2001). Leader–member exchange and its dimensions: Effects of self-effort and other's effort on relationship quality. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(4), 697.

McKnight, D. H., Cummings, L. L., & Chervany, N. L. (1998). Initial trust formation in new organizational relationships. *Academy of management review, 23*(3), 473–490.

Mowday, R. T. (1978). The exercise of upward influence in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 137–156.

Pfeffer, J. (1993). *Managing with power: Politics and influence in organizations*: Harvard Business Press.

Polkinghorne, D. E. (2005). Language and meaning: Data collection in qualitative research. *Journal of counseling psychology, 52*(2), 137.

Poole, M. S., Seibold, D. R., & McPhee, R. D. (1985). Group decision-making as a structurational process. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 71*(1), 74–102.

Raven, B. H. (1964). *Social influence and power*. Retrieved from

Scandura, T. A., Graen, G. B., & Novak, M. A. (1986). When managers decide not to decide autocratically: An investigation of leader–member exchange and decision influence. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*(4), 579.

Simons, T. L., & Peterson, R. S. (2000). Task conflict and relationship conflict in top management teams: the pivotal role of intragroup trust. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(1), 102.

Tannenbaum, R., & Schmidt, W. H. (1958). *How to choose a leadership pattern*: Institute of Industrial Relations.

Thurmond, V. A. (2001). The point of triangulation. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship, 33*(3), 253–258.

Van De Ven, A. H. (2007). *Engaged scholarship: A guide for organizational and social reserach*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. Oxford, England: Wiley.

Wang, H., Law, K. S., Hackett, R. D., Wang, D., & Chen, Z. X. (2005). Leader-member exchange as a mediator of the relationship between transformational leadership and followers' performance and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of management journal, 48*(3), 420–432.

Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of management journal, 40*(1), 82–111.

Wilson, H. S., & Hutchinson, S. A. (1991). Triangulation of qualitative methods: Heideggerian hermeneutics and grounded theory. *Qualitative Health Research, 1*(2), 263–276.

Wondolleck, J. M., & Yaffee, S. L. (2000). *Making collaboration work: Lessons from innovation in natural resource managment*: Island Press.

Yukl, G. (2010). *Leadership in organizations* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall Pearson Education.

Yukl, G. A., & Heaton, H. (2002). Leadership in organizations.

Zaccaro, S. J., & McCoy, M. C. (1988). The effects of task and interpersonal cohesiveness on performance of a disjunctive group task. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 837–851.