Power, Authority and Influence:
A Comparative Study of the Behavioral Influence Tactics Used by Lay and Ordained Leaders in the Episcopal Church

by

Margaret Ann Faeth

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
in
Human Development

Albert Wiswell, Chair
Gabriella Belli
Marcie Boucouvalas
Jamie Callahan
Lee Warren

April 8, 2004

Falls Church, Virginia

Keywords: leadership, power, authority, influence tactics

Power, Authority and Influence: A Comparative Study of the Behavioral Influence Tactics Used by Lay and Ordained Leaders in the Episcopal Church

by
Margaret Ann Faeth
Albert Wiswell, Chair

(ABSTRACT)

Leadership is a social influence process that is necessary for the attainment of societal and organizational goals. Leadership is both conspicuous in its absence and mysterious in its presence – familiar and yet hard to define.

Leadership happens within the power and authority structures of organizations. The body of research on the influence processes of leadership has focused on organizations with clear hierarchical lines of power and authority between boss, subordinate and peer.

This dissertation was designed to study the influence processes of leadership within a religious denomination, the Episcopal Church in the United States of America (ECUSA). As a Christian community, ECUSA is guided by the biblical model of servant leadership as it was made known in the life, death and resurrection of Jesus.

To compare the behavioral influence tactics used by lay and ordained leaders in ECUSA, 152 participants completed the Episcopal Leadership Questionnaire and the agent version of the Influence Behavior Questionnaire (Yukl, 2000). In addition to demographic and contextual variables, participants identified the frequency of use of 11 behavioral influence tactics with a designated target (boss, subordinate, peer, or other/hard to define). Almost one-fifth of the respondents could not classify their influence target according to hierarchical categories.

The responses of 75 ordained and 77 lay leaders in ECUSA revealed few statistically significant differences between groups on the use of Yukl's 11 categories of behavioral influence tactics. Both groups used collaboration, consultation and rational persuasion most often. Inspirational appeals, ingratiation and legitimating tactics were used somewhat often. Apprising, coalition tactics, personal appeals, exchange were used infrequently by both groups. Pressure was almost never used as an influence tactic by either group. ANOVA and discriminant function analysis indicated a slight tendency for lay leaders to use collaboration, coalition tactics and exchange more often than ordained leaders. Men used legitimating tactics somewhat more often than women. Women used exchange tactics slightly more often than men. No statistically significant differences were observed in the use of influence tactics when age, type of ministry, education or technical/adaptive work perceptions were used as the categorical variable.

This study supported previous research on the directional use of influence tactics, while suggesting possibilities for future research in non-hierarchical organizations. Results also suggested a relationship between leaders' perceptions of their sources of power in the organization and their use of influence tactics. The paucity of statistically significant findings based upon ordination status and the clear presence of a non-hierarchical category of influence target suggest that the explanatory construct of servant leadership plays a role in the power, authority and influence processes of ECUSA.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am deeply grateful for the wisdom, collegiality, encouragement and patience of my dissertation committee. Bert Wiswell, Gabriella Belli, Marcie Boucouvalas, Jamie Callahan and Lee Warren supported me through a process that was longer and more rigorous than any of us might have imagined. When life's challenges sidetracked me, your encouragement helped me more than you can ever know. You have earned my admiration, respect and gratitude. Thank you for reminding me that leadership and scholarship are both important parts of my priestly vocation.

I am grateful to Dr. Gary Yukl for his permission to use the IBQ for this research, as well as his helpful suggestions along the way.

My bishop, the Right Reverend Peter James Lee and my boss, the Very Reverend Stephen Wade, have supported and affirmed me through every stage of this learning adventure. They live their vocation to servant leadership with extraordinary faith and grace. Their mentoring has been invaluable as I continue to develop my own capacities for leadership.

The congregation at Immanuel Church-on-the-Hill was patient and good-natured when this project diverted my time and attention from the day-to-day challenges of ordained ministry. The sabbatical granted by the congregation in the fall of 2003 was a gift for which I am truly grateful. The "great cloud of witnesses" that surrounds me in the congregation, the Diocese of Virginia, and the Episcopal Church, remind me that the Spirit of God is continually working wonders in the lives of women and men. It is a joy and privilege to serve among you.

The dean and faculty of Virginia Theological Seminary supported my doctoral study with generous grants from the Bell-Woolfall scholarship fund. Thank you for your commitment to nurture a community of lifelong learners.

My friend and classmate, Tina Chindgren Wagner served as cheerleader and chaplain throughout this entire process. She listened carefully, asked all the right questions and kept me calm and confident. Tina, I am blessed and honored by your friendship and inspired by your own commitment to scholarship.

One of my earliest memories was the pleasure of reading with my parents. They instilled in me a curiosity and love of learning that has been a great source of joy and satisfaction. Thank you Mama and Daddy for your love and support.

My most heartfelt thanks and love go to my husband and children. They endured the inevitable disruptions to family plans with grace and good humor. They ate more take-out pizza and leftovers than they would have wished. They stepped over piles of books and journal articles and endured my short temper when the statistics got the better of me. When tragedy struck and nothing else seemed sure, we lived and learned and loved in the certainty that love hopes all things, believes all things and endures all things. Paul, Sean and Chelsea – this work is dedicated to you with my love and gratitude.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER IV – RESULTS

CHAPTER V – SUMMARY, DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I
OVERVIEW OF THE RESEARCH
Leadership and the Episcopal Church

Leadership is an essential part of the attainment of social and organizational goals. The need for effective leadership pervades our social process from the election of political representatives to the education of children. We expect leadership from our presidents, our principals and our preachers. It is paradoxical, therefore, that leadership is both commonly understood and difficult to define. Leadership is conspicuous in its absence and mysterious in its presence. The abundance of literature on leadership, both in the popular press and in scholarly literature bears witness to the ongoing quest for a better understanding of this social phenomenon.

One organization that is vitally interested in the process of leadership is the Episcopal Church in the United States of America (ECUSA). Like many mainstream Christian denominations, ECUSA is declining in membership (Holland & Sachs, 1999, p. 57). Theological disputes over the ordination of women, the nature of human sexuality and the interpretation of scripture have led to conflict within ECUSA. A large percentage of ECUSA's ordained clergy are nearing retirement (Wind & Rendle, 2001, p.5). Despite these challenges, however, the commitment and enthusiasm of the denomination's members has remained steady. Throughout the United States, Episcopalians are heeding the gospel imperative to "Go into all the world and preach the gospel." (Mark 16:15, New Revised Standard Version). Giving to the denomination has increased (Griswold, 2002). Individual congregations are initiating new and exciting programs to share the good news of God's love, and to respond compassionately to the need for social justice, freedom and peace (Holland & Sachs, 1999). Seminary enrollments have increased and new educational programs have emerged to prepare new leaders, both lay and ordained, for the work of ministry (Wind & Rendle, 2001).

There are, however, significant challenges facing both lay and ordained leaders in ECUSA. The election of a non-celibate gay bishop in the Diocese of New Hampshire and the subsequent endorsement of that election by the General Convention of the denomination in the summer of 2003 have brought important issues to the forefront of denominational attention. Differences of interpretation on the authority of scripture, the role of tradition and reason, and the understanding of human sexuality threaten the unity of a denomination that has typically been identified with tolerance and moderation. Within ECUSA and the larger Anglican Communion, the pain of such change has become intolerable for some. As of this writing, congregations and dioceses across ECUSA are experiencing the consequences of financial withholding and the loss of members. Adaptive leadership is necessary to prevent schism or to deal with its impact on the ECUSA.

The mission and ministry of ECUSA in the 21st century depend upon the skills and preparation of the men and women who will serve as leaders in the Church. Successful leadership development programs should be based upon a clear understanding of the roles such leaders will play. There is, however, some ambiguity regarding the differences between lay and ordained leadership in ECUSA. The organizational models employed by leadership researchers traditionally employ clear categorical distinctions between a leader's superiors, peers and subordinates. These distinctions are inadequate to describe the lines of authority in a religious organization where some functions such as worship and administration operate along clear hierarchical processes while other, equally important, functions such as mission and outreach, do not conform to hierarchical models.

By virtue of their baptisms, all members of ECUSA are commissioned for participation in the life, worship and governance of the Church. Some members are called to leadership through the process of ordination; others exercise their leadership through ministries in the parish, diocese or wider community. Both lay and ordained leaders may lead small groups or large organizations. Both types of leaders may lead simultaneously within the church hierarchy and outside of it. There is little research however, on the leadership behaviors that distinguish between these two types of church leaders. Understanding the similarities and differences between these two groups of leaders is important for the process of developing effective programs to train and empower future church leaders.

At its most basic, leadership is a social influence process (Bass & Stodgill, 1990). Leadership researchers have found that leaders employ a variety of strategies to influence the behavior of others. The use of these tactics is a function of several conditions, including sources of power, lines of authority, nature of the task and desired outcome (Yukl, Guinan, & Sottolano, 1995). One system of classification is Yukl's taxonomy of behavioral influence tactics. This taxonomy includes 11 behavioral influence tactics employed by leaders in the exercise of their leadership (Yukl 2000). This classification scheme was developed over a decade of research in a variety of organizations. Behavioral influence tactics have been useful in examining the differences between the behaviors of leaders in different levels of a hierarchical organization (Yukl & Falbe, 1991) and the differences in influence behaviors between managers and their superiors, peers and subordinates (van Knippenberg, van Knippenberg, Blaauw & Vermunt, 1999). Such tactics have not been studied, however, in the Episcopal Church, where traditional lines of power and authority have been dismantled and redefined by the concept of servant leadership.

Purpose of the Dissertation

The purpose of this dissertation was to examine the differences in the use of behavioral influence tactics by lay and ordained leaders in the ECUSA. I examined the differences between these two groups of leaders in terms of their reported use of 11 behavioral influence tactics identified by Yukl (2000). These tactics include: rational persuasion, inspirational appeal, consultation, collaboration, apprising, personal appeal, coalition tactics, pressure, ingratiation, exchange and legitimating tactics. See Table 1.1 for definitions of each influence tactic. Other demographic and contextual variables such as age, sex, level of education, type of ministry, and length of tenure were examined. Subjects' perception of organizational power bases and technical and adaptive work are included. The importance of this study lies in its contribution to the understanding of the differences in influence tactics deployed by lay and ordained leaders in the ECUSA and the corresponding insights into the implications for religious leadership development in that organization.

Table 1.1

Yukl's Classification of Proactive Influence Tactics

Rational Persuasion: The agent uses logical arguments and factual evidence to show that a proposal or request is feasible, that it is relevant for attaining important task objectives.

Apprising: The agent explains how carrying out a request or supporting a proposal will benefit the target personally or will help to advance the target person's career.

Inspirational Appeals: The agent appeals to the target's values and ideals or seeks to arouse the target person's emotions to gain commitment for a request or proposal.

Consultation: The agent asks the target person to express concerns and suggest improvements for a proposed project, activity, or change for which the target person's support is desired.

Collaboration: The agent offers to provide relevant resources and assistance if the target will carry out a request or approve a proposed change.

Ingratiation: The agent uses praise and flattery before or during an attempt to influence the target person to carry out a request or support a proposal.

Personal Appeals: The agent asks the target to carry out a request or support a proposal out of friendship or loyalty, or asks for a personal favor before saying what it is.

Exchange: The agent offers an incentive, suggests an exchange of favors, or indicates willingness to reciprocate at a later time if the target will do what the agent requests.

Coalition Tactics: The agent seeks the aid of others to persuade the target to do something, or uses the support of others as a reason for the target to agree with a request.

Legitimating Tactics: The agent seeks to establish the legitimacy of a request or to verify that he/she has the authority to make it by referring to rules and formal policies or presenting supporting documents.

Pressure: The agent uses demands, threats, frequent checking, or persistent reminders to influence the target to do what he/she wants.

Statement of the Problem

There has been very little empirical research in the field of religious leadership. Consequently, there is little objective understanding of the similarities and differences between lay and ordained leadership.

There are clearly some differences in the contexts in which lay and ordained leaders in the ECUSA exercise their leadership. It is the understanding of the ECUSA that all baptized persons are called to serve God and exercise leadership. Lay and ordained persons share in the mission and ministry of the Church. There are, however, some functions of religious leadership in the ECUSA that remain the exclusive domain of the ordained clergy. Ordination confers the authority to administer the sacraments, to pronounce the absolution of sin and to confer God's blessing. Within congregations, Episcopal clergy are charged with tending the spiritual welfare of the congregation. Lay leaders exercise a variety of functions but must be licensed to assist in the leadership of public worship. Bishops are elected by the clergy and laity of the diocese in which they will serve. Once elected they exercise administrative and pastoral oversight over that diocese. The ordination rites of priests and deacons include vows of obedience to the bishop (Book of Common Prayer, p. 526). All clergy however, also commit themselves to serve both God and humanity, with a special emphasis on service to the powerless (BCP, p. 543). Leadership in the Church, lay and ordained, is commonly understood in terms of Jesus' model of servant leadership (BCP, p. 305).

By virtue of their baptisms, however, lay leaders enjoy a degree of autonomy and freedom of initiative that is unusual in other organizations. Many of the denomination's social justice, outreach and educational initiatives are the result of the vision, energy and leadership of the laity. Many lay leaders have sought continuing education, either formal or informal, to prepare themselves for the challenges of ministry. In contrast to the standard course of theological education and professional preparation required for clergy, however, the options for theological education of lay leaders are scarce, often unsupervised and poorly coordinated.
An important first step in improving the opportunities for theological training and leadership development for both lay and ordained leaders is to understand the current similarities and differences between these two groups in the ECUSA. One of the ways in which leaders may differ is in the choice of the tactics they employ to influence their followers. Research has indicated that the choice of such tactics is influenced by a variety of factors including position in

the organization, structure of the organization, nature of the task, importance and difficulty of the task and degree of cooperation required (Yukl & Tracey, 1992). To some extent, the leadership issues faced by the ECUSA are representative of other mainstream Protestant denominations. ECUSA stands as a bridge denomination between the hierarchical and authoritative structure of the Roman Catholic tradition and the more egalitarian style of many Protestant denominations. The complex configuration of power and authority in the ECUSA offers an interesting framework in which to study the influence processes used by lay and ordained leaders in their practice of ministry.

Research Questions

In this dissertation I examined the differences in the use of behavioral influence tactics by lay and ordained leaders in the ECUSA. The research questions are:

(1) What behavioral influence tactics do lay leaders in the ECUSA deploy most often in the exercise of their ministries?

(2) What behavioral influence tactics do ordained leaders in the ECUSA deploy most often in the exercise of their ministries?

(3) What patterns of behavioral influence tactics differentiate between lay and ordained leaders in the ECUSA?

(4) What is the relationship between various demographic and contextual variables and the use of behavioral influence tactics for lay and ordained leaders in the ECUSA?

Because the instrument used to answer these questions measured the leaders' perceptions of their influence tactic use, all results refer to perceived use. Previous research comparing the similarities between the influence tactics used by leaders and those reported by their influence targets suggested that agent, target and observer perceptions were similar (Yukl, Chavez & Seifert, in press). Proving the relationship between perceived and actual use was beyond the scope of this research but similarities between the two were assumed.

Expectations

Lay and ordained leaders draw upon different sources of power and authority in the exercise of leadership. Therefore, preliminary expectations included the supposition that these two groups of church leaders might differ in the patterns and frequency of particular behavioral influence tactics.

Ordained leaders were believed to be more likely to use rational persuasion than lay leaders. Research has shown that the efficacy of persuasion is moderated by the credibility of the influence agent (Case & Keys, 1990). Because the theological education of clergy equips them to function as subject matter experts in matters of ministry they are likely to be granted some degree of functional credibility. Furthermore, cultural stereotypes have traditionally portrayed clergy as honest and ethical. To the extent that such stereotypes still exist, they are likely to convey some degree of social credibility on the ordained leader.

Ordained leaders might also be expected to use inspirational appeals more frequently than lay leaders. Inspirational appeals have been shown to be among the most effective influence tactics (Yukl & Tracey, 1992). Appeals to values and norms are risky, however, unless those values and norms are shared by the target of the influence attempt. By virtue of their public roles as preachers and teachers, clergy have more opportunities to articulate and influence values and social norms.

Ordained leaders were also believed to be more likely to use legitimating tactics than lay leaders. By virtue of their official position in the organization, ordained leaders can draw upon scripture, tradition or the constitutions and canons of the Episcopal Church to legitimate their requests.

The same power and authority structures that enhance clergy influence can constrain the use of some tactics. By virtue of their ordination vows, Episcopal clergy are guided by the doctrine, discipline and worship of the denomination. When such constraints dictate the course of action, clergy may be less likely to use consultation than lay leaders.

Ordained leaders may, however, have better access to the financial and informational resources of the organization. Since collaboration involves the promise of assistance from one who has access to resources (Yukl, 2000), I hypothesized that ordained leaders would be more likely to use collaboration than lay leaders.

As power increases, the need for coalition support decreases (Dubrin, 1998). Ordained leaders can draw upon both their personal power and the power of the church in the exercise of their ministry. Ordained leaders may be perceived as more powerful than lay leaders. It was expected therefore, that lay leaders would use coalition tactics more frequently than ordained leaders.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions are offered for purposes of clarity within this study. As the field of leadership research advances, such definitions will, properly, become the subject of refinement and clarification.

Leadership is a process of proactive social influence (Hollander & Julian, 1969) intended to change the behavior, beliefs or values of followers.

Authority is power conferred for a purpose (Heifetz, 1994).

Power is a potential or capacity for action, defined by Raven and French as “the maximum force which A can induce on B minus the maximum resisting force which B can mobilize in the opposite direction” (Raven & French, 1958a; Raven & French, 1958b).

Influence is the ability to affect the behavior of others in an intended direction (Cohen, et al, 1992, p. 139).

Influence tactics are the proactive strategies used to influence others. (See Table 1.1).

An **Agent** is the person who initiates an influence attempt.

A **Target** is the subject of an influence attempt.

Significance of the Study

As the ECUSA faces the challenges of a new millennium, leadership development will play an important role in the Church's ability to respond to the imperatives of the gospel. This study contributes to the understanding of the contexts and processes in which men and women, both lay and ordained, exercise leadership in ministry. Improved understanding of the similarities and differences between lay and ordained leaders offers insights into the need for relevant and effective methods of training and developing the leaders of the future.

The study of influence processes is one of the more recent developments in the field of leadership research. The research to date has focused on organizations where the lines of authority were clearly delineated. By focusing this research within an organization where leadership operates through service and where "the last shall be first and the first shall be last" (Matthew 20:16), this dissertation offers a unique insight into the influence processes of variant organizational structures.

Delimitations and Limitations of the Dissertation

The ECUSA is a denomination with a unique organizational structure, not entirely like any other denomination. It is both hierarchical and democratic. The emphasis on servant leadership, combined with the unique organizational structure, makes the ECUSA an interesting and challenging subject of study. Descriptions of the lines of authority between leaders and followers may include both hierarchical lines and more ambiguous relationships between servant leaders and those with whom they exercise their ministries. To the extent that some of these characteristics may be shared by other religious organizations, the results may or may not be generalizable. The choice of subjects exclusively from the ECUSA is intended to avoid confounding factors. That same choice however, limits the generalizability of results.

Statistical procedures that use predictor variables to distinguish between groups generally require large sample sizes. In order to maximize the response rate from a limited pool of possible subjects, I used the self-reporting agent version of Yukl's Influence Behavior Questionnaire (IBQ), rather than a more complicated multi-rater target version. The agent version of the questionnaire, however, is subject to self-reporting bias and may be less accurate than the target version (Yukl, personal correspondence, August 2001).

The purpose of this dissertation was to study the differences in the ways two groups of leaders use a particular set of behavioral influence tactics. Yukl's IBQ measures the frequency of use of each of the 11 influence tactics. While frequency of use may indicate a preference for a particular tactic, frequency may also be a function of the expected utility of the tactic in a particular leadership context. This study can only infer the effectiveness of influence tactics to the extent that effective leaders tend to choose the tactics that they have found to be most effective or least costly. Unlike some studies that have evaluated the results of influence attempts in terms of resistance, compliance or commitment (Falbe & Yukl, 1992), I did not attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of behavioral influence tactics.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview

We have defined leadership as a proactive social influence process intended to change the behavior, beliefs or values of followers. This definition integrates several streams of organizational and leadership study including the sources of social power and authority, the nature of the relationship between leader and follower and the influence processes that mediate that relationship. This chapter includes a historical review of the development of a body of knowledge in each of these areas and a review of the seminal research that informs the field of study.

Power and Authority

As early as the 1920's, management theorists noted the importance of social influence in the attainment of organizational goals (Follett, 1926). The earliest literature in the field of scientific management pointed to the central role of manager/subordinate relationships in the promotion of initiative, effort and efficiency (Taylor, 1911). As organizations became the subject of social science research, as in the Hawthorn studies at the Western Electric Company (Mayo, 1933; Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939), it became evident that the human factor introduced an element of complexity into the study of organizations. Leadership, motivation, human behavior, power and influence became the defining themes of human resource theory (Shafritz & Ott, 1996).

Lewin (1941) revolutionized the study of leadership by introducing the concept of social power in terms of the differential between interpersonal force and resistance. Following Lewin, French and Raven described leadership in terms of differential power relationships. In their classic research on the bases of social power, French and Raven described five bases of power: reward power, coercive power, legitimate power, referent power and expert power (Raven & French, 1958a; Raven & French, 1958b). In French and Raven's taxonomy, reward power is defined as the agent's ability to provide the target with desired outcomes such as pay increases or job promotions.   Coercive power is the agent's ability to effect negative consequences, such as a demotion or transfer to a less desirable assignment. Legitimate power is the agent's right to make a request, based upon their official position in the organization, as perceived by the target.

Referent power refers to the agent's ability to seek the target's response, based upon the target's desire to please the agent. Expert power is derived from the perceived expertise of the agent, gained by experience, education or training (French & Raven, 1959). Upon further refinement, a sixth base of power, informational power, was added to the taxonomy (Raven, 1965).

Although critics have noted that French and Raven's sources of power are neither conceptually distinct nor defined in a parallel way (Bass & Stodgill, 1990), their work has remained an important foundation for subsequent research in power and authority. Hinkin and Schriesheim (1989) offered a revision of French and Raven's model that attempted to overcome the conceptual criticisms. Each of these re-defined sources of power offers insight into the structure of power and authority within the ECUSA.

Hinkin and Schriesheim (1989), following French and Raven (1959), define reward power as the ability to offer things the target desires or to remove things that the target does not desire. From an organizational perspective, reward power only plays a minor role in the power structure of the Episcopal Church. Medieval ecclesiology vested the Church with a substantial amount of reward power. The Church was the mediator between God and humanity. Control of the sacraments meant control of the ultimate reward - eternal salvation. Modern Episcopal ecclesiology defines the mission of the Church as "the restoration of all people to unity with God in Christ, a mission carried out by all its members through worship, prayer, proclamation and the promotion of justice, peace and love" (Book of Common Prayer, p. 855). Nevertheless, the Church is still perceived as the repository of some intangible rewards including meaning, purpose, belonging and truth. While such rewards are not the exclusive domain of the Church, they are among the most important to seekers.

Coercive power is the opposite of reward power. In contrast to some fundamentalist denominations, the ECUSA does not employ the threat of immediate or eternal punishment to gain religious compliance. Much of the coercive power in the ECUSA actually rests with the followers. In many cases, it is the laity who act as the influence agents, in an attempt to coerce their leaders. Church members are free to withhold their financial support and enjoy complete freedom of movement within the denomination. An Episcopalian who finds the worship, programs or leadership of the congregation disagreeable can simply transfer their membership to another congregation. Some may exercise their coercion in place, refusing to lend their time, money or effort to church programs. After the Bishop of Virginia voted at the triennial General

Convention of ECUSA to approve the consecration of a non-celibate gay bishop who was duly elected by another diocese, the diocesan budget suffered a reduction in pledge support from congregations totaling approximately $900,000 from 2003 to 2004 – a reduction of almost 25% (Journal of the 209th Annual Council of the Diocese of Virginia, 2004).

Hinkin and Schriesheim (1989) identified legitimate power as the ability to make another person feel obligated or responsible. French and Raven (1959) identified three sources of legitimate power: cultural values, position authority, and designation by a legitimate agent. The establishment of authority through legitimate power is an important function of church leadership. People are more likely to follow an appointed or elected leader than one who emerges from the group (Bass & Stodgill, 1990). Clergy leaders in the ECUSA are ordained in a line of apostolic succession that dates back to the earliest Church. Rectors are selected by a congregation and approved and installed by the bishop. In the installation service, clergy are vested with powerful symbols of their authority. They are given a Bible as a symbol of the authority to proclaim the Word of God, water as a symbol of the power to baptize, clerical vestments as symbols of the authority of pastor and priest, a prayer book as a symbol of their responsibility to lead worship, oil as a symbol of the responsibility for healing and reconciliation, keys to the church as a reminder to extend God's hospitality, a copy of the Constitution and Canons of the Church as a symbol of their connection with the larger Church, and bread and wine as symbols of the power to administer the sacraments (*Celebration of a New Ministry*, Book of Common Prayer, p. 561-562). These symbols serve as reminders of the legitimate authority of the clergy to exercise leadership in the organization. Beyond that, the ritual and symbols of the church point to the greater authority of God to order and direct the community of faith. In the Anglican tradition, that authority is delegated through scripture, reason and tradition. While such authority is essential for Church governance and for the articulation of values and mission, it has often served an unintended purpose by drawing a false distinction between the roles of the clergy and the laity. Although the clergy carry out particular functions, the mission of the Church is the work of all the baptized. Long before the clergy are legitimized for a particular function in the Church, they are legitimized for ministry through their baptism. In practice, however, ordination continues to play a role in the establishment and maintenance of legitimate clergy power.

The fourth type of power identified in the French and Raven taxonomy is referent power. Referent power is “the ability to administer to another person’s feelings of personal acceptance or approval” (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 1989). When a follower wants the approval and acceptance of a leader, the leader wields referent power. Studies have shown that followers who perceive the approval and acceptance of their leader tend to perform better, report greater job satisfaction and role clarity, and achieve better attendance (Podsakoff & Schriesheim, 1985). But Bass (1960) noted that referent power can be lost if the one who seeks approval fails to find it. Eventually, such rejections become too painful and are replaced by the follower’s rejection of the leader’s power. Clinical pastoral training of clergy includes a warning of the risks of a therapeutic phenomenon called transference in which a parishioner or counselee projects their perception of desirable traits onto the clergy. This phenomenon points to the presence of a certain mystique and admiration of the clergy role, whether or not that perception is based in reality. Such a perception can enhance and/or distort the referent power of the clergy. A similar type of power may accrue also to the successful lay leader in the Church. Those who are admired for their efficiency, creativity, charisma or other desirable traits gain referent power as others seek to emulate them and gain approval.

The fifth form of power identified by French and Raven is expert power. Expert power is the power wielded by those who possess the particular knowledge and skills needed by the organization. This is a significant part of the clergy’s base of social power. The preparation for ordained ministry in the Episcopal Church is rigorous and selective. Almost all Episcopal clergy have earned Master’s degrees; many have earned doctorates (Dudley & Roozen, 2001). The three year long course of divinity training includes the study of scripture, history, theology, liturgics, education, ethics, biblical languages, parish administration and pastoral care. Internships and hospital chaplaincy training provide experience in pastoral settings. Ordained leaders attain expert power by possessing the knowledge, wisdom and experience necessary to solve problems and provide meaning within the Church. Followers are quick to grant power to those perceived as experts (Bass, 1960). By virtue of their theological training, even newly ordained clergy are granted a measure of expert power. This expert power tends to increase with experience.

There are responsibilities associated with the expert power granted to ordained leaders. The power to preach is the power to influence attitudes and articulate action agendas. The power to teach is the power to define the ways that meaning will be constructed. This power can be used to encourage personal exploration and spiritual growth or it can be used as a powerful means of coercion. Expert power can be used to help others find God or it can be misused in the attempt to establish the expert as the keeper of the keys to the Kingdom.

Within French and Raven's taxonomy of social power, expert and legitimate power have been shown to be the most effective and enduring (Podsakoff & Schriesheim, 1985). By understanding the power configurations of their own organization, lay and ordained leaders can learn to lead more effectively.

Power and authority are closely related but conceptually distinct constructs. Weber (1947) noted that the exercise of power is legitimated through authority. Authority is derived from real or implied perceptions of the leader's position in the organization or from the leader's knowledge and expertise (Bass, 1990). Heifetz (1994) defined authority as "power granted for a purpose." As particular beliefs, perceptions and positions become accepted within a group or organization, those within that group are united in a common perspective and come to expect and value certain patterns of influence (Pheffer, 1981).

Authority may be either formal or informal. Formal authority is derived from a recognized organizational structure with delineated lines of responsibility and influence. Informal authority may exist outside of discernible organizational role definitions. Barnard (1938) observed that authority is granted by subordinates and noted the conditions that increased or decreased subordinates' compliance. Followers will comply with authority if the orders are understood, are consistent with the objectives of the organization, are compatible with the interests of the subordinate and are within the physical and mental capabilities of the subordinate (Barnard, 1938). Under these criteria, authority may be granted to those whose knowledge or experience equips them for leadership, even if they are not formally designated within the organizational structure.

Authority is power that has been legitimated by the consent of followers, not by coercion or force. Tradition, religion and social contracts are often the sources of legitimate authority (Burns, 1978). In formal organizations, such as the Church, the degree of authority granted to a leader coincides with their legitimate power. Research in the field of legitimation theory demonstrates that power and prestige are initially conveyed through cultural expectations but must be reinforced through the consensual validation of followers (Ridgeway & Berger, 1986; Berger, Ridgeway, Fisek & Norman, 1998).

Servant Leadership

The patterns of consent, validation and legitimation that define the process of leadership often assume a hierarchical relationship between leader and follower. But these reciprocal influence processes are modified in the concept of servant leadership. The apparent paradox of servant leadership is set forth in Christian scripture as the appropriate model for the followers of Jesus:

> You know that among the Gentiles those who they recognize as their rulers lord it over them, and their great ones are tyrants over them. But it is not so among you; but whoever wishes to become great among you must be your servant, and whoever wishes to be first among you must be slave of all. For the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many.
>
> (Mark 10:42-45)

The development of an organized hierarchy of bishops, priests, deacons and laity in the early church was intended to facilitate service. Augustine of Hippo, one of the leaders of the early Church wrote to followers:

> For you I am a bishop, but with you I am a Christian. The first is an office accepted; the second is a gift received. One is danger, the other is safety. If I am happier to be redeemed with you than to be placed over you, then I shall, as the Lord commanded, be more fully your servant.

Historically, Church leaders have often been unfaithful to Jesus' model of servant leadership. The power of the clergy has frequently been misused to dominate and exploit others. The Crusades, the Spanish Inquisition and the contemporary crisis in the Roman Catholic Church regarding sexual misconduct by the clergy and the failure of Church authorities to take disciplinary action, all point to inhumane and unholy corruptions of power, authority and influence. But despite this ongoing pattern of exploitation, the integrity and power of true servant leadership continues to manifest God's creative and redeeming power in the lives of women and men. The late, beloved Mother Teresa, whose Sisters of Charity have fed, clothed and sheltered tens of thousands of Calcutta's 'untouchables' described her ministry as "doing small things with great love."

Servant leadership entered into the body of contemporary management literature through the work of Robert Greenleaf, a career executive at AT & T, where he was once referred to as the "kept revolutionary" (Frick and Spears, 1996). Throughout his long career in management and his subsequent vocation as an author, educator and philosopher, Greenleaf directed his attention to the phenomenon of change as it was manifested in organizations and, most importantly, in the lives of human beings.   Greenleaf believed that the best leaders were those who were not only able to accomplish tasks but could also change people. In his first book, *The Servant as Leader*, Greenleaf defined servant leadership:

> The servant leader is a servant first…. It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead….The difference manifests itself in the care taken by the servant – first to make sure that other people's highest-order priority needs are being served. The best test, and the most difficult to administer, is: Do those served grow as persons? Do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? And, what is the effect on the least privileged in society; will they benefit or, at least, not be further deprived? (Greenleaf, 1970, p. 7)

Greenleaf understood the powerful forces exerted upon society by large organizations. He believed that organizations, and the people within them, had both the opportunity and the obligation to change society for the better by promoting justice, compassion and human growth. He wrote:

> I believe that caring for persons, the more able and the less able serving each other, is what makes a good society. Most caring was once person to person. Now much of it is mediated through institutions – often large, powerful, impersonal; not always competent; sometimes corrupt. If a better society is to

be built, one more just and more caring and providing opportunity for people to grow, the most effective and economical way, while supportive of the social order, is to raise the performance as servant of as many institutions as possible by new voluntary regenerative forces initiated within them by committed individuals, servants. Such servants may never predominate or even be numerous, but their influence may form a leaven that makes possible a reasonably civilized society (Greenleaf, 1988, p.1).

Recent history has challenged us with painful reminders of the capacity of self-serving individuals and organizations to inflict great harm on society. The accounting scandal at Enron, the misuse of funds at the United Way, and the cover-up of sexual abuse by Roman Catholic clergy have led to a call for integrity, ethics and accountability in individuals and organizations. The themes of servant leadership have begun to pervade the literature of management and organizational studies. Not only have these topics found their way into scholarly literature (Bass, 2000; Peterson, 2004; Senjaya and Sarros, 2002), they have also begun to dominate the management shelves of popular book retailers through the work of such authors as Block (1993), Covey (1990), De Pree (1989, 1992, 1997), and Senge (1995).

In a metaanalytic study of servant leadership literature, Spears (1998) identified ten characteristics of servant leadership: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community. To date, these characteristics have not been validated by empirical research. Ongoing research involves the development of taxonomies that would identify the skill set of servant leadership. Dennis and Winston (2003), following Page and Wong (2000) found that servant leadership was strongly associated with vision, service and empowerment. Russell and Stone (2002) corroborated the view that servant leadership is an attractive concept that has not yet been thoroughly tested by empirical methods.

For communities of faith, however, the lack of empirical validation is of little concern. Christian communities have been guided by the model of servant leadership for two thousand years. Each Holy Week, Christians throughout the world reenact the institution of the Eucharist on Maundy Thursday. The word Maundy is derived from the Latin “mandatum” - mandate or commandment. Jesus’ servant leadership was manifested in the washing of his disciples’ feet and his subsequent mandate to "love one another as I have loved you." For Christians, servant leadership is grounded in love and obedience. It is characterized by service, integrity, justice, compassion, and a particular concern for the marginalized.

Servant leadership is an alternative model for the deployment of power, authority and influence in organizations. It continues to be the model for ministry in ECUSA. Service is emphasized in the rites of initiation and ordination, in the context of worship and in the mission imperative of the gospel. Bennett Sims, retired Bishop of Atlanta, has defined the obligation of servant leaders "to honor the personal dignity and worth of all who are led, and to evoke, as much as possible their own innate creative power for leadership" (Sims, 1997, p. 10-11). This definition is closely aligned with Burns' (1978, p. 20) definition of transforming leadership:

> Transforming leadership occurs when one or more persons engage with others in a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality...But transforming leadership ultimately becomes moral in that it raises the level of human conduct and ethical aspiration of both leader and led, thus it has a transforming effect on both.

Transformation is the work of the Church and servant leadership is the means through which mission and ministry are enacted.   If ECUSA is to continue the transforming work of leadership in the congregation, community and culture, it is important to understand how servant leadership affects the power structures and influence processes of the denomination.

For this dissertation, servant leadership was not a research variable. Instead, servant leadership was an important explanatory construct, used to articulate the unique context in which the power, authority and influence processes of leadership are exercised in ECUSA.

Influence tactics

Influence is the means through which power and authority are transacted.   Power is defined in terms of potential or capacity for action. In the same way, authority refers to the organizational or situational mediators of power. Together, power and authority determine the resources and perceptions that undergird social interaction. Kanter (1979) identified the two capacities of effective power: access to resources and the ability to obtain cooperation. This second capacity refers to the exercise of influence.

Influence is determined by, but not identical to, power and authority. Empirical research has demonstrated that power and influence behavior are distinct constructs (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 1990; Yukl, Kim & Falbe, 1996). Influence refers to the processes by which power is exercised and authority is legitimated. Influence translates the potentialities of power and authority into the realized action of leadership.

Yukl (1998, p. 207) has called the study of influence the “bridge between the power approach and the behavior approach to leadership.” One of the more recent developments in the field of leadership research has been the translation of earlier taxonomies of power and authority into dynamic models that attempt to explain influence processes. Kelman (1958) developed a tripartite description of influence processes that distinguished between instrumental compliance, internalization and identification. Instrumental compliance refers to those processes wherein the agent’s power is determined by control over rewards and punishments. Internalization occurs when the target’s compliance is based upon a connection between their values and beliefs and the nature of the task. The process of identification is closely related to the concept of referent power. In this type of influence process the agent relies upon the target’s need for acceptance or esteem to gain compliance (Kelman, 1974). Kipnis (1976) developed the Power Act Model, which attempts to explain a rational process whereby leaders choose influence strategies based upon their social resources, the constraints upon their use of power, the anticipated resistance of the target and the perceived costs and benefits of various influence tactics. Similarly, Raven (1992) built upon his earlier work on the bases of social power by developing the Power/Interaction Model of Interpersonal Influence. This model depicts the process of interpersonal influence in terms of the agent’s bases of power and leadership motivation, and the perceived costs and benefits of various influence strategies.

The descriptive power of these behavioral models was constrained by a lack of clarity regarding the classification of influence tactics. Marwell and Schmitt (1967) conducted some of the earliest empirical research on influence behavior. Through factor analysis they identified five categories of “compliance-gaining” behaviors including rewarding activity, punishing activity, expertise, activation of impersonal commitments, and activation of personal commitments. Kipnis, Schmidt & Wilkinson (1980) continued this line of research with their seminal study on the influence tactics used by people at work. Critical incidents research resulted in a list of 370 influence tactics grouped into 14 categories. Factor analysis refined those categories into eight dimensions of influence: assertiveness, ingratiation, rationality, sanctions, exchange, upward appeals, blocking and coalitions. Since then, a body of ongoing research (Kipnis & Schmidt, 1988; Schriesheim & Hinkin, 1990; Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl & Seifert, 2001) has produced similar classifications (Guerin, 1995; van Knippenberg et al., 1999). Related research (Kipnis, 1984; Kipnis & Schmidt, 1988; Tepper, Brown, & Hunt, 1993; Bruins, 1995) has delineated between "hard" and "soft" tactics, creating new meta-categories which are classified according to the "extent to which using particular influence tactics takes control over the situation and the target and does not allow the target any latitude in choosing whether to comply" (Tepper, Brown, & Hunt, 1993, p. 1906). This distinction between hard and soft influence tactics has been particularly helpful in research regarding the use of combinations and sequences of influence tactics (Case et al., 1988; Falbe & Yukl, 1992; Yukl, Falbe & Youn, 1993).

Research on the use of influence tactics has focused on a broad range of variables including direction of influence attempt (Mowday, 1978; Kipnis, Schmidt, & Wilkinson, 1980; Erez & Rim, 1982; Case et al., 1988; Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl & Tracey, 1992; Yukl, Guinan & Sottolano, 1995), objective of influence attempt (Kipnis, Schmidt & Wilkinson, 1980; Schmidt & Kipnis, 1984; Erez, Rim & Keider, 1986; Ansari & Kapoor, 1987; Yukl & Falbe, 1990; Yukl & Tracey, 1992; Yukl, Guinan & Sottolano, 1995), outcome of the influence attempt, personal and contextual variables (Ansari & Kapoor, 1987; Dubrin, 1991; Erez & Rim, 1982), frequency of tactic use (Schmidt & Kipnis, 1984; Yukl & Tracey, 1992), sequencing of influence tactics, combination of influence tactics (Schmidt & Kipnis, 1984), and effectiveness of tactic use (Mowday, 1978; Yukl & Tracey, 1992).

For the purposes of this dissertation, four of these variables were particularly relevant: direction of influence attempt, objective of influence attempt, outcome of influence attempt, and frequency of tactic use. Although the understanding of personal and contextual variables and the sequencing and combination of tactics are essential to the study of influence behavior and leadership, the complexity of some of these variables puts them outside of the scope of this study.

Influence behavior is enacted to change the behavior, beliefs and/or values of an individual or group. In each case, some sort of power/authority dynamic exists between the agent and the target of the influence attempt. The influence agent may be a subordinate trying to influence the boss. The agent may be a leader attempting to influence the behavior of follower/subordinates. The agent may be a leader without formal authority, who is trying to influence peers. Throughout the literature of influence behavior, it has been commonly understood that influence behavior is exerted in one of three directions - upward, downward or lateral. Recent research (Gupta & Case, 1999) has suggested a fourth direction of influence – directed outward to those outside of one's own organization. As the field of transorganizational studies develops, this aspect of influence will certainly gain greater attention as influence agents attempt to influence clients, funders and political processes. In ECUSA, the study of outward influence processes hold promise as the denomination seeks to attract new members among the unchurched. As the world changes, strategies for mission and ministry must include an understanding of the ways that influence behaviors affect those outside the institutional Church.

The use of influence tactics varies depending upon the direction of the influence attempt. Kipnis, Schmidt and Wilkinson (1980) evaluated the frequency of influence tactic use by 165 working business students by gathering data on critical incidents, which were then coded by type of tactic and direction of influence. The study indicated that rationality was the most common tactic in upward influence attempts; assertiveness and sanctions were used most often in downward attempts; and upward appeal, exchange of benefits and ingratiation were used in lateral attempts.

Erez and Rim (1982) studied the influence behavior of 125 managers and discovered that the choice of influence tactics was related not only to the direction of the influence attempt but also to the size of the organization, the profession of the manager and their span of control. As in Kipnis, Schmidt and Wilkinson's (1980) study, managers were most likely to use rationality to influence their bosses. Managers in large organizations, however, were more likely to exert influence in this direction than in smaller organizations where managers preferred to rely on coworkers. Managers with more than 16 subordinates were more likely to exercise negative forms of influence than those supervising a smaller group.

Case et al., (1988) studied the upward exercise of influence and developed descriptions of 21 different tactics used by subordinates to influence their bosses. Although these tactics were not evaluated for conceptual validity, they cover a broad range of tactics from threatening to quit to challenging the superior's power.

The direction of influence tactics has been the topic of ongoing research by Yukl and colleagues over the past decade (Yukl & Tracey, 1992; Yukl, Falbe & Youn, 1993). This research is summarized in Table 2.1. The two most recent additions to Yukl's (2000) taxonomy of influence tactics, apprising and collaboration, have not yet been examined for directional differences. Yukl and Seifert (2001) have hypothesized that apprising and collaboration are used least often in an upward direction.

Table 2.1

Directional Use of Yukl's Behavioral Influence Tactics

Type of Influence Tactic	**Commonly used in…**	**Occasionally used in…**
Rational persuasion	Upward influence attempts	Downward influence attempts Lateral influence attempts
Inspirational appeal	Downward influence attempts	Upward influence attempts Lateral influence attempts
Consultation	Downward influence attempts Lateral influence attempts	Upward influence attempts
Ingratiation	Downward influence attempts Lateral influence attempts	Upward influence attempts
Personal appeal	Lateral influence attempts	Downward influence attempts Upward influence attempts
Exchange	Downward influence attempts Lateral influence attempts	Upward influence attempts
Coalition tactics	Lateral influence attempts Upward influence attempts	Downward influence attempts
Legitimating tactics	Downward influence attempts Lateral influence attempts	Upward influence attempts
Pressure	Downward influence attempts	Lateral influence attempts Upward influence attempts
Apprising	Not yet examined	
Collaboration	Net yet examined	

The directional use of influence tactics has not been studied in organizations such as the Episcopal Church, where the lines of power and authority are ambiguous. In the present research, respondents who were serving as formal or non-formal leaders in church settings were asked to identify whether the target of their influence attempts is a peer, a subordinate or "hard to define." The "hard to define" classification was added because of the expectation that leaders might be unwilling or unable to articulate the power/authority configurations that typically define the peer and subordinate relationships that exist between leaders and followers.

Another important variable in the study of influence behavior is the objective of the influence attempt. People use influence in order to effect change. Building on prior research (Erez et al., 1986; Kipnis et al., 1980; Yukl and Falbe, 1990), Yukl, Guinan and Sottolano (1995) used diaries and influence incidents to identify five types of influence objectives: assign work, change behavior, obtain assistance, get support and obtain personal benefit. Influence attempts intended to give the target new tasks or assign new responsibilities were coded under the objective "assign work." "Change behavior" referred to attempts to get the target to do things better, faster or in a different way. Attempts to "get assistance" included the solicitation of help in tasks for which the agent was responsible. This objective included such requests as problem-solving, demonstration of an unfamiliar task, asking for information or asking the target to do some of the agent's work. "Get support" refers to attempts to gain approval, get resources or elicit the cooperation of others. Tangible and intangible rewards such as pay raises and promotions, group belonging, changes in personal status and personal favors are included in the "get personal benefit" objective (Yukl, Guinan & Sottolano, 1995, p. 276). This study indicated that assigning work and seeking a change in behavior were made most often in a downward direction; and that attempts to get support or gain personal benefits were usually directed upward. There was some support for their hypothesis that attempts to get assistance were mostly directed laterally. The research demonstrated that most of the nine influence tactics (rational persuasion, consultation, inspirational appeals, personal appeals, ingratiation, exchange, pressure, legitimating and coalition tactics) could be used effectively to assign work, change behavior, get assistance and get support. When an agent was seeking personal benefit, however, the choice of tactics was limited to personal appeals, exchange and pressure (Yukl, Guinan & Sottolano, 1995, p. 290-292).

Despite the lack of clear lines of institutional power and authority, each of the five influence objectives takes place in the Episcopal Church. Heifetz' (1994) definition of authority, "power conferred for a purpose," is helpful here. Within working groups that share both power and goals, authority may be conferred for such purposes as achieving influence objectives. In the absence of clear lines of authority influence agents are more likely to seek influence objectives that are deemed appropriate for lateral relationships. The coordinator of volunteer Sunday School teachers, for example, may be more likely to solicit assistance or support than assign work, seek a change in behavior or seek personal benefit. Assigning work and seeking a change in behavior are most likely to take place in the ECUSA in those instances where there is a clear line of authority. The rector of a parish is free to assign work to associate clergy or paid staff members in a manner that would seem inappropriately authoritative with parishioners. A diocesan bishop may require clergy or diocesan staff to participate in workshops on such topics as the prevention of sexual misconduct in order to influence behavior; but the same bishop would have little authority for demanding that all members of the denomination attend such classes.

Within the context of leadership in the ECUSA, the outcome of influence attempts deserves special consideration. Among the early research on influence outcomes was Barnard's (1938) description of the tendency of followers to exhibit various degrees of compliance, which he labeled "zones of indifference." Following Barnard, researchers have come to some general agreement on the three basic categories of influence outcomes - resistance, compliance and commitment. While the identification of influence outcomes is beyond the scope of this research, it is important to note that a voluntary organization such as ECUSA relies heavily upon the commitment of its members. As a multitude of vocational, recreational and service opportunities compete for the time, talent and treasure of human beings, the institutional Church cannot survive without the commitment of its members. Yukl, Kim and Falbe (1996) determined that consultation, inspirational appeals or strong rational persuasion without pressure were most likely to result in target commitment. The referent power of the agent also promoted target commitment. But the same study also found that content factors, such as task importance or enjoyability, influenced target commitment independent of agent power or influence tactics. This suggests that leaders in the Church who are seeking the commitment of followers, need to clearly articulate the importance of the task, maintain personal integrity and credibility, and create situations in which camaraderie, learning and enjoyment benefits outweigh the costs of participation.

Since the early research in the use of influence tactics, the frequency of tactic use has usually been studied in the context of other variables, particularly the direction of the influence attempts (Kipnis & Schmidt, 1988; Kipnis, Schmidt & Wilkinson, 1980). Yukl and Falbe (1991) explored the frequency of influence tactic use in relation to French and Raven's (1958) taxonomy of power. Yukl and Tracey (1992) studied the frequency of influence attempts as they pertained to managerial effectiveness and target task commitment. They noted that managerial effectiveness ratings were positively correlated with the use of consultation, inspirational appeal and rational persuasion. They also discovered strong correlations between the task commitment of peers and subordinates and the use of three influence tactics - exchange, personal appeal and ingratiation.

Technical and adaptive work

One of the most challenging distinctions in the field of leadership studies is the difference between management and leadership. The terms are often used interchangeably, but most believe that there is a qualitative difference. Proverbial wisdom has suggested that managers do things right, while leaders do the right thing. Heifetz (1994) has defined leadership as "the mobilization of adaptive work." This definition acknowledges the work inherent in changing the values, beliefs and behaviors of followers, while differentiating between technical and adaptive change. Heifetz was the first to identify the conceptual distinction between the technical work of management, in which there are fixed solutions, and the adaptive work of leadership, which requires the change in the attitudes, beliefs and norms of others. This is an important distinction in organizations such as ECUSA, where certain ritual functions are technical, with well-defined historical patterns and precedents, but where much of the important work of mission and ministry challenges followers to adaptive change.

Heifetz's definition of leadership as the mobilization of adaptive work makes sense in a religious organization that is theologically grounded in repentance, renewal and growth. Returning to the three outcome categories of resistance, compliance and commitment, it is evident that achieving the commitment of followers requires the leadership of adaptive change (Heifetz & Linsky 2002). To the extent that it can be measured, the degree to which one's work is technical or adaptive may become an interesting variable for exploration in the study of leadership influence tactics.

In this study, frequency of influence tactic use was used to explore possible differences between lay and ordained leaders in the ECUSA. Contextual variables such as perceptions of power bases and technical/adaptive work descriptions were analyzed. Other variables included sex, length of tenure, age, type of position held, and educational attainment.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

For this dissertation, a quantitative approach was utilized to examine the differences between lay and ordained leaders in the Episcopal Church (ECUSA). Descriptive statistics and multivariate analysis was used to look for differences between two groups of leaders in the ECUSA. Using a demographic questionnaire (the Episcopal Leadership Questionnaire) and the agent version of Yukl's (2000) Influence Behavior Questionnaire, I explored the use of behavioral influence tactics by lay and ordained leaders in the ECUSA.

Participants

The participants in this study included two groups of subjects within the same religious denomination. Participants were limited to adult members of the ECUSA in order to avoid confounding factors related to organizational hierarchy and its impact on power, authority and influence. The first groups of subjects included non-ordained (lay) leaders who were currently leading programs, groups or processes within the ECUSA. The second group of subjects consisted of ordained clergy within the same denomination who were currently exercising leadership in some capacity.

Some of the statistical techniques that were used, such as discriminant function analysis, require sufficient sample sizes to effectively discriminate between groups (Hair, et al., 1998). For the 11 categorical variables posed by Yukl's Influence Behavior Questionnaire (2000) I hoped to receive at least 125 usable surveys. In order to obtain sufficient sample sizes, subjects were recruited by two methods - advertisement and direct nomination. Advertisements were placed in denominational magazines and diocesan newsletters, soliciting participation in the study. The response to these advertisements was low – less than 20 potential candidates. Letters were also sent to groups of clergy including diocesan colleagues, seminary graduates, and active clergy listed in the Episcopal Church Annual, a register of all living, ordained clergy in the ECUSA. Cover letters solicited participants and nominations for participation of other exemplary leaders. Participants were also solicited directly by the researcher at the annual council of the Episcopal Diocese of Virginia. Several clergy colleagues returned uncompleted surveys with letters explaining that they were not currently serving in a leadership capacity.

The result of these solicitation methods was that very few of the respondents were self-selected. Most were either clergy exercising leadership, lay leaders who held elected positions, or lay leaders nominated by a clergy person.

Procedures

Copies of the Episcopal Leadership Questionnaire, including Yukl's Influence Behavior Questionnaire, were distributed to lay and ordained leaders in the ECUSA, along with cover letter (see Appendix B) and stamped return envelopes. The mailings consisted of two types of solicitations. The first type consisted of a single set – questionnaire, cover letter, and return envelope. The second type of mailing, which was sent to lay and ordained colleagues and seminary classmates of the researcher, included several complete sets along with a cover letter inviting the recipient to pass the extra questionnaire sets along to lay and ordained leaders of their acquaintance. Between the single set mailings and the multiple set packets, a total of 450 questionnaires were mailed out to 150 ordained and 75 lay leaders. Prior to the cutoff date, responses were received from 163 participants. The total response rate was 36%. Among the responses received before the cutoff date were 9 questionnaires that were not completed (most of those arrived with personal notes explaining the reasons they were not completed). Two questionnaires came back without sufficient usable data. The total number of usable questionnaires was 152, resulting in an adjusted response rate of 31.5%. Although follow-up postcards might have increased the overall response, the cost of postage was a constraining factor.

When completed questionnaires were received, postmark dates were coded on the questionnaires and the return envelopes were attached to the questionnaires. Responses from the questionnaires were entered into a spreadsheet, using SPSS statistical software. Data input was checked for out-of-range values. Statistical analysis was performed including descriptive statistics, ANOVA, MANOVA, and discriminant function analysis. Reliability measures were compared to previously published reliabilities of the IBQ.

Instrumentation

Episcopal Leadership Questionnaire

The Episcopal Leadership Questionnaire, designed for this study, consists of two parts. The first part of the instrument is the agent version of the Influence Behavior Questionnaire (Yukl, 2000). The IBQ was developed to measure the frequency of influence tactic use by the participants.

The second part of the Episcopal Leadership Questionnaire was designed to collect demographic, situational and contextual information from lay and ordained leaders in ECUSA. These variables were chosen to inform the results of the IBQ and to offer some additional perspective on the similarities and differences between lay and ordained leaders in that denomination.

Influence Behavior Questionnaire (IBQ)

Yukl's Influence Behavior Questionnaire (Yukl 2000) was developed to measure the use of 11 behavioral influence tactics used by leaders to influence others. There are two versions of the questionnaire. The target version measures these influence tactics from the perspective of the recipient of those tactics from a named agent. The target version requires that each subject solicit the cooperation of a person with whom they have interacted over a sustained period of time. One of the shortcomings of this method is the expectation of a sharply reduced response rate due to the extra effort required to locate a cooperative target. Another drawback is the expected response bias, as targets respond to the fear that their responses will somehow be seen by the agent. Finally, Yukl (personal correspondence, August 2001) has noted that the use of influence tactics is often subtle and that influence targets may be unaware of the tactics realized by the agents. Nevertheless, according to Yukl & Seifert (2001) the reliability of each of the target scale items indicates that the IBQ is an effective measure of the use of behavioral influence tactics (See Table 3.1).

Table 3.1
Psychometric Analysis of Influence Behavior Questionnaire (Target Version)

Method	**Results**
Factor Analysis	11 factors account for 73% of item variance.
Content validity	Coding accuracy between 77 – 95%
Internal consistency	Chronbach's alpha ranged from .75 (coalition tactics) to .89 (ingratiation).

According to the author of the instrument, the agent version of the IBQ, used here, is potentially less reliable than the target version because of self-reporting bias. Since self-reporting bias is caused in part by the perceived social desirability of answers, instruments such as the IBQ, where no answer is likely to be construed as more desirable than another, are somewhat less likely to be impacted by this response bias. Any response bias that might be present is somewhat offset by the ability of the agent to identify the particular tactics used in influence attempts. The agent version asks the subject to answer the scale questions with regard to a particular target, who is identified either as a subordinate, peer, boss or other (where other is described). In this dissertation, where subjects reported on their own leadership, targets were described as boss, peer, subordinate, or other/hard to define. Because the attainment of sufficient sample sizes was an important methodological concern, the agent version is simpler to use, avoids the necessity for the subject to obtain the cooperation of another, and enhances the probability of an adequate response rate.

The IBQ consists of 11 scales based on the behavioral influence tactics. Each scale consists of 3 - 5 items, randomly distributed throughout the instrument. The "legitimating tactics" and "personal appeal" scales each consist of three items. The "rational persuasion" and "inspirational appeal" scales each include five items. The remaining seven tactic scales are comprised of four items. To complete the IBQ, the subject was asked to respond according to a 5 point Likert scale, with responses ranging from "I can't remember ever using this tactic with him/her" to "I use this tactic very often with him/her." Influence tactics and sample scale items are shown in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2

Influence Behavior Questionnaire – Sample scale items

Tactic	**Sample item**
Rational persuasion	Use facts and logic to make a persuasive case for a request or a proposal.
Exchange	Offer to do a specific task for the person in return for carrying out a request for you.
Ingratiation	Praise the person's skill and knowledge before asking him/her to do something for you.
Apprising	Explain how a proposed activity or change would help the person's career.
Pressure	Demand that the person carry out a request promptly.
Inspirational Appeal	Use stirring, emotional language to build enthusiasm for a proposed activity or change.
Collaboration	Offer to help implement a change if the person agrees to make it.
Legitimating tactics	Say that your request is consistent with organization rules and policies.
Consultation	Ask a person to help plan an activity that you want him/her to support or carry out.
Personal appeal	Ask the person to do something for you as a friend.
Coalition tactics	Ask someone else to help influence the person to implement a request or support a proposal.

Contextual measures

Leadership is an influence process that always takes place in a social context. Two contextual variables were included in this research. These variables, base of social power and technical/adaptive work scores, refer to the broader contexts in which leadership can occur. The first contextual variable refers to the agent's perception of the type and degree of power they hold in their leadership context, as defined by French & Raven's (1959) bases of social power. The second contextual variable describes the degree to which the participant's leadership is technical or adaptive work, following Heifetz's (1994) distinction. These contextual variables were not tested independently for validity and reliability. These contextual variables were included in this study because of the recognized importance of each of these contexts for leadership research. French & Raven's distinction between types of social power remains an important part of the foundations of leadership research, almost fifty years after its conception. In this research, participants were asked to identify the degree to which they held each of French & Raven's bases of social power: reward, coercive, legitimate, expert and referent. Each type of power was measured using a single item.

Another context that has gained recent recognition through the work of the leadership educators at Harvard is the continuum between technical and adaptive work. Following Heifetz's (1994) distinction between these polarities, subjects were asked to identify the degree to which their work was technical or adaptive, using a five-point Likert scale, with three questions. Three complimentary definitions of technical and adaptive work were presented as polarities on the Likert scale and totals were attained and averaged. Cronbach's alpha indicated scale reliabilities to be somewhat low (a =.59). While ordination status remained the categorical variable of interest in this research, the research could have been strengthened by the use of validated measurement statistics for these two constructs.

Demographic items

In addition to the IBQ, the questionnaire designed for this study included demographic information including age, sex, educational attainment, and situational information such as type of leadership position, and type of organization. The second part of the questionnaire, titled the Episcopal Leadership Questionnaire, was evaluated and refined in a small focus group consisting of Episcopal clergy. See Appendix A for the questionnaire used for this study.

Because of the organizational usefulness of the IBQ for human resource development, use of the questionnaire is proprietary. All of the IBQ questions have been deleted from the appendix, to comply with the use agreement granted by Dr. Gary Yukl for purposes of this research.

Data Analysis

Statistical techniques including frequency rankings and ANOVA were used to determine whether there were statistically significant differences in the use of behavioral influence tactics between lay and ordained leaders in the ECUSA and to look at demographic differences between the two groups. Discriminant function analysis was used to identify which set of behavioral variables distinguished most effectively between the two groups of leaders. The research questions and corresponding methods of analysis are listed below.

Research Questions and Analytical Methods

> Research Question #1: What behavioral influence tactics do lay leaders in the ECUSA deploy most often in the exercise of their ministries?

The frequency of influence tactic use was depicted using descriptive techniques including mean and standard deviation for each influence tactic scale score. Tactics were ranked by frequency and patterns were observed.

> Research question #2: What behavioral influence tactics do ordained leaders in the ECUSA deploy most often in the exercise of their ministries?

Similar to the analysis for lay leaders, these data were described according to mean scores, standard deviations and ranking according to frequency of tactic use.

> Research Question #3: What patterns of behavioral influence tactics differentiate between lay and ordained leaders in ECUSA?

Mean tactic scale scores for lay and ordained leaders were compared using MANOVA and ANOVA to determine whether there were statistically significant differences between the two groups. To protect against unacceptable levels of Type I error, MANOVA was used to corroborate the ANOVA results.

A descriptive form of discriminant function analysis was used to determine which behavioral influence tactics served as the best predictors of differences between the two groups. Contextual variables such as the leaders' perception of power base and technical/adaptive work scores were entered into the analysis to determine if these leadership context variables were more effective predictors of influence tactic use than ordination status.

> Research Question #4: What is the relationship of various demographic and contextual variables to the use of behavioral influence tactics by lay and ordained leaders in ECUSA?

Demographic variables, including age, sex, education and type of position were analyzed to see how they influenced the use of behavioral influence tactics used by the two groups of leaders. The descriptive and multivariate techniques used above were utilized in the analysis of these variables.

Contextual variables such as target of influence attempt, perceptions of social power and technical/adaptive work scale scores were also explored using ANOVA, MANOVA, and discriminant function analysis. Post hoc testing offered additional insight into the relationships between these variables and the use of behavioral influence tactics.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to compare the differences in usage of behavioral influence tactics between lay and ordained leaders in ECUSA. Respondents completed the Episcopal Leadership Questionnaire, which included Yukl's (2000) Behavioral Influence Questionnaire (agent version), and a survey of demographic and situational variables such as sex, age, position, focus and scope of ministry, tenure and designation between formal and informal status. In addition, subjects indicated their perceptions of bases of social power (reward, coercive, expert, legitimate and referent) and an indicator of the technical or adaptive nature of their work.

The data were compiled and analyzed to answer the research questions pertaining to the use of behavioral influence tactics. The purpose of this chapter was to describe the subject sample used in this study, to review the instrument used, and to evaluate the survey results in the context of the research questions.

Participants

Out of 450 distributed questionnaires, 152 useable surveys were returned before the cutoff date. For a summary of demographic and response variables, see Table 4.2. All of the clergy responses came from Episcopal priests. No responses were received from deacons or bishops.

Of 152 usable responses, approximately half were received from lay leaders and half from ordained leaders. Similarly, responses from men and women were almost evenly divided.

Two characteristics that differed noticeably between lay and ordained leaders were education and paid versus volunteer status. Both differences were anticipated because of the organizational culture of ECUSA. Ordained Episcopal clergy are required to hold Master's degrees. There are no such expectations of lay people. The percentage of Episcopal clergy holding graduate degrees (almost 100%) far exceeds the degree of educational attainment in the general population or ECUSA. It would be expected therefore, that the ordained subjects in this study would have completed more graduate work than the lay leaders.

Another difference was related to the proportion of paid and volunteer leaders among lay and ordained leaders. This difference was also anticipated due to the specialized role that ordained clergy play in ECUSA. Sacramental ministries such as the celebration of Holy Eucharist, officiating at weddings, baptisms and funerals, remain the exclusive responsibility of ordained leaders. In order to fulfill these roles, primary staff positions in parishes are filled by clergy. For this reason, most clergy leaders serve in paid positions in ECUSA. On the other hand, many lay leaders in ECUSA exercise their ministries in a volunteer capacity, often as an adjunct to their paid vocation.

Demographic statistics on church membership and affiliation vary widely, due to a large difference between the numbers who name a particular denomination as their affiliation and the numbers of active, attending church members recorded on parish registers. In general, women comprise about 60% of the lay membership of ECUSA and 30% of the clergy – a number that is increasing rapidly as older males retire and seminary classes become more evenly divided between men and women (ECUSA, 2003). The proportion of laymen and women in this study closely approximates national trends, while the proportion of ordained women responding was higher than the clergy population of ECUSA.

Because almost one-third of the respondents failed to report their age, comparison with national demographics was not possible. Among the subjects reporting their ages, the mean age of respondent was 53 (SD = 11.8), which happens to be the average age of Episcopal clergy. Reason would suggest that church leadership might cluster more toward middle age, when leaders have had time to gain experience prior to retirement. The age categories shown below were created to compare with available church demographics. Over three-quarters of the respondents who revealed their age fell within the 30-64 year old age category. For these reasons, the age and sex of the respondents is assumed to adequately reflect the demographics of lay and ordained leaders in ECUSA. National demographics were not available for education, paid or volunteer status, or focus of ministry.

Table 4.1
Sample Demographics

Variable	***Total***	***N=152***	***Ordained***	***N=75***	***Lay***	***N=77***
Sex						
Male	70	46%	41	55%	29	38%
Female	78	51%	32	43%	46	60%
Missing data	4	3%	2	2%	2	2%
Scope of Ministry						
Parish	111	73%	66	88%	45	58%
Community	14	9%	3	4%	11	14%
Diocesan	14	9%	4	5%	10	14%
National	11	7%	0	0	11	14%
Other	2	2%	2	3%	0	0
Focus of Ministry						
Pastoral	68	44%	53	71%	15	19%
Educational	27	18%	9	12%	18	23%
Administrative	23	15%	4	5%	19	25%
Outreach	14	9%	4	5%	10	13%
Other	11	7%	1	1%	10	13%
Missionary	5	3%	4	6%	1	1%
Social justice	2	2%	0	0	2	3%
Missing data	2	2%	0	0	2	3%
Pay status						
Paid	97	64%	74	99%	23	30%
Volunteer	55	36%	1	1%	54	70%
Education						
Some college	8	5%	0	0	8	10%
Bachelor’s	26	17%	1	1%	25	32%
Master’s	88	58%	60	80%	28	36%
Doctorate	30	20%	14	19%	16	22%
Age*						
<29	1	1%	0	0	1	1%
30-64	85	56%	38	51%	47	61%
>65	18	12%	4	5%	14	18%
No age given	48	31%	33	44%	15	20%
*Mean = 53						
SD = 11.8						

Direction of influence attempt

All four categories of target relationship were represented in this study. Table 4.2 summarizes the breakdown of targets, according to their hierarchical relationship with the agent.

Table 4.2
Direction of influence attempt – By ordination status

Chosen target	***Total***	***Ordained***	***Lay***
Boss	42 (27%)	23 (31%)	19 (25%)
Subordinate	37 (24%)	28 (37%)	9 (13%)
Peer	50 (33%)	12 (16%)	38 (49%)
Other/hard to define	23 (16%)	12 (16%)	9 (13%)

Pearson Chi-Square measured the goodness-of fit compared to the null hypothesis of an equal distribution across all categories. The Chi-Square statistic (21.679, df = 3) was statistically significant at the .001 level. As expected, Episcopal leaders sometimes found it difficult to characterize their relationship with an influence target in classical hierarchical terms. Almost one-fifth of the participants chose the "other/hard to define" category to designate the target of their influence attempt. Several of the surveys included handwritten comments such as "I don't know how to define the relationship in terms of these categories." Ordained leaders chose bosses and subordinates as their designated target more often than lay leaders, who designated peers 49% of the time. Men chose subordinates more frequently than women. Women chose peers twice as often as men. Pearson's Chi-Square for sex and target (10.316, df = 3) was statistically significant at $p = .015$, indicating differences in the distribution between men and women. See Table 4.3 for direction of influence attempt summarized by sex of agent.

Table 4.3

*Direction of influence attempt – By sex**

Chosen target	***Total***	***Male (n=70)***	***Female (N=78)***
Boss	42 (27%)	21 (29%)	21 (27%)
Subordinate	37 (24%)	25 (36%)	12 (15%)
Peer	50 (33%)	15 (21%)	33 (43%)
Other/Hard to define	23 (16%)	11 (14%)	12 (15%)

*****Four participants did not indicate their sex on the questionnaire.

Behavioral Influence Tactics

Scale reliabilities

As described in the previous chapter, the instrument used for this research included the 44 item Influence Behavior Questionnaire - IBQ (Yukl, 2001) and the Episcopal Leadership Questionnaire, which provided information on a number of demographic and contextual variables. Previous research has supported the psychometric adequacy of the target version of the IBQ from the perspective of content validity, factor analysis and internal consistency. Because the agent version of the IBQ used for this research was believed to be less reliable than the target version, I calculated internal scale consistency as designated by Cronbach's alpha. Only two of the 11 tactic subscales indicated a reliability below the alpha = .70 threshold generally recommended (Nunnaly, 1978). Because the Cronbach's alpha for these two subscales was only slightly less than .70, the scales were retained in order to compare with previous research. Results of this analysis of internal consistency and comparison with the previously published reliabilities of the target version are demonstrated in Table 4.4.

Factor analysis provided moderate support for the 11 factor subscale, although results for the agent version were not as strong as previously published validation of the target version (Yukl & Seifert, 2001). Principal components analysis was performed with varimax rotation. All but five of the scale items loaded at acceptable levels (.3 or higher) on the expected subscales. None of the items had cross loadings greater than .27. The terms under which permission for use was granted by the author of the IBQ prohibited changes to the format, refinement of scale items, or deletion of questions. Overall, the reliability and validity of the IBQ was considered adequate for purposes of this research.

Table 4.4

IBQ Subscale Reliabilities – Cronbach's alpha

IBQ Subscale	**Agent version Present study**	**Target version Previously published**
Rational persuasion (5 items)	.66	.78
Inspirational appeal (5 items)	.78	.80
Consultation (4 items)	.72	.80
Pressure (4 items)	.71	.76
Exchange (4 items)	.78	.82
Coalition tactics (4 items)	.68	.75
Collaboration (4 items)	.71	.84
Legitimating tactics (3 items)	.81	.85
Apprising (4 items)	.88	.81
Personal appeals (3 items)	.79	.79
Ingratiation (4 items)	.80	.89

Use patterns of behavioral influence tactics

The first two research questions referred to the frequency of tactic use by lay and ordained leaders in ECUSA.

Research Question #1: Which behavioral influence tactics do lay leaders in ECUSA deploy most often in the exercise of their ministry?

Each of the subscales on the IBQ consists of three to five questionnaire items. In order to determine frequency of tactic use, mean total scores for each scale were divided by the number of scale items. The mean scores were ranked according to frequency of tactic use. Table 4.5 lists the use of behavioral influence tactics, by order of frequency, for lay leaders.

Table 4.5

Behavioral Influence Tactics Ranked by Frequency - Lay Leaders

Tactic	**Mean Scale Score**
Collaboration	3.80
Rational Persuasion	3.78
Consultation	3.67
Inspirational Appeal	3.12
Ingratiation	3.07
Legitimating Tactics	2.73
Apprising	2.21
Coalition Tactics	2.07
Exchange	1.97
Personal Appeals	1.75
Pressure	1.50

The mean scale scores are an indicator of the average frequency of use for each tactic, on a scale from 1 to 5. According to the Likert scale descriptors, the three tactics used most frequently by lay leaders (collaboration, consultation and rational persuasion) were used "moderately often," with mean scores between 3.7 and 3.8. The second tier of tactics, consisting of inspirational appeal, ingratiation and legitimating tactics, were used "occasionally," with mean scores between 2.7 and 3.1. Apprising, coalition tactics, exchange and personal appeal were used "seldom." Pressure was the least frequently used tactic, with a mean score of 1.5 – half way between "seldom" and "never."

Reason would suggest that mean scores should be skewed toward the lower end of the Likert scale, based on the IBQ scale descriptors. Capable leaders deploy a variety of influence tactics depending upon the context, the nature of the task, the relationship between the target and the agent, the urgency of the request and a host of other variables. If a response of "1" on a Likert scale means "never" it is likely that a response of "5" will be interpreted as "always." According to the IBQ instructions, a "5" response signifies "I **very often** use this tactic with him or her." If the respondents construe the five point Likert scale as a range from "never" to "always", results are likely to shift downward. In the use of influence, it is easier to identify a tactic that is almost never used than a tactic that is always used. It is possible that the IBQ could be strengthened by the redefinition of the Likert categories.

Research Question #2: Which behavioral influence tactics do ordained leaders in ECUSA deploy most often in the exercise of their ministry?

Table 4.6 lists the use of behavioral influence tactics, by order of frequency, for ordained leaders. The results are consistent with previous research, which indicates that consultation, rational persuasion and inspirational appeals are used most frequently when target commitment, rather than compliance, is desired (Yukl and Tracey, 1992; Yukl and Falbe, 1996). The less frequent use of exchange and personal appeals, which are correlated with the target commitment of subordinates (Yukl & Tracey, 1992) and pressure, which is used most frequently in a downward direction, may indicate a reluctance on the part of Episcopal clergy to exploit power relationships in the process of leadership. In the context of servant leadership, personal appeals, exchange and pressure would also be expected to be at the bottom of the frequency scale. Previous research (Yukl, Guinan & Sottolano, 1995) suggests that these tactics are used most frequently when the agent is seeking personal benefit.

Table 4.6

Behavioral Influence Tactics Ranked by Frequency - Ordained Leaders

Tactic	**Mean Scale Score**
Consultation	3.86
Rational Persuasion	3.65
Collaboration	3.53
Inspirational Appeal	3.29
Ingratiation	3.09
Legitimating Tactics	2.92
Apprising	2.25
Coalition Tactics	1.74
Personal Appeals	1.72
Exchange	1.68
Pressure	1.51

Research Question #3: What patterns of behavioral influence tactics distinguish between lay and ordained leaders in ECUSA?

Comparison of lay and ordained leaders' behavioral influence tactics

Table 4.7 (below) demonstrates that lay and ordained leaders in ECUSA use similar patterns of influence tactics. For both groups, the same three tactics (collaboration, rational persuasion, and consultation) were used moderately often. Inspirational appeal, ingratiation and legitimating tactics were used occasionally. For both groups, apprising, coalition tactics, exchange, and personal appeals were seldom used. Pressure was used least often, with a mean score between "very seldom" and "never".

Table 4.7

Influence Tactics Ranked by Frequency - Lay and Ordained Leaders

Rank	Lay Leaders	Ordained Leaders
1	Collaboration	Consultation
2	Rational persuasion	Rational persuasion
3	Consultation	Collaboration
4	Inspirational appeals	Inspirational appeals
5	Ingratiation	Ingratiation
6	Legitimating tactics	Legitimating tactics
7	Apprising	Apprising
8	Coalition tactics	Coalition tactics
9	Exchange	Personal appeals
10	Personal appeals	Exchange
11	Pressure	Pressure

In order to explore these differences in frequency rankings between lay and ordained leaders, tactic means were analyzed using MANOVA and one-way ANOVA. Three tactics – collaboration, exchange and coalition tactics - produced statistically significant differences between lay and ordained leaders. A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) revealed a statistically significant difference between lay and ordained participants on the set of 11 tactics scores ($F(11, 140) = 774.948$, $p < .001$). Univariate ANOVAs are shown in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8

ANOVA - Mean Use of Influence Tactics by Lay and Ordained Leaders

	Mean (SD)			
Tactic	**Ordained (n=75)**	**Lay (n=77)**	**F**	**p**
Rational Persuasion	3.65 (.71)	3.78 (.69)	1.329	.251
Inspirational Appeal	3.29 (.90)	3.12 (.86)	2.017	.158
Consultation	3.86 (.80)	3.67 (.82)	2.042	.155
Collaboration	**3.53 (.81)**	**3.80 (.73)**	**4.51**	**.035**
Apprising	2.25 (1.10)	2.21 (1.00)	.052	.82
Ingratiation	3.09 (.90)	3.06 (1.03)	.032	.86
Exchange	**1.68 (.64)**	**1.97 (.90)**	**5.066**	**.026**
Pressure	1.51 (.60)	1.50 (.61)	.001	.972
Coalition	**1.74 (.63)**	**2.07 (.80)**	**7.595**	**.007**
Personal Appeal	1.72 (.81)	1.75 (.86)	.045	.832
Legitimating Tactics	2.92 (.96)	2.73 (1.08)	1.175	.28

The three tactics (collaboration, exchange and coalition) that differ between the two groups share an intrinsic characteristic. Each is a "cooperative" tactic, in which the use of the influence tactic requires the cooperation of others. While the use of influence tactics presumes the compliance or commitment of targets, these three cooperative tactics imply an explicit, intentional interaction. In each case, lay leaders used the cooperative tactic slightly more frequently than ordained leaders. It is important to note, however, that exchange and coalition tactics are used quite infrequently. The infrequency of use of these tactics diminishes the importance of the differences.

Frequency patterns of tactic use were further analyzed with the introduction of other variables including sex, target and power scores. Patterns of tactic use were similar between men and women. Little difference was observed when the subjects were analyzed according to the target they chose for the questionnaire or when differences in the subjects perception of power bases were analyzed. In each case, rational persuasion, consultation and collaboration were the most frequently used tactics, with one exception. When the target of the influence attempt was a subordinate, ingratiation became one of the three influence tactics used most frequently.

Predicting group membership

Discriminant function analysis (DFA) is a multivariate statistical method used to distinguish between two groups of subjects, in this case lay and ordained leaders in ECUSA. DFA can be used either as a descriptive technique to identify the variables that distinguish between two pre-defined groups, or as a predictive tool to determine which group a subject is likely to belong. In this study, a descriptive form of DFA was used to determine which behavioral influence tactics distinguished most effectively between lay and ordained leaders in ECUSA.

The manner in which variables are entered in the analysis is one of the research decisions required by discriminant function analysis. Predictor variables can be entered all at once, or stepwise, according to the degree to which each contributes to the explanatory power of the model. For this research, simultaneous and stepwise DFA were conducted and classification results were compared. In this case, the simultaneous method resulted in better classification of subjects (72% versus 64% of cases correctly classified). Results of the simultaneous analysis are discussed below.

Discriminant function analysis depends upon several methodological assumptions. It assumes that the dependent variable is a true dichotomy (or in some cases a multichotomy). The groups formed by the dependent variable for this study are exhaustive and mutually exclusive. All subjects are either ordained or lay leaders.

Discriminant function analysis requires adequate sample sizes to effectively discriminate between groups. Adequate sample sizes have been variously defined however, ranging from 10 to 20 subjects for each categorical variable (Hair et al., 1998). With two groups and eleven influence tactics, the sample of 152 subjects was considered adequate for this study.

Like most multivariate techniques, DFA assumes multivariate normality, with a random distribution of predictor variables. Because these data represented frequency of tactic use, it was expected that the distributions of tactic scores would exhibit some skew, particularly in those tactics that are used least frequently. This was the case with exchange, pressure, personal appeals and coalition tactics. Fortunately, DFA is somewhat robust with respect to violations of normality, although less sensitive to outliers. Because of the relatively narrow range of possible tactic scores (the largest possible difference between low score and high score was 20, the largest observed difference was 16) and the large sample size, outlying values did not pose a problem in this analysis.

Discriminant function analysis also assumes homogeneity of variance and covariance matrices. Unequal covariance matrices cause overclassification into the group(s) with the larger matrices. Box's M was used to test the null hypotheses that the covariance matrices are equal. See Table 4.9 for Box's M test. Because of its statistical sensitivity, Box's M is considered significant if $p < .001$. In this analysis Box's M was not statistically significant. If the covariance matrices were exactly equal, the log determinant values would be equal. In this case, they were unequal but not markedly different. These statistics indicate that the equality of the covariance matrices between influence tactics was satisfactory for this analysis.

Table 4.9

Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices

Box's M	F	df1	df2	p
95.461	1.335	66	71639.103	.036

	Rank	Log Determinant
Ordained	11	21.151
Lay	11	23.590
Pooled within groups	11	23.023

The next step in discriminant function analysis is the evaluation of the canonical discriminant functions. In a simultaneous DFA, all of the predictor variables are entered at once. The discriminant function redefines the combination of variables into a new composite variate for each group and attempts to maximize the difference between group centroids. In this case there was only one discriminant function. Eigenvalues measured the amount of variance explained by the function. Wilk's lambda was used to test the statistical significance of the canonical correlation.

Table 4.10

Eigenvalues and Wilks Lambda

Eigenvalue	Canonical Correlation	Wilk's Lambda	Chi-square	df	p
.275	.464	.784	35.114	11	.000

The canonical correlation was statistically significant for the discriminant function, but not large, indicating some moderate discriminatory power of the function. Group membership explained 27.5% of the variance between scores.

The structure matrix (Table 4.11, below) indicates the relative contribution of each predictor variable to the discriminant function. Again, we see that our three cooperative tactics – coalition, exchange and collaboration – offer some discriminatory power to the model.

Table 4.11

Structure matrix

Predictor variable/ Tactic	**Pooled within-groups correlation**
Coalition	.429
Exchange	.350
Collaboration	.331
Consultation	-.222
Inspirational appeal	-.187
Rational persuasion	.179
Legitimating	-.169
Apprising	-.035
Personal appeal	.033
Ingratiation	-.028
Pressure	-.025

Variables ordered by absolute size of correlation within function

The structure matrix indicates that coalition tactics, exchange and collaboration are the tactics that contribute most to the discrimination between groups. This is supported by the ANOVA results, which detected significant differences between the scores of lay and ordained leaders in the same three tactics. However, as the classification matrix (Table 4.12, below) indicates, the classification ability of the discriminant function is not very strong. Because the subject pool was almost equally divided between lay and ordained leaders, one could predict group membership with a 50% accuracy rate simply by chance. Correctly classifying 72% of the subjects using influence tactic scores is some improvement over chance but, at best, the predictive ability of such scores is moderate.

Table 4.12

Classification Results

	Ordained	Lay	Total
Predicted ordained	55	20	75
% classified ordained	73.3%	26.7%	100%
Predicted lay	22	55	77
% classified lay	28.6%	71.4%	100%

Overall: 72.4% of subjects were classified correctly

Demographic and Contextual Variables

Research Question #4: What is the relationship between of various demographic and contextual variables and the use of behavioral influence tactics by lay and ordained leaders in ECUSA?

Sex of influence agent

Based on a 2-way MANOVA, there was no ordained-by-sex interaction on the set of 11 influence tactics ($F (11, 130) = .548$, $p = .867$). There were statistically significant differences for both ordained and sex factors. Differences between ordained and lay tactic scores have already been described. Table 4.13 depicts the means scores of influence tactic use for men and women, disregarding ordination status, along with the subsequent ANOVAs. Women's scores for the exchange tactic, where something is offered to the subject in return for their cooperation, were higher than men's scores. Men reported more frequent use of legitimating tactics than women.

It is important to note, however, that statistical significance does not necessarily imply that results are meaningful. Previous results on the frequency of tactic use indicated that legitimating tactics are used occasionally, while exchange tactics are seldom used. Small differences on infrequently used tactics require caution in interpretation.

Table 4.13

Analysis of Variance - Mean Use of Influence Tactics by Sex

	Mean (SD)			
Influence tactic	**Men (n=70)**	**Women (n=78)**	**F**	**p**
Rational persuasion	3.79 (.71)	3.65 (.70)	1.393	.24
Inspirational appeal	3.13 (.90)	3.26 (.87)	1.310	.25
Consultation	3.83 (.75)	3.75 (.86)	.289	.59
Collaboration	3.58 (.71)	3.72 (.85)	1.160	.28
Apprising	2.17 (1.01)	2.29 (1.11)	.469	.49
Ingratiation	3.08 (.99)	3.05 (.94)	.038	.84
Exchange	**1.56 (.55)**	**2.04 (.92)**	**14.72**	**.00**
Pressure	1.51 (.50)	1.49 (.68)	.029	.86
Coalition tactics	1.90 (.66)	1.89 (.82)	.008	.92
Personal appeals	1.74 (.83)	1.76 (.85)	.010	.92
Legitimating tactics	**3.06 (1.04)**	**2.59 (1.06)**	**7.58**	**.00**

Research in the field of influence tactics has failed to uncover many meaningful differences in tactic use between men and women (Aguinas & Adams, 1998; Eagly & Carli, 2003; Lee & Sweeney, 2001; Rajan & Krishnan, 2002). The differences highlighted above, albeit small, are supported by research in the broader field of human behavior. Babcock and Laschever (2003) asserted that societal norms still exert pressure on women to act unselfishly and modestly. They also found that assertion is construed differently when displayed by men and women. This research supported several previous studies that found that some of the assertive behaviors that are admired in men are viewed unfavorably when used by women (Burgoon, Dillard & Doran, 1983; Carli, 1990; Wiley & Eskilson, 1985). Castro, Douglas, Hochwarter, Ferris and Frink (2003) found that the use of hard influence tactics by women can be moderated however, by positive affect including interest and enthusiasm. Nevertheless, Nicotera and Rancer (1994) suggest that women tend to choose more nurturing and mutually supportive influence tactics than men. This finding was supported by a metaanalysis by Eagly and Carli (2003), which indicated that women use more interpersonal and democratic leadership styles, while men used more task-oriented and autocratic styles. The "softer" approach would include the use of such tactics as exchange, where something is offered to compensate for a request. Behavioral expectations might inhibit women leaders' use of stronger methods of influence such as drawing upon legitimate authority to influence a target.

Recent research on the stress responses of males and females uncovered biological differences that shed light on the behavioral differences of men and women in stressful situations. Taylor, et al., (2000) found that instead of the adrenaline secreted by men in times of stress, women's secretion of oxytocin prompted a different behavioral response – the formation of mutually supportive social groups. Heim and Murphy (2000) called this the "tend and befriend" response, in contrast to the "fight or flight" response observed in men. Although the difference in influence tactic use between men and women were small, there were statistically significant differences in the distribution of target choices between women and men. Women chose to report their interactions with peers 43% of the time, compared with a 21% rate for men. Men chose subordinates as their target 36% of the time; women chose subordinates only 15% of the time. The differences in influence tactic use and target choices between men and women support the "tend and befriend" construct. The leadership of change is inherently stressful, as people are challenged to adapt their attitudes, values or behaviors. As women take on more leadership positions in organizations, the differences in sex roles and the behavioral inclinations of men and women deserve additional attention.

To test these differences further, I analyzed the differences in exchange and legitimating tactics between lay and ordained women using one-way ANOVA and discriminant function analysis. There were no statistically significant differences between clergywomen and their lay counterparts in the use of legitimating tactics, even though ordained women might have been expected to use the power of their position in the Church to achieve their desired outcomes. Nor were there any statistically significant difference in the use of exchange tactics between the two groups of women. Results were similar when comparing lay and ordained men on these two tactics. This suggests that for exchange and legitimating tactics, influence behaviors were more influenced by sex roles than ordination status.

Age, length of tenure, scope of ministry, formal authority, technical and adaptive work

Age, length of tenure and focus and scope of ministry seemed to make very little difference in the use of influence tactics by lay and ordained leaders in the Episcopal Church. ANOVA and DFA failed to uncover statistically significant differences in the use of influence tactics when these variables were entered into the analysis.

In order to investigate differences between those who had formal authority and those who did not, subjects were asked if they had been "hired, elected or appointed" to their leadership position. Each of the three categories represented some type of formal authority. Participants who answered No were classified as holding informal authority. Based upon the responses, almost all (139) subjects were classified in the "formal authority" category, only 13 were in the "informal authority" category. Because of this dramatic size discrepancy, valid comparisons were not possible.

Similarly, no differences in the use of influence tactics were observed when technical/adaptive work scores were used as the categorical variable. I suspect that this finding is influenced by the tendency of respondents to identify the mix of technical and adaptive aspects of ministry. The mean score on the technical/adaptive scale was 3.3 with a standard deviation of .71, indicating a strong clustering around the mean. There was not enough variation in the sample to provide an explanation of the effects of technical and adaptive work on the use of behavioral influence tactics by lay and ordained leaders in ECUSA. Refinement of the technical/adaptive scale items may provide opportunity for future research.

Bases of social power

Previous research (Hinkin & Schreishiem, 1990; Yukl, Kim & Falbe, 1996) has suggested that the use of influence tactics is moderated by the influence agent's perception of the type of power they hold in the organization. Using French and Raven's (1959) taxonomy of social power, subjects in this study were asked to define the extent to which they held reward, coercive, expert, legitimate and social power in their ministry. A single 5 point Likert scale was used for each type of power and results were added to determine a total power score. Cronbach's alpha for the total power score was .40 – too low to be reliable for an aggregate measure of total power. Table 4.14 depicts mean power scores for lay and ordained leaders. .

Table 4.14

Power Scores by Ordination Status

Type of Power	**Ordained mean (SD)**	**Lay mean (SD)**	**F**	**p**
Reward power	3.01 (1.01)	3.13 (1.30)	.38	.539
Coercive power	1.77 (.92)	1.51 (.93)	3.161	.077
Legitimate power	**3.75 (.93)**	**2.97 (1.35)**	**16.830**	**.000**
Expert power	4.48 (.60)	4.36 (.72)	1.16	.283
Referent power	**3.81 (.83)**	**3.45 (1.12)**	**5.008**	**.027**

As Table 4.14 indicates, there was not much difference between lay and ordained perceptions of their sources of power in the organization. Based on a 2-way MANOVA, there was no ordained by sex interaction on the set of five power scores (F (5,140) = 1.135, p = .345). As expected, ordained leaders believed that they held more legitimate power than lay leaders. Ordination still confers a measure of formal authority on clergy in ECUSA.

In order to determine whether there was a relationship between influence tactic use and bases of social power, I looked for correlations between tactic and power scores. Table 4.15 shows the Spearman R correlations between power scale scores and reported influence tactic use. Rational persuasion was correlated with expert power (significant at .01 level). Apprising was correlated with reward, coercive and referent power. Pressure was correlated with coercive power. Legitimating tactics were correlated with legitimate power. There was less correlation (significant at .05 level) between inspirational appeals and referent power; between consultation and legitimate and referent power; between ingratiation and referent power; and between personal appeals and legitimate and referent power.

Table 4.15

Correlation table – Power and influence tactics
Spearman R

	Power Base				
Tactic	**Reward**	**Coercive**	**Legitimate**	**Expert**	**Referent**
Rational persuasion	.054	.116	.093	**.285****	.105
Inspirational appeals	.139	.069	.062	.085	**.168***
Consultation	.100	-.032	**.202***	.065	**.196***
Collaboration	.067	.046	-.006	.143	-.002
Apprising	**.265****	**.211****	.023	.048	**.215****
Ingratiation	.105	.083	.080	.125	**.206***
Exchange	-.020	-.031	-.122	-.114	-.104
Pressure	.092	**.248****	-.002	.081	-.009
Coalition	.119	.117	-.074	-.022	.041
Personal appeals	-.035	-.008	**.193***	.051	**.168***
Legitimating	-.002	.128	**.218****	.095	.147

**Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2 - tailed).
*Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2 - tailed).

The results above are intuitively consistent with French and Raven's bases of social power. One would logically expect that apprising (informing someone of potential rewards or consequences) would increase with the leader's perception of their power to reward and punish. Apprising was also correlated with referent power. As a leader seeks to build and maintain referent power, the ability to keep followers aware of potential benefits is an asset. As the leader's perception of their ability to punish increases, they are likely to expect more utility from pressure tactics. Legitimate power, which comes from formal authority or position, is related to legitimating tactics. As a leader gains knowledge and expertise, they are more likely to rely upon rational persuasion to influence others.

As Table 4.15 demonstrates, the correlations between influence tactic use and power sources are weak. Several influence tactics, including the frequently used collaboration tactic, did not appear to be correlated with any particular sources of power, even though influence is conceptually related to power. There are several possible explanations for this apparent paradox. Power sources tend to be relatively stable, while the use of influence is highly contextual. Participants in this research have may have, in some cases, reported a high (or low) score for a particular source of power, but chosen an influence target or leadership situation that does not draw upon that source of power. Finally, if servant leadership, as expected, does redefine the relationships between power and influence, any power scale that does not include the power derived from service may be inadequate to describe the power, authority and influence processes of ECUSA.

Direction of influence attempt

The first instruction on the IBQ involves the choice of a person whom the subject has interacted in their exercise of leadership. Subjects were instructed to designate whether the target of the leadership influence was their boss, a subordinate, a peer, or "other/hard to define." This designation was in recognition of the strong role that direction of influence attempts plays on the choice of tactic.

Correlation analysis revealed some statistically significant relationships between direction of influence attempt and the use of influence tactic. Results are summarized in Table 4.16.

Table 4.16

Correlation table – Target and influence tactic
Spearman's R

	Target			
Influence tactic	**Boss**	**Subordinate**	**Peer**	**Other**
Rational persuasion	**.242****	**-.209****	-.047	.011
Inspirational appeal	.118	.017	-.049	-.103
Consultation	**-.212****	**.207***	.093	-.105
Collaboration	.022	-.017	-.010	.006
Apprising	-.067	**.173***	.064	**-.207***
Ingratiation	**-.331****	**.261****	.040	.048
Exchange	-.138	.098	**.279****	-.076
Pressure	.042	**.259****	**-.162***	-.151
Coalition	.004	**-.196***	.096	.105
Personal appeals	-.093	-.002	.061	.038
Legitimating	.117	-.107	-.104	.118

**Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2 – tailed).
*Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2 – tailed).

Several of the influence tactics differed significantly depending upon the target relationship. Rational persuasion was used most often in an upward direction and least often with subordinates, as suggested by previous research (Erez & Rim, 1982; Kipnis, Schmidt & Wilkinson, 1980; Yukl & Tracy, 1992; Yukl, Falbe & Youn, 1993). This may explain why ordained leaders do not use rational persuasion more than lay leaders, despite their enhanced opportunity to use such methods through preaching and teaching. The tendency to intuit the appropriateness of influence use based upon relationship to the target may override the situational opportunity to use rational persuasion.

Consultation was used more often in a downward direction. Consultation involves the solicitation of feedback, while retaining the right to make the final decision. Such prerogatives would be expected to accrue to one in a position of authority.

Apprising was one of the tactics added to the most recent taxonomy of influence tactics. Apprising happens when the agent informs the influence target how a particular change will be good for them, the organization or their career. To use this tactic, one must presume to know something that the target does not. Therefore, it would make sense that apprising would occur most frequently in a downward influence attempt. This research confirms Yukl and Seifert's 2001 hypothesis that apprising is used more often with subordinates.

Previous research (Yukl & Falbe, 1991; Yukl & Tracey, 1992; Yukl. Guinan and Sottolano, 1995) suggests that ingratiation is used more frequently with subordinates. This study supported that conclusion. Ingratiation is used as an equalizing tactic, designed to level the hierarchical distinctions. To use such a tactic with the boss can be seen as currying favor, a passive-aggressive redefinition of power differentials. The use of ingratiation with a subordinate has a different effect. To use ingratiation with a subordinate is to invite them into collegiality, consistent with the objectives of transforming leadership.

Exchange is a tactic usually reserved for more transactional forms of leadership, in which the agent and the target each gain something through the transaction. In this study, exchange was used most often with peers, a finding which is consistent with previous research in the use of influence tactics (Yukl & Seifert, 2001). The use of exchange in peer relationships indicates mutuality, the possession of needed resources by both parties to the transaction, and shared goals. While exchange processes are fundamental to the operation of any organization, such tactics would normally be initiated by a leader with a peer or subordinate.

Pressure is the tactic used least often by lay and ordained leaders in the church. While this study found no differences in the use of this tactic by ordination status, it did corroborate existing research on the tendency to use pressure in a downward direction. Pressure is the tactic which is most likely to bring discomfort to the target. It also carries a high risk of resistance and social consequences to the agent. Such tactics are used infrequently and most often in a downward direction.

Summary

In this chapter the analytical processes and outcomes of this study on the use of behavioral influence tactics by lay and ordained leaders in ECUSA were described. Frequency rankings, descriptive statistics, analysis of variance and discriminant function analysis were used to investigate the differences between these two groups based upon the Episcopal Leadership Questionnaire (including Yukl's Influence Behavior Questionnaire).

The analysis uncovered some slight evidence of differences in the use of influence tactics by lay and ordained leaders in ECUSA. Lay leaders were found to use three cooperative tactics (coalition, collaboration and exchange) slightly more often than ordained leaders. Overall, however, patterns and frequency of tactic use were similar between the two groups.

Possible differences were also noted between the use of influence tactics by men and women. Women exhibited a slight tendency to use the exchange tactic more often, while men used legitimating tactics more. These small differences between men and women seemed to be unrelated to their ordination status.

Subjects' perception of their sources of power in the organization became variables of interest in this research when it became evident that eight of the influence tactics – apprising, pressure, legitimating tactics, rational persuasion, inspirational appeals, ingratiation, personal appeals, and consultation - showed statistically significant differences depending upon the leader's perception of their sources of social power. This finding lends some construct validity to the untested, single – item Likert scale used to measure bases of social power. The influence tactic use trends found for each type of power – reward, coercive, expert, legitimate and referent – tended to support the definition of the power construct. Despite statistical significance, however, correlations between particular sources of power and influence tactic use were low.

This research supported previous studies in the directional use of influence tactics. It is important to note, however, that the direction of influence attempt, as defined by choice of influence target, included a "hard to define" category. Subsequent research might bring this category into sharper focus and provide some insight into the use of influence tactics in ambiguous power relationships.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Research Questions

This research investigated the use of behavioral influence tactics by lay and ordained leaders in the Episcopal Church in order to explore similarities and differences in terms of four research questions.

The first two research questions explored patterns of influence use by lay and ordained leaders in ECUSA. Responses to the Episcopal Leadership Questionnaire (including the Influence Behavior Questionnaire) were received from 152 lay and ordained leaders in the Episcopal Church. The IBQ section of the instrument asked the subject to choose a person with whom they had interacted repeatedly over a period of several months. Subjects identified, when possible, the hierarchical relationship they held with their chosen "target" of influence. Subjects then identified the frequency with which they used a particular set of influence tactics with that target. Scores were averaged for each influence tactic.

Results indicated that lay and ordained leaders use similar patterns of influence tactics. Frequency rankings indicated that collaboration, rational persuasion and consultation were used most often by both groups. Inspirational appeal, ingratiation and legitimating tactics were used occasionally. Apprising, coalition tactics, exchange, and personal appeals were used infrequently. Pressure was almost never used as an influence tactic.

This research suggests that both lay and ordained leaders in ECUSA have an intuitive sense of the complexities of influence tactic use. Influence tactics are chosen based upon the agent's perception of the nature of the task, the potential resistance from the target, the desired outcome, and the social costs and benefits of the influence strategy (Yukl, Guinan & Sottolano, 1995; Yukl & Tracey, 1992). Ordination status had only a minimal effect on the pattern of tactic use. In an organization like ECUSA, where many of the followers are volunteers and the desired outcome is commitment to the work of ministry, it is important for lay and ordained leaders to use influence tactics that emphasize shared goals and values. This study supports previous research which indicates that rational persuasion, consultation and inspirational appeal are the tactics used most often when target commitment is desired (Yukl & Tracey, 1992; Yukl & Falbe, 1996). Tactics traditionally used to gain personal benefit, such as coalition tactics, exchange and pressure were among those used least often by both groups. Similarities in the frequency rankings of tactic use indicate that contextual and situational variables exert more influence in the choice of tactic use than ordination status.

Understanding the patterns and frequency of influence tactic use provided context for subsequent analysis of the differences in influence tactic use between lay and ordained leaders in research question #3. Analysis of variance and discriminant function analysis revealed that lay leaders used coalition tactics, collaboration and exchange slightly more often than ordained leaders. These tactics are distinctive in the degree of cooperation they require for the completion of the influence attempt. It is important to note, however, that two of the three tactics that distinguished between the groups were coalition and exchange – tactics which were used quite infrequently.

The underlying assumption of this research was that there would be statistically different differences in the use of some influence tactics by lay and ordained leaders. It was expected that the legitimate power and authority conferred in ordination, the rigorous academic and vocational training for ordained ministry, and the referent power of the office would lead to differences in tactic use. These assumptions turned out to be mostly unfounded. Ordained leaders did not use the rational persuasion tactic more frequently than lay leaders, despite their opportunities to do so through preaching and teaching. This study found a slight tendency for the use of rational persuasion to increase as the agent's perception of their expert power increased. Despite clear differences in their formal preparation for ministry, lay and ordained leaders in ECUSA reported similar scores of expert power.

Despite expectations, ordained leaders did not use inspirational appeals more often than lay leaders. The appeal to abiding principles such as justice, service and love seem to be entrenched in the influence repertoire of both lay and ordained leaders. Although clergy probably continue to have more formal opportunities to use inspirational appeals, lay leaders are finding ways to inspire others to commitment.

Ordained leaders also did not use legitimating tactics more often than lay leaders. Small, but statistically significant, differences were observed, however, between men and women on the use of this tactic. These results correspond to the reality that women still tend to hold less influential positions of power in ECUSA. Despite the growing proportion of women clergy (and the overall ratio of women to men in the denomination), men still hold a disproportionate percentage of the higher status positions, including rectors of large parishes and positions in the House of Bishops (ECUSA, 2003). Twenty-eight years after ECUSA began ordaining women, there are still several diocesan bishops who refuse to ordain women or hire them for ordained positions. A disproportionate number of experienced clergy women serve in lower status assistant, associate, or non-stipendiary positions.

It was assumed that some of the institutional constraints embedded in the formal organization might inhibit the use of consultation by the clergy. This assumption was unsupported by the present study. There were no significant differences in the use of consultation between lay and ordained leaders. This suggests that there are fewer “lone rangers” among the clergy than history and circumstance might suggest. The era of clergy who made all the decisions and did all the work of ministry is over. In keeping with ECUSA’s baptismal theology, all Christians are called to full participation in the work of the Church.

The use of collaboration as an influence tactic implies the control of resources such as expertise, money and power, particularly by the influence agent, who offers to provide those resources if the target will help. One example might be a rector who offers church funds to support a new educational initiative. Preliminary expectations included the assumption that ordained leaders might have better access to institutional resources and, therefore, use collaboration more frequently. This assumption was unsupported by the present research. In fact, collaboration was one of the three cooperative tactics which lay leaders used more often than ordained leaders. Collaboration is an effective tactic for gaining the commitment of peers. As the culture of the Church moves toward mutual accountability, lay leaders become more aware of their own control over the resources necessary for mission and ministry. As this awareness grows, lay leaders are more likely to engage collaboratively with others to accomplish goals.

The one preliminary expectation that was supported by this study was the statistically significant differences in the use of coalition tactics by lay and ordained leaders. As expected, lay leaders have both the means and motivation to network with one another to gain support. Lay leaders’ perceptions of legitimate power in the organization are lower than ordained leaders’. As legitimate power decreases, the use of coalition tactics increases. In order to consolidate power and solicit support for shared goals, lay leaders use coalition tactics more often than ordained leaders.

The preliminary expectations that proved unfounded were based upon the previous understanding of influence tactic use in hierarchical organizations. This research investigated the use of a defined set of influence tactics with a chosen target over an extended period. Clergy leadership, however, is often directed more at groups than individuals. Many of the major roles of clergy leadership, such as preaching and teaching, happen in group settings. This research clearly demonstrates that the influence behaviors that clergy direct at individual targets are virtually the same as the behavior of lay leaders. Differences might occur if the use of influence were compared in settings where lay and ordained leaders led groups of followers. The field of leadership studies and influence behavior might benefit from the refinement of instruments such as the IBQ for use in settings of group leadership.

Research question #4 introduced a number of demographic and contextual variables into the analysis, with interesting results. Statistically different differences were found between men and women in use of influence tactics, choice of influence target, and bases of social power. Men used legitimating tactics more often than women. Women used exchange more often than men. These results are moderated by the infrequency of use of these particular tactics. There were some differences between men and women, however, in the choice of influence target. Men chose subordinates much more often as the reported target of their influence attempt. Women chose to report their interactions with peers twice as often as men. This is consistent with the findings of a growing body of research that suggests that women tend to see the world, and in particular human interaction, in a much less hierarchical manner than men (Eagley & Carli, 2003). Overall, however, both men and women, lay and ordained used the types of influence tactics that are most effective at eliciting the commitment of followers, particularly rational persuasion, consultation and inspirational appeals (Yukl, Kim & Falbe, 1996). In a transformational model of leadership, such as servant leadership in the Church, the concept of leadership from among/within a group of followers is consistent with the values of mutuality, trust, justice and respect.

This study supports the body of existing research on the direction of influence attempts. As previous research has suggested, this study found that rational persuasion is used most often with the boss and consultation was used least often in the upward direction. Apprising, ingratiation and pressure tactics were directed most often toward subordinates. Exchange tactics were used most often with peers. It is evident that the nature of the relationship between the influence agent and target plays a major role in the selection of appropriate behavioral influence tactics. One confounding factor in this research, however was the presence of the “other/hard to define” category of target. A substantial proportion of the subject sample (16%) could not define the relationship with the target of their influence attempt in terms of the hierarchical categories traditionally defined in research on the direction of influence attempts. The finding that such a significant percentage of agents chose a non-hierarchical category suggests that the model of servant leadership does re-define the traditional lines of formal power and authority in ECUSA. The extent to which this is true in other religious or service organizations is a promising topic for future research.

Respondents in this study were asked to indicate their perceptions of social power in their organization according to French and Raven’s (1959) bases of social power. Ordained leaders scored higher than lay leaders on perceptions of legitimate power and referent power. Men scored higher than women on perceptions of legitimate power and coercive power. In general, the power and influence constructs reinforced one another by suggesting intuitively sensible results. As the agent’s perception of their legitimate power increased, so did their use of legitimating tactics. As reward and coercive power increased, the use of the apprising tactic, which involves informing the target of potential rewards or consequences, increased. As expert power increased, so did the use of rational persuasion. An increase in referent power scores was associated with more frequent use of ingratiation tactics. In general, these correlations were statistically significant but weak. The results, however, offer some support of the general power constructs in the French and Raven scale.

Implications

Connections to leadership research and theory

This study adds to the growing body of research on the use of influence by leaders in organizations. Previous research has focused on organizations with traditional lines of hierarchical authority. This study offered a new perspective by demonstrating that, in ECUSA, the traditional categories of boss, subordinate and peer are inadequate to describe the sometimes complex relationships between those who are acting in service of a shared vision.

In this study, 16 % of the respondents could not categorize the target of their influence attempt according to the boss/subordinate/peer categories. The IBQ included an instruction asking the agent to describe their relationship with the target, but only a few participants attempted to do so. More responses to this descriptive would have offered additional insight into the types of relationships that were classified as “other/hard to define.” Some of the participants in this research did use the first part of the IBQ to describe the agent/target relationship. One respondent wrote “I am a rector, the target is my senior warden” to express his own uncertainty of how the most senior elected lay leader in the congregation stood in hierarchical terms. Another wrote “I don’t know how to classify this person” to convey the ambiguity of their relationship with their follower. I suspect that there would be some religious denominations in which the paid clergy would almost always be considered “the boss.” But it is also likely that there are many non-religious organizations, characterized by a service-orientation, where the energy and expertise of volunteers plays such an essential role in the mission of the organization that the distinctions imposed by hierarchy become obsolete or irrelevant. Some possible examples of such ambiguous relationships include the coordinator of a soup kitchen and the lawyer who offers pro-bono legal services to clients; the diocesan staff liaison to a working group and the appointed leader of that group; or the executive director of a non-profit service organization and the chairwoman of the board of directors. Advisory boards, professional associations and even cross - functional teams within hierarchical organizations offer new possibilities for future research.

Research on influence tactics integrates previous research on power and authority. Influence refers to the processes by which power is exercised and authority is legitimated. This study suggests that power and authority are deployed in a variety of organizational structures and situational contexts. The lack of differences between two groups of leaders who exercise leadership in ECUSA point out new opportunities for leadership research relating to formal and informal leadership, legitimation processes and the contexts in which leaders and followers negotiate the power differentials and responsibilities of authority.

Theological implications

Throughout the gospels, Jesus reminds his disciples that the authentic exercise of leadership is manifested in the transforming and redemptive power of love. While the four gospels differ in their theological perspectives, the thematic dismantling of traditional power and authority structures is consistent throughout:

He who is greatest among you shall be your servant; whoever exalts himself will be humbled, and whoever humbles himself will be exalted. (Matthew 23:11-12)

For the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many. (Mark 10:45)

The stone that the builders rejected has become the chief cornerstone. (Luke 20:17)

I am the good shepherd – the good shepherd lays down his life for the sheep. (John 10:11)

Servant leadership in ECUSA is enacted through the mission and ministry of the people of God, both lay and ordained, who find meaning, challenge and fulfillment in service. Prayer book revision in the 1970's challenged Episcopalians to a greater awareness of their baptismal covenant. Baptisms are no longer private social occasions. Instead they are community celebrations of ministry, enacted as a central component of Sunday worship. Baptism is recognized as full initiation into the mission and ministry of the Church. The theological perspective of servant leadership is expressed clearly in the prayer book Catechism which defines the ministry of the laity in terms of responsibilities for action:

> The ministry of lay persons is to represent Christ and his Church; to bear witness to him wherever they may be; and, according to the gifts given them, to carry on Christ's work of reconciliation in the world, and to take their place in the life, worship and governance of the Church (Book of Common Prayer, p. 855).

This study demonstrates that the privileges and responsibilities of leadership are shared among the baptized. Traditional hierarchical structures exist in the formal organization of the denomination with four distinct orders of ministry: bishops, priests, deacons and laity. It is clear, however, that formal lines of authority are sometimes hard to identify in ECUSA. Many of the respondents in this study could not label the target of their influence attempt according to traditional categories. While ordained clergy retain specific responsibilities for pastoral oversight and sacramental ministries, lay women and men are leading programs, processes and people, while serving the gospel imperative to "go into all the world and preach the Good News" (Mark 16:15).

This research demonstrated that there is very little difference in the use of behavioral influence tactics by lay and ordained leaders in the Episcopal Church. Theologically, this is consistent with Christian scripture. As St. Paul wrote in a letter to the leaders of the early Christian community at Galatia: There is no longer Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male or female; all are one in Christ Jesus (Galatians 3:28). The influence processes used by lay and ordained leaders ECUSA suggest that the power and authority structures that moderate influence are legitimated by integrity, shared purpose and service, rather than institutional hierarchy or traditional role distinctions.

For this research, servant leadership was used as an explanatory construct, rather than a research variable. Any examination of the power, authority and influence processes of ECUSA would be meaningless unless they can be understood and interpreted in the light of servant leadership. This context is not exclusive to religious organizations, however. The results of this research might be generalizable to any organization in which vision, service and empowerment of followers shape group norms and serve as guiding principles for change.

Servant leadership is good news for the Church. The dismantling of institutional barriers to service has opened broader possibilities for the inclusion of lay men and women as leaders in ECUSA. The decline of clericalism, the blurring of traditional distinctions between lay and ordained leadership, has resulted in a renewed sense of the Church as a community of practice, where the gifts and talents of all are celebrated, cultivated and sanctified for the work of ministry.

Implications for ministry

The results of this research indicated that lay and ordained leaders in ECUSA use a broad variety of influence tactics in the exercise of their ministries. There were few meaningful differences observed between the two groups, suggesting that ordination status had little effect on the use of influence tactics in the process of leadership. The effective use of influence tactics is one of the core competencies for leadership. Both lay and ordained leaders must understand the sources of the power and authority in their ministry and use tactics appropriate for the cultivation of commitment by their followers. The formal theological training of clergy includes little, if any, exposure to the behavioral aspects of ministry, including leadership development. The effective use of power, authority and influence are central to the practice of ministry but hold a peripheral role in the training and development of clergy. The situation for lay leadership development is worse. Formal opportunities for leadership based ministry development, when they exist, are usually geared to developing skill sets for a particular ministry, rather than broader competencies for leadership. Such an education does little to develop servant leaders who are trained, educated and supported, not only in their own area of ministry but in the transformational development of followers.

This is changing in the Episcopal Diocese of Virginia, where efforts are underway to recruit, train and equip all of those called to leadership in the Church, lay or ordained. The Episcopal Leadership Initiative is a program designed to develop a cadre of entrepreneurial leaders who are able to excel within their own context of ministry and who will take responsibility for the discernment and development of new servant leaders. This program is currently in development. The Episcopal Leadership Initiative holds great promise for the future leadership development of lay and ordained leaders in ECUSA. The results of this research will continue to inform the conceptualization and implementation of this exciting leadership development initiative.

Strategies for leadership development

The ongoing need for the talents, energy and enthusiasm of faithful lay and ordained leaders in ECUSA, combined with the results of this research, suggest some strategies for leadership development in ECUSA.

Cultivate communities of practice

Throughout the scriptures the Church is referred to as the Body of Christ, with an emphasis on mutual dependence and accountability. In terms of sacramental worship, ECUSA already exists as a community of practice, not dissimilar to those described in the leadership literature (Wenger, McDermott & Snyder, 2002). Knowledge sharing is one of the great strengths of the denomination. The scripture, reason and tradition that set the context for development of meaning are explored through preaching, educational opportunities and shared service initiatives. Lay and ordained leaders in ECUSA share power and authority for the mission and ministry of the Church. The informed and intentional use of effective influence tactics can enhance the development of transformational servant leaders who are actively engaged in the identification and nurturance of new leaders. Lay and ordained leaders in

ECUSA should cultivate this opportunity to make ECUSA a place of learning and growth, where the ability to contribute to the greater good is based upon gifts and preparation, rather than ordination status.

Develop opportunities for lay leadership development

To cultivate a community of practice, all qualified members should be given the opportunity to engage in the process of lifelong learning. Adult learners in the Church should be supported in their striving for learning and growth. Denominational, diocesan, and parish resources should be re-directed toward the implementation of programs for lay leadership development that parallel the opportunities and support given to clergy-in-training. Such programs should address the needs of bi-vocational leaders through innovative adult learning programs. Distance learning, action learning and self-directed learning programs hold great promise for the ongoing development of capable leaders in ECUSA.

Model servant leadership

Improved awareness of the dynamics of power, authority and influence in ECUSA offers the potential for more intentional sharing of the responsibilities and challenges of leadership. Lay and ordained leaders who perceive themselves as "leaders among" or "leaders from within" rather than "leaders over" are more likely to develop the trust and authenticity that inspire the commitment of followers. This degree of mutuality and service is the basis for the transformation of followers into the leaders of tomorrow. There is no more compelling way to honor the centrality of Jesus in the life and work of the Church than to strive toward his model of justice, service, compassion and love.

The servant leadership model is challenged, however, when conflict and anxiety within the organization lead to a decreased tolerance for uncertainty or ambiguity. In such cases, the presence of a designated leader, with the authority to "fix" the situation, results in a temporary reduction in anxiety. If the problem is adaptive, however, the designation of an authority is merely a technical solution that is unlikely to bring about lasting change (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002). The mobilization of adaptive work, whether through servant leadership or more traditional forms, is difficult and costly (Heifetz, 1994). This is the crisis which faces the contemporary ECUSA. Service orientation and obedience to the gospel have been subordinated to the overwhelming pressure to consolidate resources, define boundaries and form alliances in the presence of theological and organizational conflict. If ECUSA is to continue as a denomination devoted to the sharing of God's love, servant leadership, however difficult, must be normative and formative as denominational leaders seek to catalyze adaptive change.

Encourage creativity and entrepreneurial initiative

To be created in the image of God is to share in God's capacities for relationship, creativity and initiative. To be the Church of God, in all its frailty and glory is to allow the Spirit to speak to the hearts and minds of men and women and to give them the freedom and resources to respond with energy, enthusiasm, creativity and sensitivity. Liturgy, from the Greek laos, means "work of the people." God's own invitation into the work of ministry leaves the power and authority for action in the hands of the people. Influence transforms the potential of power and authority into action. Leadership at its best draws upon the diverse power bases of the organization, legitimizes authority through the sharing of meaning, and translates that power and authority into creativity and productivity. An organization that honors and encourages creativity and initiative not only enhances the capacity for adaptive change, it also manifests its own spark of the divine.

Limitations of the study and suggestions for future research

The instrument used for this dissertation was the agent version of the Influence Behavior Questionnaire developed by Dr. Gary Yukl and refined over several iterations (Yukl, Lepsinger & Lucia, 1992). Use of this valuable instrument was granted for purposes of this research, with some constraints to protect the proprietary rights of the author. I received permission from Dr. Yukl to make one change to the IBQ with the addition of the "other/hard to define" category of target. Because items could not be added, deleted or changed, the factor analysis of scale items was for informational purposes, rather than refinement. The agent version lacks the reliability and validity research that supports the target version of this instrument. The agent version is believed to be less accurate than the target version of the IBQ, but was chosen for this study in order to ensure adequate sample sizes that were believed unattainable if two tiers of subjects (agents and targets) had to be recruited. This study will contribute to the ongoing reliability and validity testing of the agent version of the IBQ.

The study of leadership, power, authority and influence is complex, including an almost infinite array of demographic, situational and contextual variables. Even within this limited study, I could not begin to account for such integral factors as the outcomes of the influence attempts, patterns and combinations of influence tactics, and antecedents of influence. Ongoing research continues in these areas. Such research would be interesting and informative in the setting of religious organizations.

Leaders choose from a variety of influence tactics in the process of leadership. Each choice of influence tactic is the result of a decision process in which many variables are simultaneously considered. This process is often almost instantaneous as leaders seek to maximize the likelihood of compliance or commitment at the lowest social and organizational cost. While many of the demographic and contextual variables that might influence the choice of influence tactics were considered in this research, the effects of personality on influence tactic use were beyond the scope of this study.

As mentioned earlier, there is a growing interest in the phenomenon of servant leadership within the field of leadership studies. Empirical research is still scarce. Increasing interest in servant leadership has begun to address the need to empirically understand servant leadership. This study used servant leadership as an explanatory context for leadership within ECUSA, rather than a quantifiable variable. We would be naïve to assume that all leadership in ECUSA, or in other religious organizations, attains the altruistic, ethical, transforming service ideal of servant leadership. I am hopeful, however, that the results of this study - the degree of cooperation modeled by lay ministers, and the absence of overt and coercive influence tactics by the clergy- points toward the model of servant leadership made known in the life, death and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth.

Two of the scales used in the Episcopal Leadership Questionnaire were not tested for reliability and validity. The bases of social power scale used a single item to designate the leader's perceptions of their sources of power in ECUSA. The relationship of these variables to the influence tactics used makes this an important area for future refinement and study.

Similarly, the technical/adaptive scale contained three items with parallel continua, describing the degree to which the leader's work as technical or adaptive. There was a strong clustering around the mean on this item, indicating that both lay and ordained leaders did both technical and adaptive work in their ministries. The development of an empirically tested scale, along with its use as a variable of interest in leadership studies would be warranted.

When service sets the context for leadership, the distinctions between formal and informal authority deserve particular attention. The participants in this research did not include enough leaders with informal authority to compare these two categories in terms of influence. This distinction is an important variable for future research in leadership.

The Episcopal Church in the United States is a mainline Christian denomination with a hierarchical structure of formal authority, which has been redefined in the context of servant leadership. The laity in this denomination are expected to envision, initiate and implement the mission and ministry of the denomination. To some extent, the results of this study may be generalizable to similar denominations where lay leaders live out their vocations as faithful and active members of the Body of Christ. Other denominations may still hold onto traditional structures, or use the authority of scripture to limit the leadership of their members.   Women and minorities still have not taken their place among the leadership of many religious groups. The story of unfulfilled human longing for meaning and belonging is writ large in the exclusion and marginalization of segments of the faith community. Expansion of this research to other Protestant denominations, to the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches, to the growing group of evangelical churches, and to synagogues, mosques and religious groups outside of Christianity would offer deeper insights into the use of power, authority and influence as they are exercised among the broader community of believers.

References

Aguinas, H., & Adams, S. K. R. (1998). Social-role versus structural models of gender and influence use in organizations. *Group & Organization Management, 23* (4), 414-447.

Ansari, M., & Kapoor, A. (1987). Organizational context and upward influence tactics. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 40,* 39-49.

Babcock, L., & Laschever, S. (2003). *Women don't ask: Negotiation and the gender divide.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Barnard, C. I. (1938). *The functions of the executive.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Bass, B. M. (1960). *Leadership, psychology, and organizational behavior.* New York: Harper.

Bass, B.M. (2000). The future of leadership in learning organizations. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 7*(3), 18-40.

Bass, B. M., & Stodgill, R. M. (1990). *Bass & Stodgill's handbook of leadership* (3rd ed.). New York: The Free Press.

Berger, J., Ridgeway, C. L., Fisek, M. H., & Norman, R. Z. (1998). The legitimation and delegitimation of power and prestige orders. *American Sociological Review, 63* (3), 379-405.

Blanchard, K., & Johnson, S. (1982). *The one-minute manager*. New York: William Morrow.

Block, P. (1993). *Stewardship: Choosing service over self-interest*. San Francisco: Berrett Koehler.

Bruins, J. (1995, July). Determinants of interpersonal influences tactics. *Fourth European Conference of Psychology*, Athens, Greece.

Burgoon, M., Dillard, J. P., & Doran, N. B. (1983). Friendly or unfriendly persuasion: The effects of violations of expectations by males and females. *Human Communication Research, 10*, 283-294.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

Carli, L. L. (1990). Gender, language and influence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *59*, 941-951.

Case, T. L., & Keys, B. (1990). How to become an influential manager. *Academy of Management Executive*, *4* (4), 38-51.

Case, T.L., Dosier, L., Murkinson, G., & Keys, B. (1988). How managers influence superiors: A study of upward influence tactics. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal, 9* (4), 25-31.

Castro, S.L., Douglas, C., Hochwarter, W. A., Ferris, G. R., & Frink, D. D. (2003). The effect of positive affect and gender on the influence tactics – job performance relationship. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 10* (1), 1-13.

Church Hymnal Corporation. (1979). *The Book of Common Prayer*.

Cohen, P., Morgan, J., & Pollack, M. (1992). *Intentions in communication*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Covey, S. R. (1990). *Principle-centered leadership.* New York: Fireside Books.

De Pree, M. (1989). *Leadership is an art.* New York: Doubleday.

De Pree, M. (1992). *Leadership jazz.* New York: Doubleday.

De Pree, M. (1997). *Leading without power: Finding hope in serving community*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Dennis, R., & Winston, B. E. (2003). A factor analysis of Page and Wong's servant leadership instrument. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 24* (8), 455-459.

DuBrin, A. J. (1991). Sex and gender differences in tactics of influence. *Psychological Reports, 68*, 635-646.

DuBrin, A. J. (1998). *Leadership: Research, findings, practice, and skills* (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Dudley, C. S., & Roozen, D. A. (2001). *Faith communities today*. Hartford, CT: Hartford Seminary.

Eagly, A.H., & Carli, L.L. (2003). The female leadership advantage: An evaluation of the Evidence. *Leadership Quarterly, 14* (6), 807-834.

ECUSA (2003). www.episcopalchurch.org/documents/EPISCOPAL_FAST_FACTS.pdf. Downloaded 10/2003.

Episcopal Diocese of Virginia. (2004). *Journal of the 209th Annual Council of the Diocese of Virginia.*

Erez, M., & Rim, Y. (1982). The relationship between goals, influence tactics and personal and organizational variables. *Human Relations, 35* (10), 871-878.

Erez, M., Rim, Y., & Keider, I. (1986). The two sides of the tactics of influence: Agent vs. target. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 59*, 25-39.

Falbe, C.M., & Yukl, G. (1992). Consequences for manager of using single influence tactics and combinations of tactics. *Academy of Management Journal, 35*, 638-653.

Follett, M. P. (2001). The giving of orders. In J. M. Shafritz & J. S. Ott (Eds.), *Classics of organization theory, 5th Ed.* (pp. 152-157). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth. (Reprinted from *Scientific foundations of business administration* by H. C. Metcalf, Ed., 1926, Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins).

French, J. R. P., & Raven, B. H. (1959). Bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in Social Power* (pp. 150-167). Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.

Frick, D. M., & Spears, L.C. (Eds.). (1996). *On becoming a servant leader: The private writings of Robert K. Greenleaf*. San Francisco: Jossey – Bass.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). *The servant as leader*. Indianapolis: Robert K. Greenleaf Center for Servant-Leadership.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1988). *Spirituality as leadership*. Indianapolis: Robert K. Greenleaf Center for Servant-Leadership.

Griswold, F. (2002). Presiding Bishop's pastoral address to the Episcopal Church.

Guerin, B. (1995). Social influence in one-to-one and group situations: Predicting influence tactics from basic group processes. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 135, 371-385.

Gupta, S., & Case, T. L. (1999). Managers' outward influence tactics: An exploratory study. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal, 20* (6), 300-311.

Hair, J. E. , Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis (5th edition).* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Heifetz, R. A. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.

Heifetz, R. A., & Linsky, M. (2002). *Leadership on the line: Staying alive through the dangers of leading.* Cambridge, MA: HBS Press.

Heim, P., & Murphy, S. (2000). *In the company of women: Turning workplace alliances into powerful alliances.* New York: Tarcher- Putnam.

Hinkin, T. R., & Schriesheim, C. A. (1989). Development and application of new scales to measure the French and Raven (1959) bases of social power. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*, 561-567.

Hinkin, T. R., & Schriesheim, C. A. (1990). Relationships between subordinate perceptions of supervisor influence tactics and attributed bases of supervisory power. *Human Relations, 43*, 221-237.

Holland, T. P., & Sachs, W. L. (1999). *The Zaccheus project: Discerning Episcopal identity at the dawn of the new millennium.* New York: The Episcopal Church Foundation.

Hollander, E. P., & Julian, J. W. (1969). Contemporary trends and the analysis of leadership processes. *Psychological Bulletin, 71*, 387-397.

Kanter, R. M. (1979). Power failure in management circuits. *Harvard Business Review*, 57, 65-75.

Kelman, H. C. (1958). Compliance, identification and internalization: Three processes of attitude change. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 2*, 51-56.

Kelman, H. C. (1974). Further thoughts on the process of compliance, identification, and internalization. In J. T. Tedeschi (Ed.), *Perspectives on Social Power* (pp. 125-171). Chicago: Aldine.

Kipnis, D. (1976). *The powerholders*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kipnis, D. (1984). The use of power in organizations and interpersonal settings. *Applied Social Psychology Annual, 5*, 179-210.

Kipnis, D., & Schmidt, S. M. (1988). Upward influence styles. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 33*, 528-542.

Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S. M., & Wilkinson, L. (1980). Intraorganizational influence tactics: Explorations in getting one's way. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 65*, 440-452.

Lee, D. R., & Sweeney, P. J. (2001). An assessment of influence tactics used by project managers. *Engineering Management Review, 13* (2), 16-25.

Lewin, K. (1941). Analysis of the concepts whole, differentiation, and unity. *University of Iowa Studies in Child Welfare, 18*, 226-261.

Marwell, G., & Schmitt, D. R. (1967). Dimensions of compliance-gaining behavior: An empirical analysis. *Sociometry*, *30*, 350-364.

Mayo, E. (1933). *The human problems of an industrial civilization*. New York: Viking Press.

Mowday, R. T. (1978). The exercise of upward influence in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *23* (1), 137-156.

Nicotera, A. M., & Rancer, A. S. (1994). The influence of sex on self-perceptions and social stereotyping of aggressive communication dispositions. *Western Journal of Communication, 58*, 283-307.

Nunnaly, J. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Oxford University Press. *The Holy Bible: New Revised Standard Version.*

Page, D., & Wong, T. P. (2000). A conceptual framework for measuring servant leadership. In S. Adjibolosoo, (Ed.), *The Human Factor in Shaping History and Development* (pp. 69-110). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Peterson, D. (2004). Perceived leader integrity and the ethical intentions of subordinates. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, *25* (1), 7-23.

Pheffer, J. (1981). *Power in organizations*. Marshfield, MA: Pitman Publishing.

Podsakoff, P. M., & Schriesheim, C. A. (1985). Field studies of French and Raven's bases of social power: Critique, reanalysis, and suggestions for future research. *Psychological Bulletin, 97,* 387-411.

Rajan, S., & Krishnan, V. R. (2002). Impact of gender on influence, power and authoritarianism. *Women in Management Review, 17* (5/6), 197-207.

Raven, B. H. (1965). Social influence and power. In I. D. Steiner, M. Fishbein, & B.H. Raven, (Eds.), *Current Studies in Social Psychology* (pp. 399-444). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Raven, B. H. (1992). A Power/Interaction model of interpersonal influence: French and Raven thirty years later. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 7* (2), 217-244.

Raven, B. H., & French, J. R. P. (1958a). Group support, legitimate power and social influence. *Journal of Personality, 26,* 400-409.

Raven, B. H., & French, J. R. P. (1958b). Legitimate power, coercive power and observability in social influence. *Sociometry, 21*, 83-97.

Ridgeway, C. L., & Berger, J. (1986). Expectations, legitimation, and dominance behavior in task groups. *American Sociological Review, 51*, 603-617.

Roethlisberger, F., & Dickson, W. (1939). *Management and the worker.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Russell, R. F., & Stone, A. G. (2002). A review of servant leadership attributes: Developing a practical model. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal, 23* (3/4), 145-158.

Schmidt, S. M., & Kipnis, D. (1984). Managers' pursuit of individual and organizational goals. *Human Relations, 37* (10), 781-794.

Schriesheim, C. A., & Hinkin, T. R. (1990). Influence tactics used by subordinates: A theoretical and empirical analysis and refinement lf the Kipnis, Schmidt and Wilkinson subscales. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 246-257.

Sendjaya, S., & Sarros, J. C. (2002). Servant leadership: Its origin, development and application in organizations. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 9* (2), 57-65.

Senge, P. M. (1995). Robert Greenleaf's legacy: A new foundation for twenty-first century institutions. In L. Spears (ed.), *Reflections on Leadership* (pp. 217-240). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Shafritz, J. M., & Ott, J. S. (Eds.). (1996). *Classics of organization theory* (4th ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Sims, B. (1997). *Servanthood: Leadership for the third millennium.* Cambridge, MA: Cowley Publications.

Spears, L. (1998). *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit and servant Leadership.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The principles of scientific management*. New York: Norton.

Taylor, S. E., Cousino-Klein, L, Lewis, B. P., et al. (2000). Bio-behavioral responses to stress in females: Tend-and-befriend, not fight-or-flight. *Psychological Review, 107 (3),* 28.

Tepper, B. J., Brown, S. J., & Hunt, M. D. (1993). Strength of subordinates' upward influence tactics and gender congruency effects. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 23*, 1903-1919.

van Knippenberg, B., van Knippenberg, D., Blaauw, E., & Vermunt, R. (1999). Relational considerations in the use of influence tactics. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 29* (4), 806-819.

Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization*. New York: Free Press.

Wenger, E., McDermott, R., & Snyder, W. M. (2002). *Cultivating communities of practice*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Wiley, M. G., & Eskilson, A. (1985). Speech style, gender stereotypes and corporate success: What if women talk more like men? *Sex Roles, 12,* 993-1007.

Wind, J. P., & Rendle, G. R. (2001). *The leadership crisis facing American congregations*. Washington, D. C.: Alban Institute.

Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in organizations*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Yukl, G. (2000). *Influence behavior questionnaire*.

Yukl, G., Chavez, C., & Seifert, C. F. (in press). Assessing the utility of two new influence tactics with three research methods. *Journal of Applied Psychology.*

Yukl, G., & Falbe, C. M. (1990). Influence tactics in upward, downward, and lateral influence attempts. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 132-140.

Yukl, G., & Falbe, C. M. (1991). Importance of different power sources in downward and lateral relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76* (3), 416-423.

Yukl, G., Falbe, C. M., & Youn, J. Y. (1993). Patterns of influence behaviors for managers. *Group and Organization Management, 18,* 5-28.

Yukl, G., Guinan, P. J., & Sottolano, D. (1995). Influence tactics used for different objectives with subordinates, peers and superiors. *Group and Organization Management, 20* (3), 272-296.

Yukl, G., Kim, H., & Falbe, C. M. (1996). Antecedents of influence outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 309-317.

Yukl, G., Lepsinger, R., & Lucia T. (1992). Preliminary report on development and validation of the Influence Behavior Questionnaire. In K. E. Clark, M. B. Clark, & D. P. Campbell (Eds.). *Impact of Leadership* (pp. 417-427). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Yukl, G., & Seifert, C. (2001). Preliminary results from validation research on the extended version of the Influence Behavior Questionnaire. Unpublished press release.

Yukl, G., & Tracey, J. B. (1992). Consequences of influence tactics used with subordinates, peers and the boss. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *77*, 525-535.

APPENDIX A

Episcopal Leadership Questionnaire

Estimated completion time - 20 minutes

Part 1 - Influence Behavior Questionnaire Form - Agent2000

Instructions

The purpose of this questionnaire is to learn more about the different ways people try to influence each other in organizations. Please choose a person whom you work with in your capacity as a leader. Please choose someone with whom you have interacted repeatedly for at least four months.

This person is my: _______ boss/supervisor ______ subordinate ______ peer ______ other/hard to define

If "other/hard to define" please explain:

Please describe how much you use each of the following types of behavior in an effort to influence the (target) person described above. For each behavior item, select one of the following response choices, and circle the number that best describes your leadership.

(1) I can't remember ever using this tactic with him/her.

(2) I very seldom use this tactic with him/her.

(3) I occasionally use this tactic with him/her.

(4) I use this tactic moderately often with him/her.

(5) I use this tactic very often with him/her.

Please be accurate and honest in your answers. They will remain confidential and won't be seen by anyone in your organization. If an item does not apply to your situation, use the #1 response.

IBQ scale items deleted per agreement with author. See Table 4 for sample scale items.

Part 2 - Subject information

Please provide the following information. Individual information is for control purposes only. No personal information will be disseminated or viewed by anyone except the researcher.

1. Are you ordained in the Episcopal Church? Please circle Yes No

   If ordained: Are you a Bishop Priest Deacon? (Circle one)

   If ordained, how long have you been ordained?______________________________

2. Sex: (Circle one) Male Female

3. Year of birth: _______________

4. Educational background: Please circle highest level of education

   High school or GED Some college Bachelor's degree Master's Doctorate

   If Doctorate, please circle type of degree: D.Min. Ph.D. Other ________________

5. Description of current leadership activity:

Position:____

Scope of ministry: (Circle the choice that best describes your position)

Community leadership Parish ministry Diocesan ministry National Church Other

If "Other", please describe: ____

Primary focus of your leadership activity: (Circle the choice that best describes your ministry)

Parish/pastoral Social justice Community outreach Missionary Educational Administrative Other

If "Other" please describe ____

6. Are you Paid for this activity? Volunteer? (Circle one)

7. How many hours per week are you engaged in this activity?_______________

8. Were you hired, elected or appointed to your current position? (Circle one) Yes No

9. How long have you been exercising leadership in this capacity? ________________________

10. Researchers have identified several different sources of power that leaders use to effect change.

On a scale from 1 to 5, please describe to what extent you see yourself having the power that comes from the following sources? 1=none 5=very much

The power to offer something the other person wants.	1	2	3	4	5
The power to take something away from or punish another person.	1	2	3	4	5
The power that comes from your title or position in the organization.	1	2	3	4	5
The power that comes from your knowledge, experience, talent or expertise.	1	2	3	4	5
The power that you have because others like you or want to please you.	1	2	3	4	5

11. Technical/Adaptive Leadership

Please circle the number that best represents where your current leadership work falls between each pair of statements						
There are usually clear precedents for my decisions.	1	2	3	4	5	Most situations demand new, creative solutions.
The situations call upon familiar patterns of thought or behavior.	1	2	3	4	5	The situations require major changes in attitude or behavior.
The issues I deal with are clear.	1	2	3	4	5	The issues I deal with are complex and ambiguous.

Your own comments and insights on leadership in the Episcopal Church and on your own practice of leadership are welcomed on the back of this page.

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. A return envelope is provided for your convenience.
The Rev. M.A. Faeth 4529 Peacock Avenue Alexandria, VA 22304

Thank you for completing this survey! Please use the stamped, addressed envelope (enclosed) to return the survey and your consent form to:

The Reverend M.A. Faeth
4529 Peacock Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22304

APPENDIX B
Solicitation Letters

The Reverend Margaret Ann Faeth
Address

December 2002

Dear :

I am sending you this letter because of my admiration for your leadership in ministry. As you may know, I am in the midst of writing my Ph. D. dissertation in Adult Learning and Human Resource Development at Virginia Tech. My dissertation is a comparative study on leadership behaviors among lay and ordained leaders in the Episcopal Church. At last, I am ready to collect data which will provide some insights for leadership development in the Episcopal Church. The statistical techniques I am using require large sample sizes so I am asking for your help.

May I ask you to spend a few minutes to fill out the attached questionnaire and consent form? A generic cover letter and return envelope are attached to each set. If you know of an outstanding leader, lay or ordained, in the Episcopal Church, would you also be willing to pass a questionnaire along to them? I have enclosed several sets for your convenience. Confidentiality and anonymity are guaranteed. One methodological note – due to the unique power and authority configurations involved, I cannot use surveys from current seminarians. If you have any questions, or need more questionnaires to share, please contact me at the email address above.

Leadership is an integral part of the ministry that we share in the name of Christ. Thank you in advance for assisting me in this research.

Faithfully yours,

The Rev. M.A. Faeth
Associate Rector
Immanuel Church-on-the-Hill

Ph.D. candidate, Virginia Tech

The Reverend Margaret Ann Faeth
Address

January 2003

Dear colleague in ministry:

You have received this letter because you have been identified as a leader in the Episcopal Church. Either you have been nominated by a colleague or have answered an advertisement for research subjects on Episcopal leadership.

As we face the changes and challenges of modern ministry, the Episcopal Church needs lay and ordained leaders who are prepared for leadership. One part of that challenge is understanding how true leaders actually go about the process of leading others and serving Christ.

I am an Episcopal priest in the Diocese of Virginia and a Ph.D. candidate in Adult Learning and Human Resource Development at Virginia Tech. This solicitation is a part of my dissertation research on leadership in the Episcopal Church.

May I please ask you to take a few minutes to fill out the attached questionnaire? Your input is essential to ensure that my research includes a broad sample of lay and ordained leaders in the Episcopal Church. (For methodological reasons, I cannot use responses from current seminarians who are seeking ordination.) Your responses will be anonymous and confidential. By returning the completed survey, you will be agreeing to participate. A stamped, pre-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Thank you in advance for your participation. I give thanks for your leadership and rejoice in the ministry that we share.

Faithfully yours,

The Reverend M.A. Faeth
Immanuel Church-on-the-Hill
Alexandria, Virginia

Ph.D. candidate, Virginia Tech

VITA

The Reverend Margaret Ann Faeth (Sam) is an Episcopal priest in the Diocese of Virginia. She earned undergraduate and graduate degrees in Business Administration. After a career in financial management and consulting, she attended Virginia Theological Seminary, where she earned a Master of Divinity degree, with honors in Church History. She studied theology at Wadham College, Oxford; and leadership education at the JFK School of Government at Harvard.

In addition to her parish ministry, Sam is an adjunct instructor at Virginia Theological Seminary, and a leadership coach and consultant. She serves on the boards of several non-profit community service organizations.