



National Library of Canada

Cataloguing Branch
Canadian Theses Division

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Direction du catalogage
Division des thèses canadiennes

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

**THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED**

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

**LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE**

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF INFLUENCE AND POWER
IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

by Huguette Labelle

Thesis presented to the School of
Graduate Studies as partial ful-
fillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

University of Ottawa

Ottawa, Canada, 1979

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my most sincere appreciation to Dr. Pierre Poirier for his advice and wise counsel during the course of this study.

To my family and work colleagues, who have provided support and demonstrated patience, I also wish to extend my gratitude.

CURRICULUM STUDIORUM

Huguette Labelle was born in Rockland, Ontario, on April 15th, 1939. She obtained her Bachelor of Science in Nursing Education in 1960, her Bachelor of Education, and her Master in Education in 1968.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	page
INTRODUCTION	vi
I.- METHODOLOGY	1
1. The Sample	1
2. Theoretical Framework	16
3. Operational Approach to Analysis of Elements Comprising the Phenomena of Influence and Power	18
II.- PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS: INTRAPHENOMENAL ANALYSIS OF INFLUENCE	21
1. Intradimensional Analysis of the Phenomenon of Influence	21
2. Interdimensional Analysis of the Phenomenon of Influence	55
3. Presentation of Findings Resulting from the Intradimensional and Interdimensional Analysis of the Phenomenon of Influence	62
4. Interpretation of Findings	78
III.- PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS: INTRAPHENOMENAL ANALYSIS OF POWER	79
1. Intradimensional Analysis of the Phenomenon of Power	79
2. Interdimensional Analysis of the Phenomenon of Power	131
3. Presentation of Findings Resulting from the Intradimensional and Interdimensional Analysis of the Phenomenon of Power	145
4. Interpretation of Findings	164
IV.- INTERPHENOMENAL ANALYSIS OF THE PHENOMENA OF INFLUENCE AND POWER	165
1. Interphenomenal Intradimensional Analysis of the Phenomena of Influence and Power	165
2. Presentation of Findings Resulting from the Interphenomenal Intradimensional Analysis of Influence and Power	234
3. Interpretation of Findings	265
V.- ESSENTIAL FINDINGS FROM THE ANALYSES OF THE PHENOMENA OF INFLUENCE AND POWER: A SYNOPTIC VIEW	266
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	288

TABLE OF CONTENTS

v

Chapter	page
BIBLIOGRAPHY	293
Appendix	
1. VALIDATION REVIEW PANEL	298
2. ABSTRACT OF <u>A Comparative Study of Influence and Power in Educational Administration</u>	300

INTRODUCTION

In reviewing educational administration literature, it seems that the use of the phenomena* of influence and power is surrounded by confusion. Various authors seem to use these two phenomena interchangeably; in the analysis of these two phenomena they sometimes seem to utilize the same elements without indicating whether they are specific to a phenomenon or conversely whether they are common to both phenomena: they utilize one phenomenon in defining the other; or use both phenomena interchangeably in defining related phenomena such as leadership, control, and authority. Finally, certain authors present one phenomenon as deriving from the other phenomenon or conversely as its basis.

The purpose of this study is to attempt to clarify this state of confusion surrounding the use of influence and power, and to provide basic information which could serve as a basis to the development of a differential theory of influence and power. Based on authors studied, there will be an attempt to identify elements comprising each dimension of each phenomenon, to identify elements specific to each phenomenon and those common to both phenomena.

This study is exploratory and comparative in nature in that based on authors studied, it will analyze and compare

* All internal or external reality which can be observed or felt independently of any explanation about its existence.

documentation on influence and power by following a specific approach based on logic and developed and adapted by other authors for the exploration of a concept.

As indicated this study is exploratory and comparative and is limited to influence and power in educational administration. Related phenomena such as leadership, authority, and control are only considered to the extent that they are used in the literature to clarify influence and power. In the operational approach to analysis of elements and in presenting results, there is no attempt to present philosophical implications inherent in definitions presented by various authors or to consider various schools of thought in the field of educational administration. Further, the historical evolution as to how individual authors and authors generally have viewed these phenomena over time is not presented.

It will consist of the following analyses: an intra-phenomenal analysis consisting of an intradimensional and an interdimensional analysis of each phenomenon studied; and an interphenomenal analysis consisting of an intradimensional analysis of both phenomena.

This analytical approach will utilize the methodology first developed by Poirier¹ for his doctoral thesis, Une étude des phénomènes de l'autorité et du leadership en

¹ Pierre Poirier, Une étude des phénomènes de l'autorité et du leadership en administration scolaire, unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Presented to the Faculty of Education of the University of Ottawa, Ontario, 1973, v-371 p.

administration scolaire and later adapted by Fortin.² While recognizing that this approach contributes to heaviness of the text, it is hoped that readers will bear with the steps leading to the eventual identification of essential findings.

A review of the literature reveals that few studies have been conducted for the purpose of analyzing and comparing administrative phenomena. Two studies have analyzed related phenomena: Hanlon³ attempted to determine the interaction between authority and power, and Poirier⁴ analyzed the phenomena of authority and leadership in educational administration.

This study's first chapter presents the methodology used in conducting the study. The second and third chapters consist of the intraphenomenal, intra and interdimensional analyses of influence and of power respectively. The fourth chapter presents the interphenomenal intradimensional analysis of influence and power. The fifth chapter contains a synoptic view of essential findings from the analyses of influence and power. Conclusions include main results and need for future research.

2 J. C. Fortin, Une étude des phénomènes de l'organisation, de l'administration et de la coordination, unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Presented to the Faculty of Education of the University of Ottawa, Ontario, 1976, ix-265 p.

3 James M. Hanlon, An Analysis of Authority and Power in Administration, unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Presented to the Faculty of Education, Buffalo University, Buffalo, U.S.A., 1961, 81 p.

4 P. Poirier, Op. Cit.

CHAPTER I

METHODOLOGY

This chapter contains the sample serving as a basis for this study, the theoretical rationale, operational definitions, and the method utilized to analyze elements of the phenomena of influence and power.

1. Sample.

The following texts written by authors in educational administration have served as a basis to select the works of authors to be utilized in this study: Baron,¹ Baron and Taylor,² Bennett,³ Bogue and Saunders,⁴ Brown and Giles,⁵ Burton and Bruechner,⁶ Campbell and

1 George Baron, The Government and the Management of Schools, London, Athlone Press, 1974, viii-245 p.

2 George Baron and William Taylor, Eds., Educational Administration and the Social Sciences, London, Athlone Press, 1969, 193 p.

3 Stephen J. Bennett, The School: An Organizational Analysis, Glasgow, Blackie, 1974, 128 p.

4 Ernest Grady Bogue and Robert L. Saunders, The Educational Manager: Artist and Practitioner, Worthington, Ohio, Jones, 1976, ix-213 p.

5 Carl Brown and T. Giles, Strategies for Instruction and Organization, Calgary, Detseling Enterprises, 1976, 267 p.

6 William H. Burton and Leo J. Bruechner, Supervision: A Social Process, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1955, x-715 p.

Gregg,⁷ Campbell, Bridges, and Nystrand,⁸ Carver and Sergiovanni,⁹ W. W. Charters et al.,¹⁰ Chernow and Chernow,¹¹ Eye and Netzer,¹² Fortin,¹³ Franseth,¹⁴ Garton,¹⁵ Getzels, Lipham, and Campbell,¹⁶

7 Roald F. Campbell and Russell T. Gregg, Eds., Administrative Behavior in Education, New York, Harper & Row, 1957, xi-547 p.

8 Roald F. Campbell, Edwin M. Bridges, and Raphael O. Nystrand, Introduction to Educational Administration, 5th Ed., Boston, Allyn & Bacon, 1977, x-396 p.

9 Fred D. Carver and Tomas J. Sergiovanni, Eds., Organizations and Human Behavior, New York; McGraw-Hill, 1969, xx-410 p.

10 W. W. Charters, et al., Perspectives on Educational Administration and the Behavioral Sciences, Eugene, University of Oregon, Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1965, vi-120 p.

11 Fred B. Chernow and Carol Chernow, School Administrator's Guide to Managing People, West Nyack, New York, Parker, 1976, 226 p.

12 Glen G. Eye and Lanore A. Netzer, School Administration and Instructions: A Guide to Self-Appraisal, Boston, Allyn & Bacon, 1969, xvi-304 p.

13 J. C. Fortin, Une étude des phénomènes de l'organisation, de l'administration et de la coordination, unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Presented to the Faculty of Education of the University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario, 1976, ix-265 p.

14 Jane Franseth, Supervision as Leadership, Evanston, Illinois, Row Peterson, 1961, xi-195 p.

15 Richard A. Garton, School Administration: Challenge and Opportunity for Leadership, Dubuque, Iowa, Brown, 1976, xiii-436 p.

16 Jacob W. Getzels, James M. Lipham, and Raold F. Campbell, Educational Administration as a Social Process: Theory Research, Practice, New York, Harper & Row, 1968, xx-420 p.

Gibb,¹⁷ Graff, et al.,¹⁸ Griffiths,^{19,20,21} Griffiths, et al.,²² Gue,²³ Hack, et al.,²⁴ Halpin,²⁵ Hamilton,²⁶ Hanlon,²⁷

17 Cecil Austin Gibb, Ed., Leadership: Selected Readings, Harmondsworth, England, Penguin, 1979, 439 p.

18 Orin B. Graff, et al., Philosophic Theory and Practice in Educational Administration, Belmont, California, Woodsworth, 1966, vi-314 p.

19 Daniel E. Griffiths, Human Relations in School Administration, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1956, xii-458 p.

20 Daniel E. Griffiths, Administrative Theory, New York, Appelton-Century-Crofts, 1959, viii-123 p.

21 Daniel E. Griffiths, Ed., "Behavioral Science and Educational Administration", in Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1964, vi-360 p.

22 Daniel E. Griffiths, et al., Organizing Schools for Effective Education, Danville, Illinois, Interstate, 1962, x-338 p.

23 Leslie R. Gue, An Introduction to Educational Administration in Canada, Toronto, McGraw-Hill, Ryerson, 1977, 230 p.

24 Walter G. Hack et al., Educational Administration: Selected Readings, 2nd Ed., Boston, Allyn & Bacon, 1971, vii-344 p.

25 Andrew W. Halpin, Ed., Administrative Theory in Education, London, Collier-McGraw-Macmillan, 1969, vii-185 p.

26 Norman K. Hamilton, New Techniques for Effective School Administration, West Nyack, New York, Parker, 1975, 205 p.

27 James M. Hanlon, Theory, Practice and Education, Wisconsin, Marian College Press, 1973, 232 p.

Harris,²⁸ Hemphill, et al.,²⁹ Hicks and Gullett,³⁰ House,³¹
Jensen and Clark,³² Kimbrough,³³ Kimbrough and Nunnery,³⁴
Knezevich,³⁵ Landers and Myers,³⁶ Lane, et al.,³⁷ Litterer,³⁸

28 Ben M. Harris, Supervisory Behavior in Education, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1975, xviii-557 p.

29 John K. Hemphill, et al., Administrative Performance and Personality, New York, Teachers' College Press, 1962, xviii-432 p.

30 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Organizations: Theory and Behavior, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1975, xvii-446 p.

31 Ernest R. House, The Politics of Educational Administration, Berkeley, California, McCutchan, 1974, ix-312 p.

32 Theodore J. Jensen and David L. Clark, Educational Administration, New York, The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1964, x-118 p.

33 Ralph B. Kimbrough, Political Power and Educational Decision-Making, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1964, ix-307 p.

34 Ralph B. Kimbrough and Michael Y. Nunnery, Educational Administration: An Introduction, New York, Macmillan, 1976, viii-504 p.

35 Stephen J. Knezevich, Administration of Public Education, New York, Harper & Row, 1975, xi-620 p.

36 Thomas J. Landers and Judith C. Myers, Essentials of School Management, Philadelphia, Saunders, 1977, x-445 p.

37 Willard R. Lane, et al., Foundations of Educational Administration: A Behavioral Analysis, New York, Macmillan, 1967, x-433 p.

38 Joseph A. Litterer, Organizations: Structure and Behavior, 2nd Ed., New York, Wiley, 1969, xii-498 p.

Lucio and McNeil,³⁹ Lutz and Iannacone,⁴⁰ Mann,⁴¹ McCarty and Ramsey,⁴² Monahan,⁴³ Morphet, Johns, and Reller,⁴⁴ Mort and Ross,⁴⁵ Newell,⁴⁶ Nolte,⁴⁷ Ohms and Monahan,⁴⁸ Owens,⁴⁹

39 William H. Lucio and John D. McNeil, Supervision: A Synthesis of Thought and Action, 2nd Ed., New York, McGraw-Hill, 1969, xi-329 p.

40 Frank W. Lutz and Laurence Iannacone, Understanding Educational Organizations: A Field Study Approach, Columbus, Ohio, Merrill, 1969, viii-184 p.

41 Dale Mann, The Politics of Administrative Representation: School Administrators and Local Democracy, Lexington, Mass., Lexington Books, 1976, xiii-185 p.

42 Donald J. McCarty and Charles E. Ramsay, The School Managers, Wesport, Connecticut, Greenwood, 1971, xxii-281 p.

43 William G. Monahan, Theoretical Dimensions of Educational Administration, New York, Macmillan, 1975, xii-481 p.

44 Edgar Morphet, Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller, Educational Organizations and Administration: Concepts, Practices and Issues, 3rd Ed., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1974, x-566 p.

45 Paul R. Mort and Donald H. Ross, Principles of School Administration: A Synthesis of Basic Concepts, 2nd Ed., New York, McGraw-Hill, 1957, xi-451 p.

46 Clarence Albert Newell, Human Behavior in Educational Administration, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1978, x-261 p.

47 Chester M. Nolte, An Introduction to School Administration, New York, Macmillan, 1966, xvii-413 p.

48 R. E. Ohms and W. G. Monahan, Eds., Educational Administration: Philosophy in Action, University of Oklahoma Press, 1965, ix-108 p.

49 Robert G. Owens, Organizational Behavior in Schools, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1970, ix-246 p.

Poirier,⁵⁰ Poirier,⁵¹ Reeves, Melsness, and Cheal,⁵² Reller and Morphet,⁵³ Roe,⁵⁴ Roe and Drake,⁵⁵ Sachs,⁵⁶ Sarthory,⁵⁷ Saunders, Phillips, and Johnson,⁵⁸ Savage,⁵⁹

50 Pierre Poirier, Une étude des phénomènes de l'autorité et du leadership en administration scolaire, unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Presented to the Faculty of Education of the University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario, 1973, v-371 p.

51 Yves Poirier, Une analyse de facteurs administratif aux moyens d'une étude comparative des perceptions de ces facteurs par quinze théoriciens de l'organisation et de l'administration, unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Presented to the Faculty of Education of the University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario, 1971, xiii-255 p.

52 Arthur W. Reeves, Harold C. Melsness, and John E. Cheal, Educational Administration: The Role of the Teacher, Toronto, Macmillan, 1962, xxi-277 p.

53 Theodore L. Reller and Edgar L. Morphet, Eds., Comparative Educational Administration, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1962, 438 p.

54 William H. Roe, School Business Management, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1961, xi-285 p.

55 William H. Roe and Thelbert L. Drake, The Principals, New York, Macmillan, 1974, vii-337 p.

56 Benjamin M. Sachs, Educational Administration: A Behavioral Approach, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1966, xiii-412 p.

57 Joseph A. Sarthory, Ed., Educational Leadership, Renewal and Planning: A Synthesis, New York, MSS Information, 1974, 158 p.

58 Robert L. Saunders, Ray C. Phillips, and Harold J. T. Johnson, A Theory of Educational Leadership, Columbus, Ohio, Merrill, 1966, xii-174 p.

59 William W. Savage, Interpersonal and Group Relations in Educational Administration, Glenview, Illinois, Scott, Foreman, 1968, 426 p.

Scribner,⁶⁰ Sergiovanni and Carver,⁶¹ Walton,⁶² Wilson,⁶³
Wilson,⁶⁴ Zaltman, Florio, and Sikorski.⁶⁵

The above list of authors has served as the basis for the selection of works to be utilized in this study. Authors dealing with influence and power have been retained from this original list and from the sources of reference used in these texts. The authors considered in this study are therefore as follows: Adams,⁶⁶ Merton, Broom, and Cottrell,⁶⁷

60 Jay D. Scribner, Ed., "The Politics of Education", in The 76th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II, Chicago, University of Chicago, 1977, 367 p.

61 Thomas Sergiovanni and Fred D. Carver, The New School Executive: A Theory of Administration, New York, Dodd, Mead, 1973, xiii-246 p.

62 John Walton, Administration and Policy Making in Education, revised edition, Baltimore, John Hopkins Press, 1969, viii-228 p.

63 L. Craig Wilson, School Leadership Today: Strategies for the Educator, Boston, Allyn & Bacon, 1978, xiv-346 p.

64 Robert F. Wilson, Educational Administration, Columbus, Ohio, Merrill, 1966, xxi-853 p.

65 Gerald Zaltman, David H. Florio, and Linda A. Sikorski, Dynamic Educational Change: Models, Strategies, Tactics and Management, New York, Free Press, 1977, xvi-364 p.

66 Richard Newbold Adams, Energy and Structure, Austin, University of Texas Press, 1975, xviii-353 p.

67 Robert King Merton, Leonard Broom, and Leonard S. Cottrell, Eds., Sociology Today: Problems and Prospects, New York, Harper & Row under the auspices of the American Sociological Society, 1965, xxxiv-623 p.

Balandier,⁶⁸ Banfield,⁶⁹ Bell,⁷⁰ Bennett,⁷¹ Bennis,⁷² Bennis, Benne, and Chin,⁷³ Berle,⁷⁴ Bierstedt,⁷⁵ Blau,⁷⁶ Blau and Scott,⁷⁷ Campbell and Gregg,⁷⁸ Cartwright,⁷⁹ Cartwright and

68 Georges Balandier, Political Anthropology, translated by A. M. Sheridan Smith, New York, Random House, 1970, viii-214 p.

69 Edward Christie Banfield, Political Influence, New York, Free Press, 1965, vi-354 p.

70 David V. J. Bell, Power, Influence and Authority, New York, Oxford University Press, 1975, xii-131 p.

71 Stephen J. Bennett, Op. Cit.

72 Warren G. Bennis, Changing Organizations, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1966, xi-223 p.

73 Warren G. Bennis, Kenneth D. Benne, and Robert Chin, The Planning of Change, New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969, vii-627 p.

74 Adolf A. Berle, Power, New York, Brace & World, 1969, xv-603 p.

75 Robert M. Bierstedt, "An Analysis of Social Power", in American Sociological Review, Vol. 15, December 1950, p. 730-738.

76 P. M. Blau, Exchange and Power in Social Life, New York, Wiley, 1964, xxiii-352 p.

77 Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach, San Francisco, California, Chandler, 1962, x-312 p.

78 Roald F. Campbell and Russell T. Gregg, Eds., Op. Cit.

79 Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Studies in Social Power, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan, 1959, ix-225 p.

Zander,⁸⁰ Charters, et al.,⁸¹ Cozier,⁸² Dahl,^{83,84,85}
d'Antonio and Ehrlich;⁸⁶ Deutsch,⁸⁷ Emerson,⁸⁸ Etzioni,⁸⁹
Fleisher,⁹⁰ Galbraith,⁹¹ Gamson,⁹²

⁸⁰ Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, Eds., Group Dynamics: Research and Theory, 3rd Ed., New York, Harper & Row, 1968, ix-580 p.

⁸¹ W. W. Charters, et al., Op. Cit.

⁸² M. Cozier, The Bureaucratic Phenomenon, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1964, x-320 p.

⁸³ Robert A. Dahl, "The Concept of Power", in Behavioral Science, Vol. 2, June 1957, p. 201-218.

⁸⁴ Robert A. Dahl, "Power", in International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Vol. 12, New York, Macmillan, Free Press, 1968, p. 405-415.

⁸⁵ Robert A. Dahl, Modern Political Analysis, 3rd Ed., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1976, xii-156 p.

⁸⁶ William V. d'Antonio and Howard J. Ehrlich, Eds., Power and Democracy in America, Notre Dame, Indiana, University of Notre Dame Press, 1961, xvi-181 p.

⁸⁷ Karl Deutsch, The Nerves of Government, New York, The Free Press, 1966, xxxvi-316 p.

⁸⁸ Richard M. Emerson, "Power-Dependence Relations", in American Sociological Review, Vol. 17, February 1962, p. 31-41.

⁸⁹ Amitai Etzioni, A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations, New York, Free Press of Glencoe, 1961, xx-366 p.

⁹⁰ Martin Fleisher, Ed., Machiavelli and the Nature of Political Thought, Canada, McClelland and Stewart, New York, Atheneum, 1972, vii-307 p.

⁹¹ John Kenneth Galbraith, American Capitalism: The Concept of Countervailing Power, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1956, xi-208 p.

⁹² William A. Gamson, Power and Discontent, Homewood, Illinois, Dorsey, 1968, xi-208 p.

Gibb,⁹³ Goldhamer and Shils,⁹⁴ Griffiths,^{95,96,97} Hack et al.,⁹⁸ Harris,⁹⁹ Hicks and Gullett,¹⁰⁰ Hobbes,¹⁰¹ Hollander,^{102,103} Homans,^{104,105} Hunter,¹⁰⁶ Katz and Kahn,¹⁰⁷

93 Cecil Austin Gibb, Ed., Op. Cit.

94 Herbert Goldhamer and Edward A. Shils, "Types of Power and Status", in American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 45, September 1939, p. 171-182.

95 Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1956.

96 Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1959.

97 Daniel E. Griffiths, Ed., Op. Cit., 1964.

98 Walter G. Hack, et al., Op. Cit.

99 Ben M. Harris, Op. Cit.

100 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit.

101 Thomas Hobbes, Leviathan, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1957, lxvi-468 p.

102 Edwin Paul Hollander, Leaders, Groups and Influence, New York, Oxford University Press, 1964, xiv-256 p.

103 Edwin Paul Hollander, Leadership Dynamics: A Practical Guide to Effective Relationships, New York, Free Press, 1978, xii-212 p.

104 George C. Homans, The Human Group, New York, Harcourt, Brace, 1950, xxvi-484 p.

105 George Caspar Homans, Social Behavior. Its Elementary Forms, New York, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1974, xi-386 p.

106 Floyd Hunter, Community Power Structure, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1953, xiv-297 p.

107 Daniel Datz and Robert L. Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organizations, New York, Wiley, 1966, vii-498 p.

Keynes and Ricci,¹⁰⁸ Kimbrough,¹⁰⁹ Kimbrough and Nunnery,¹¹⁰
King,¹¹¹ Knezevich,¹¹² Kolb,¹¹³ Lane, et al.,¹¹⁴ Lasswell and
Kaplan,¹¹⁵ Lazarus and Warren,¹¹⁶ Leavitt,¹¹⁷ Leavitt, Dill,
and Eyring,¹¹⁸ Lewin,¹¹⁹ Likert,^{120,121}

108 Edward Keynes and David M. Ricci, Political Power, Community and Democracy, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1970, viii-286 p.

109 Ralph B. Kimbrough, Op. Cit.

110 Ralph B. Kimbrough and Michael Y. Nunnery, Op. Cit.

111 Stephen W. King, Communication and Social Influence, Don Mills, Ontario, Addison-Wesley, 1975, x-169 p.

112 Stephen J. Knezevich, Op. Cit.

113 Eugene J. Kolb, A Framework for Political Analysis, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, 1978, xiii-338 p.

114 Willard R. Lane, et al., Op. Cit.

115 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Power and Society, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1969, xxiv-295 p.

116 Harold Lazarus and E. Kirby Warren, The Progress of Management, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1968, vi-330 p.

117 Harold J. Leavitt, Managerial Psychology, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1972, viii-366 p.

118 Harold J. Leavitt, William R. Dill, and Henry B. Eyring, The Organizational World, New York, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1973, xvi-335 p.

119 Kurt Lewin, Field Theory in Social Science, New York, Harper & Row, 1951, xx-346 p.

120 Rensis Likert, New Patterns of Management, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1961, vii-279 p.

121 Rensis Likert, The Human Organization, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1967, ix-258 p.

Lippitt,¹²² Litterer,¹²³ Lucio and McNeil,¹²⁴ Lutz and Iannacone,¹²⁵ March,^{126,127} March and Simon,¹²⁸ Martindale,¹²⁹ McCarty and Ramsey,¹³⁰ McClelland,¹³¹ McFarland,¹³² McGregor,¹³³

122 Gordon L. Lippitt, Organizational Renewal: Achieving Viability in a Changing World, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969, xii-321 p.

123 Joseph A. Litterer, The Analysis of Organizations, New York, Wiley, 1973, vii-757 p.

124 William H. Lucio and John D. McNeil, Op. Cit.

125 Frank W. Lutz and Laurence Iannacone, Op. Cit.

126 James G. March, "An Introduction to the Theory and Measurement of Influence", in APSR, Vol. 49, June 1955, p. 431-451.

127 James G. March, Ed., Handbook of Organizations, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1965, xvi-1247 p.

128 James G. March and Herbert A. Simon, Organizations, New York, Wiley, 1967, xi-262 p.

129 Don Martindale, Institutions, Organizations and Mass Society, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1966, xvi-576 p.

130 Donald J. McCarty and Charles E. Ramsey, Op. Cit.

131 David C. McClelland, Power, The Inner Experience, New York, Irvington, 1975, xiv-427 p.

132 Andrew S. McFarland, Power and Leadership in Pluralist Systems, Stanford, California, Stanford University Press, 1969, xiii-273 p.

133 Douglas McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1960, x-246 p.

Mechanic,¹³⁴ Merton,¹³⁵ Miles,¹³⁶ Monahan,¹³⁷ Morphet, Johns, and Reller,¹³⁸ Mort and Ross,¹³⁹ Nagel,¹⁴⁰ Netzer, et al.,¹⁴¹ Newman and Warren,¹⁴² Parsons,^{143,144} Petrullo and Bass,¹⁴⁵

134 D. Mechanic, "Sources of Power of Lower Participants in Complex Organizations", in Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 7, 1962, p. 349-364.

135 Robert King Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, Toronto, Collier-Macmillan, 1968, xxiii-702 p.

136 Raymond E. Miles, Theories of Management: Implications for Organizational Behavior and Development, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1975, xv-240 p.

137 William G. Monahan, Op. Cit.

138 Edgar Morphet, Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller, Op. Cit.

139 Paul R. Mort and Donald H. Ross, Op. Cit.

140 Jack H. Nagel, The Descriptive Analysis of Power, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1975, xi-200 p.

141 Lanore A. Netzer, et al., Interdisciplinary Foundations of Supervision, Boston, Allyn & Bacon, 1970, ix-400 p.

142 William Herman Newman and E. Kirby Warren, The Process of Management: Concepts, Behavior and Practice, 4th Ed., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1977, xv-670 p.

143 Talcott Parsons, Politics and Social Structure, New York, The Free Press, 1969, xvii-557 p.

144 Talcott Parsons, Social Systems and the Evolution of Action Theory, New York, The Free Press, 1977, x-420 p.

145 Luigi Petrullo and Bernard Bass, Eds., Leadership and Interpersonal Behavior, New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1967, 382 p.

Pettigrew,^{146,147} Polsby,¹⁴⁸ Presthus,¹⁴⁹ Reeves, Melsness,
and Cheal,¹⁵⁰ Roe and Drake,¹⁵¹ Russell,^{152,153} Sachs,¹⁵⁴
Schein,¹⁵⁵ Scott,¹⁵⁶ Scribner,¹⁵⁷ Sergiovanni and Carver,¹⁵⁸

146 Andrew M. Pettigrew, The Politics of Organizational Decision-Making, U.S.A., Harper & Row, 1973, xvii-302 p.

147 A. M. Pettigrew, "Information as a Power Resource", in Sociology, Vol. 6, 1976, p. 187-204.

148 Nelson W. Polsby, Community Power and Political Theory, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1963, xiv-144 p.

149 Robert Presthus, Men at the Top: A Study in Community Power, New York, Oxford University Press, 1964, x-485 p.

150 Arthur W. Reeves, Harold C. Melsness, and John E. Cheal, Op. Cit.

151 William H. Roe and Thelbert L. Drake, Op. Cit.

152 Bertrand Russell, Power: A New Social Analysis, New York, Norton, 1938, 315 p.

153 Bertrand Russell, Authority and the Individual, London, George Allen & Unwin, 1949, 125 p.

154 Benjamin M. Sachs, Op. Cit.

155 Edgar H. Schein, Organizational Psychology, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1965, xi-114 p.

156 William G. Scott, Organizational Theory A Behavior Analysis for Management, Illinois, Irwin, 1967, xii-442 p.

157 Jay D. Scribner, Ed., Op. Cit.

158 Thomas Sergiovanni and Fred D. Carver, Op. Cit.

Simon,^{159,160} Simon and Barnard,¹⁶¹ Skibbins,¹⁶² Stogdill,¹⁶³
Tannenbaum, Weschler, and Massarik,¹⁶⁴ Thompson,¹⁶⁵ Weber,^{166,167}
Wilson,¹⁶⁸ Wilson,¹⁶⁹ Zaleznik,¹⁷⁰ Zaltman, Florio, and

¹⁵⁹ Herbert A. Simon, Models of Man, New York, Wiley, 1957, xiv-287 p.

¹⁶⁰ Herbert A. Simon, Administrative Behavior, New York, Macmillan, 2nd Ed., 1965, xlvii-259 p.

¹⁶¹ Herbert A. Simon and Chester I. Barnard, Administrative Behavior, New York, Macmillan, 14th printing, 1968, xlvii-259 p.

¹⁶² Gerald J. Skibbins, Organizational Evolution: A Program for Managing Radical Change, New York, American Management Associations, 1974, xvi-267 p.

¹⁶³ Ralph M. Stogdill, Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research, New York, Macmillan, 1974, viii-613 p.

¹⁶⁴ Robert Tannenbaum, Irving R. Weschler, and Fred Massarik, Leadership and Organization: A Behavioral Science Approach, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1961, xiv-456 p.

¹⁶⁵ James D. Thompson, Organizations in Action, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1967, xi-192 p.

¹⁶⁶ Max Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons (trans.) and Talcott Parsons, Ed., Glencoe, Illinois, Free Press and Falcon's Wing Press, 1947, x-436 p.

¹⁶⁷ Max Weber, Basic Concepts in Sociology, Connecticut, Greenwood, 1962, 123 p.

¹⁶⁸ L. Craig Wilson, Op. Cit.

¹⁶⁹ Robert F. Wilson, Op. Cit.

¹⁷⁰ Abraham Zaleznik, "Power and Politics in Organizational Life", in Harvard Business Review, May-June, 1970, p. 47-60.

Sikorski.¹⁷¹

2. Theoretical Framework.

The theoretical framework for this study is primarily based on the doctoral dissertation of Poirier¹⁷² and its later utilization by Fortin.¹⁷³ In accordance with the methodology developed and utilized in the above two studies influence and power will be analyzed according to nine dimensions: the essential definition, the basis, the condition, the purpose, the function, the limit, the cause, the consequence, the relation.

The dimensions are defined* in the following way:

Essential definition. It is the description or demarcation of a phenomenon.

The basis. It is the fundamental principle justifying the existence and activity of a phenomenon.

The condition. It pertains to fact(s), circumstance(s) or standing required as essential to the operation of a phenomenon.

¹⁷¹ Gerald Zaltman, David H. Florio, and Linda A. Sikorski, Op. Cit.

¹⁷² P. Poirier, Op. Cit.

¹⁷³ J. C. Fortin, Op. Cit.

* The definitions used by P. Poirier and J. C. Fortin in their doctoral dissertation have been utilized and translated from French to English by the author of this study.

The purpose. It is the ultimate end attributed to a phenomenon.

The function. Function refers to an action or role assigned to a phenomenon.

The limit. Limit circumscribes or confines the area of activity of a phenomenon.

The cause. It is that from which a phenomenon proceeds and without which it would not exist.

The consequence. It is that which derives directly from the activity of a phenomenon.

The relation. It is the connection between or the position of one phenomenon with regard to another.

The comparative method of analysis developed by Bereday¹⁷⁴ and adapted by Poirier¹⁷⁵ and Fortin¹⁷⁶ will be utilized to analyze the elements of the phenomena under study. This method assists analysts to progress systematically in their work, by undertaking the following steps: a description of elements attributed by authors to the phenomenon under study, interpretation of these elements and their juxtaposition.

¹⁷⁴ George Bereday, Comparative Method in Education, New York, Rinehart and Winston, 1964, xvi-302 p.

¹⁷⁵ P. Poirier, Op. Cit.

¹⁷⁶ J. C. Fortin, Op. Cit.

The juxtaposition of the elements assigned to each dimension of the phenomena of influence and power will allow these elements to be classified according to: common elements, complementary elements, and contradictory elements. These terms are defined in the following manner.

Common element. An element is common whenever it is assigned to a dimension of a phenomenon and is mentioned by two or more authors.

Complementary element. An element is complementary whenever it is assigned to a dimension of a phenomenon and is mentioned by only one author.

Contradictory element. An element is contradictory whenever it is assigned to a dimension of a phenomenon while being the center of divergent opinion from authors.

3. Operational Approach to Analysis of Elements Comprising the Phenomena of Influence and Power.

The operational approach to analysis of elements comprising the phenomena of influence and power will be undertaken in the following manner.

A. Intraphenomenal analysis including an intradimensional and interdimensional analysis.

1. Works of authors selected for this study will be reviewed and elements perceived by these authors in relation to influence and power will be retained.

2. These elements, as perceived by various authors, will be assigned to each dimension of the phenomena of influence and power.
3. As part of the validation process, three independent reviewers will also assign elements perceived by authors studied to each dimension of the phenomena of influence and power.* Only these elements having been classified in the same dimension by the three independent reviewers and the author of this study will be retained.
4. The elements will then be regrouped within each dimension of the phenomena of influence and power according to their commonality, complementarity and divergence.
5. For validation purposes the same three independent reviewers will repeat this last step of regrouping elements within each dimension of the two phenomena. Again, the elements retained will only be those grouped in the same manner by the three reviewers and the author.
6. Identification of interdimensional elements within each phenomenon will follow, that is, elements assigned to one dimension of a phenomenon which can be assigned to at least another dimension of this same phenomenon will be identified.

* Members of Validation Review Panel (Appendix 1).

B. Interphenomenal Analysis

Influence and power will be analyzed from an interphenomenal standpoint at the level of each dimension. The analysis will be limited to comparisons of each dimension of the other phenomenon. Interdimensional analysis will not be conducted. This interphenomenal analysis will be carried as follows.

1. Specific elements

For each dimension the elements within this dimension that are specific to each phenomenon will be identified, that is those elements assigned to a dimension of the phenomenon of influence and not found in the corresponding dimension of the phenomenon of power and vice versa.

2. Common elements

Elements that are part of each dimension of a phenomenon and found in the corresponding dimension of the other phenomenon will be identified.

Having discussed the methodology utilized in this study, let us consider the intraphenomenal analysis of influence.

CHAPTER II

PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS: INTRAPHENOMENAL ANALYSIS OF INFLUENCE

This chapter is divided into four sections: first, an intradimensional analysis of the phenomenon of influence; second, an interdimensional analysis of the phenomenon of influence; third, a presentation of general results arising from these intradimensional and interdimensional analyses; and fourth, interpretation of findings.

1. Intradimensional analysis of the phenomenon of influence.

In this section, elements are assigned to each dimension of the phenomenon of influence according to their commonality, complementarity and divergence: common elements are those assigned to a dimension of the phenomenon of influence and which are mentioned by more than one author; complementary elements are those assigned to a dimension of the phenomenon of influence and mentioned by only one author; and contradictory elements are those assigned to a dimension of the phenomenon of influence and which give rise to divergent views from authors.

A. Elements assigned to the dimension
essential definition of the
phenomenon of influence.

Common, complementary and contradictory elements are identified under the dimension essential definition of the phenomenon of influence.

Common elements: Influence is explained by the following authors in terms of causality: it is seen as behavior causing behavior by Simon,¹ McFarland,^{2,3} Dahl,⁴ Gibb,⁵ Lutz and Iannacone,⁶ Skibben,⁷ Gamson,⁸ March,⁹ and

1 Herbert A. Simon, Models of Man, New York, Wiley, 1957, p. 8.

2 Andrew S. McFarland, Power and Leadership in Pluralist Systems, Stanford California, Stanford University Press, 1969, p. 6.

3 Ibid., p. 154.

4 Robert A. Dahl, Modern Political Analysis, 3rd Ed., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1976, p. 30.

5 Cecil Austin, Gibb, Ed., Leadership: Selected Readings, Harmondsworth, England, Penguin, 1979, p. 11.

6 Frank W. Lutz and Laurence Iannacone, Understanding Educational Organizations: A Field Study Approach, Columbus, Ohio, Merrill, 1969, p. 11.

7 Gerald J. Skibbins, Organizational Evolution: A Program for Managing Radical Change, New York, AMACOM, 1974, p. 240.

8 William A. Gamson, Power and Discontent, Homewood, Illinois, Dorsey, 1968, p. 60.

9 James G. March, "An Introduction to the Theory and Measurement of Influence", in APSR, Vol. 49, June 1955, p. 437.

Cartwright,¹⁰ and as behavior producing an effect in behavior, psychological state or any other condition by Katz and Kahn.¹¹ Other authors construe influence in terms of control over the behavior of another person or persons: Homans,¹² Scott,¹³ Banfield,¹⁴ Simon and Barnard,¹⁵ and Simon.¹⁶ Authors who see influence as a medium of persuasion are Reeves et al.¹⁷ Parsons,^{18,19} and Hills.²⁰ Influence is viewed as a process

10 Dorwin Cartwright, "Influence, Leadership, Control", in James G. March, Ed., Handbook of Organizations, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1965, p. 4.

11 Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organizations, New York, Wiley, 1966, p. 218-219.

12 George Caspar Homans, Social Behavior Its Elementary Forms, New York, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1974, p. 70.

13 William G. Scott, Organization Theory A Behavior Analysis for Management, Illinois, Irwin, 1967, p. 200.

14 Edward Christie Banfield, Political Influence, New York, Free Press, 1965, p. 3.

15 Herbert A. Simon and Chester I. Barnard, Administrative Behavior, New York, Macmillan, 1968, p. 222.

16 Herbert A. Simon, Administrative Behavior, New York, Macmillan, 1965, p. 222-223.

17 Arthur W. Reeves, Harold C. Melsness, and John E. Cheal, Educational Administration: The Role of the Teacher, Toronto, Macmillan, 1962, p. 28.

18 Talcott Parsons, Politics and Social Structure, New York, Free Press, 1969, p. 415.

19 Talcott Parsons, Social Systems and the Evolution of Action Theory, New York, Free Press, 1977, p. 199.

20 R. Jean Hills, "What Educators Really Do: A Parsonian View of Education", in William G. Monahan, Theoretical Dimensions of Educational Administration, New York, Macmillan, 1975, p. 248.

which induces a change in the state of another individual or group of individuals by King,²¹ and Merton.²² Finally, Dahl,²³ and Gamson²⁴ consider influence to be implicit whenever a behavior is attempted by an influencee to meet an intention of an influencer without any action on the part of the latter.

Complementary elements: Different authors have interpreted influence in the following various ways. According to Litterer,²⁵ influence means that a person in an organization is seen as having a capacity to have an impact on the events of the organization or the behavior of a person or group. Lasswell and Kaplan²⁶ contend that influence is the value position and potential of a person or group. King²⁷ describes influence as the result of actualized power, while

21 Stephen W. King, Communication and Social Influence, Don Mills, Ontario, Addison-Wesley, 1975, p. 7-15.

22 Robert King Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, Toronto, Collier-Macmillan, 1968, p. 470.

23 Robert H. Dahl, Op. Cit., p. 31.

24 William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 69.

25 Joseph A. Litterer, The Analysis of Organizations, New York, Wiley, 1973, p. 413.

26 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Power and Society, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1969, p. 55.

27 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 7.

Black²⁸ contends that influence is the kind of power which changes attitudes. Influence is viewed as kinetic power by French and Raven,²⁹ as a symbolic medium by Parsons,³⁰ as an effort to change behavior by Leavitt,³¹ and by Merton³² as a process implicating two or more people.

Goldhamer and Shils³³ state that influence is to be understood as both an alteration of behavior and a maintenance of behavior, other than it would have been without an intervention of the influencer. Within limits, Parsons³⁴ contends that influence should be conceived to be transferable from one solidary grouping to another in a way similar to the transfer of wage income from the employer to the household.

28 Kurt W. Back, "Power, Influence and Pattern of Communication", in Luigi Petrullo and Bernard Bass, Eds., Leadership and Interpersonal Behavior, New York, Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1967, p. 139.

29 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, "The Bases of Social Power", in Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Studies in Social Power, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan, 1959, p. 152.

30 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 417.

31 Harold J. Leavitt, Managerial Psychology, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1972, p. 110.

32 Robert King Merton, Op. Cit., p. 464.

33 Herbert Goldhamer and Edward A. Shils, "Types of Power and Status", in American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 45, September 1939, p. 171.

34 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 434.

According to Simon,³⁵ the influence process consists in affecting policies of others than the self. Ideas or a plan of action sponsored by some and followed by others in preference to alternatives is viewed as influence by Martindale.³⁶ French and Raven³⁷ describe the influence of O on a system, in the life space of a person as the resultant force on this system which has its source in an act of O; they further claim that this resultant force induced by O consists of a force to change the system in the direction desired by O and an opposing resistance initiated by the same act of O.

Finally, influence is construed: as voluntary acceptance of guidance by Newman;³⁸ as leadership by Skibbins;³⁹ as giving another the premises for action, attitudes, habits, etc. leading to organizational goals by Lucio and McNeil;⁴⁰

35 Herbert A. Simon, Op. Cit., 1957, p. 65.

36 Don Martindale, Institutions, Organizations and Mass Society, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1966, p. 292.

37 John R. P. French Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 151.

38 William Herman Newman and E. Kirby Warren, The Process of Management: Concepts, Behavior and Practice, 4th Ed., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1977, p. 579.

39 Gerald J. Skibbins, Op. Cit., p. 240.

40 William H. Lucio and John D. McNeil, Supervision: A Synthesis of Thought and Action, 2nd Ed., New York, McGraw-Hill, 1969, p. 26.

and by Bell⁴¹ as involving a sort of prediction in the form of advice, encouragement, warning, etc. that given certain actions certain outcomes will occur.

Contradictory elements: While Newman and Kirby⁴² claim that with influence there is the likelihood of a give-and-take communication ending with the person who accepts advice potentially influencing the outcome to some minor extent. Simon,⁴³ on the other hand, states that influence is exercised through control over the premises of decisions; he further contends that the decision of the subordinate must be consistent with premises selected for him by his superior.

B. Elements assigned to the dimension basis of the phenomenon of influence.

The elements assigned to the dimension basis of the phenomenon of influence are classified according to their commonality and complementarity. No contradictory elements have been assigned to this dimension by authors studied.

Common elements: The possession of resources is viewed by authors as a source of influence. The following

⁴¹ David V. J. Bell, Power, Influence and Authority, New York, Oxford University Press, 1975, p. 25.

⁴² William Herman Newman and E. Kirby Warren, Op. Cit., p. 250.

⁴³ Herbert A. Simon, Op. Cit., 1965, p. 223.

are such resources: wealth by Parsons,⁴⁴ Lasswell and Kaplan,⁴⁵ and Simon;⁴⁶ power by Parsons,⁴⁷ Lasswell and Kaplan,⁴⁸ King,⁴⁹ and Newman and Warren;⁵⁰ status by Zaltman et al.,⁵¹ Parsons,⁵² Sergiovanni and Carver,⁵³ Newman and Warren,⁵⁴ King,⁵⁵ Scott,⁵⁶ and Hollander;⁵⁷ prestige and

44 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 436.

45 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 83.

46 Herbert A. Simon, Op. Cit., 1957, p. 70.

47 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 436.

48 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 83.

49 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 17-18.

50 William Herman Newman and E. Kirby Warren, Op. Cit., p. 256.

51 Gerald Zaltman, David H. Florio, and Linda A. Sikorski, Dynamic Educational Change: Models, Strategies, Tactics, and Management, New York, Free Press, 1977, p. 73.

52 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 373.

53 Thomas Sergiovanni and Fred D. Carver, The New School Executive: A Theory of Administration, New York, Dodd, Mead, 1973, p. 19.

54 William Herman Newman and E. Kirby Warren, Op. Cit., p. 251.

55 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 17-18.

56 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 200.

57 Edwin Paul Hollander, Leaders, Groups, and Influence, New York, Oxford University Press, 1964, p. 26.

reputation by Hills,⁵⁸ Parsons,⁵⁹ Bell,⁶⁰ Sergiovanni and Carver,⁶¹ King,⁶² and Gamson;⁶³ competence by Parsons,^{64,65} Bennis,⁶⁶ and Hollander;⁶⁷ achievements by Parsons;⁶⁸ knowledge by Lasswell and Kaplan,⁶⁹ King,⁷⁰ and Bennis;⁷¹ personality by King,⁷² and Scott;⁷³ physical strength, and well-being by Lasswell and Kaplan;⁷⁴ motivation, and self-esteem

58 R. Jean Hills, "What Educators 'Really' Do: A Parsonian View of Education", in William G. Monahan, Op. Cit., p. 248.

59 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 418.

60 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 26.

61 Thomas Sergiovanni and Fred D. Carver, Op. Cit., p. 19.

62 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 17-18.

63 William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 72-73.

64 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 418.

~~65 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 363.~~

66 Warren G. Bennis, Changing Organizations, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1966, p. 19.

67 Edwin Paul Hollander, Op. Cit., 1964, p. 11.

68 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 363.

69 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 83.

70 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 17-18.

71 Warren G. Bennis, Op. Cit., p. 19.

72 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 17-18.

73 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 200.

74 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 83.

by King;⁷⁵ access to communication channels by Scott;⁷⁶ and the ability to hire, promote and fire, the ability to allocate corporation money to civic projects, the ability to influence large numbers of voters and the ability to enhance or damage reputation by Gamson.⁷⁷

Influence rests on the control over resources according to Cartwright,⁷⁸ Gamson,⁷⁹ and Zaltman et al.⁸⁰

More specifically, these are: control over gains and costs, and physical control over another's body according to Cartwright;⁸¹ control over funding and over legal sanctions according to Zaltman et al.,⁸² and control over communication according to Gamson.⁸³

75 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 17-18.

76 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 200.

77 William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 72-73.

78 Dorwin Cartwright, Op. Cit., 1965, p. 12-13.

79 William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 72-73.

80 Gerald Zaltman, David H. Florio, and Linda A. Sikorski, Op. Cit., p. 73.

81 Dorwin Cartwright, Op. Cit., 1965, p. 12-13.

82 Gerald Zaltman, David H. Florio, and Linda A. Sikorski, Op. Cit., p. 73.

83 William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 72-73.

While Dahl,⁸⁴ Gamson,⁸⁵ and Banfield⁸⁶ regard inducements as sources of influence, Wilson,⁸⁷ Banfield,⁸⁸ and Gamson⁸⁹ see sanctions or constraints in the form of threats or appeals as sources of influence. According to Newman,⁹⁰ Cartwright,⁹¹ and Scott⁹² influence is sustained by the possession and control of information. Customs, beliefs and values are viewed as supportive of influence by Bennet,⁹³ Katz and Kahn,⁹⁴ King,⁹⁵ and Cartwright and Zander.⁹⁶

84 Robert A. Dahl, Op. Cit., 1976, p. 45.

85 William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 75-81.

86 Edward Christie Banfield, Op. Cit., p. 4-5.

87 Robert F. Wilson, Educational Administration, Columbus, Ohio, Merrill, 1966, p. 55.

88 Edward Christie Banfield, Op. Cit., p. 4-5.

89 William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 75-81.

90 William Herman Newman and E. Kirby Warren, Op. Cit., p. 252.

91 Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., p. 12-13.

92 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 200.

93 Stephen J. Bennett, The School: An Organizational Analysis, Glasgow, Blackie, 1974, p. 30.

94 Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organizations, New York, Wiley, 1966, p. 1.

95 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 17-18.

96 Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, Eds., Group Dynamics: Research and Theory, 3rd Ed., New York, Harper & Row, 1968, p. 226.

According to Katz and Kahn,⁹⁷ Cartwright,⁹⁸ and Levinger⁹⁹ influence rests on interpersonal transactions, while Banfield,¹⁰⁰ Dahl,¹⁰¹ Parsons,¹⁰² and Wilson¹⁰³ regard influence as depending on rational persuasion which entails improving logic and/or information of the influencee. The solidarity of a group which gives rise to loyalty and belongingness is considered a source of influence by Parsons¹⁰⁴ and Gamson,¹⁰⁵ and influence is viewed as resting on friendship by Banfield,¹⁰⁶ King,¹⁰⁷ and Lasswell and Kaplan.¹⁰⁸ Finally, influence is seen as resting on the legitimate authority of

97 Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, Op. Cit., p. 218-219.

98 Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., p. 15-18.

99 George Levinger, "The Development of Perceptions and Behavior in Newly Formed Social Power Relationships", in Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., p. 84.

100 Edward Christie Banfield, Op. Cit., p. 4.

101 Robert A. Dahl, Op. Cit., 1976, p. 45.

102 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 212.

103 Robert F. Wilson, Op. Cit., p. 55.

104 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 418.

105 William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 145-147.

106 Edward Christie Banfield, Op. Cit., p. 4.

107 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 17-18.

108 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 83.

a position by Bell,¹⁰⁹ French and Snyder,¹¹⁰ and Simon;¹¹¹ on respect by Lasswell and Kaplan,¹¹² and Banfield,¹¹³ on authority by Katz and Kahn,¹¹⁴ and Banfield,¹¹⁵ and on acceptance of role within an organization by King,¹¹⁶ and Katz and Kahn.¹¹⁷

Complementary elements: The following elements represent the varying opinions of authors regarding bases of influence. The use of supportive relationships and group methods of decision-making and supervision serves as a source of influence according to Likert.¹¹⁸ The strengthening and inspiring of an audience sustains a leader's influence according to McClelland.¹¹⁹ According to Bennett,¹²⁰

109 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 26.

110 John R. P. French, Jr. and Richard Snyder, "Leadership and Interpersonal Power", in Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., p. 118.

111 Herbert A. Simon, Op. Cit., 1957, p. 70.

112 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 83.

113 Edward Christie Banfield, Op. Cit., p. 4.

114 Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, Op. Cit., p. 458.

115 Edward Christie Banfield, Op. Cit., p. 4.

116 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 17-18.

117 Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, Op. Cit., p. 218.

118 Rensis Likert, The Human Organization, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1967, p. 69.

119 David C. McClelland, Power, The Inner Experience, New York, Irvington, 1975, p. 260.

120 Stephen J. Bennett, Op. Cit., p. 18-19.

environmental influences such as laws, governmental regulations, professional organizations, trade unions, customer reactions serve as sources of influence. Lasswell and Kaplan¹²¹ consider that whenever a person has influence over another, it places him in a favorable position vis-à-vis this person, thereby sustaining his capacity to exercise influence. The adherence of an individual to agreed upon procedures is supportive of influence according to Hollander.¹²² Parsons¹²³ contends that the command over commitments is a source of influence.

Finally, influence rests on: the established rules of organization according to Levinger;¹²⁴ the temporal features that is the time dimension according to Cartwright;¹²⁵ control over another according to Katz and Kahn;¹²⁶ knowledge about the environment, insight into the decision-making process,¹²⁷ selection of symbols and words that create a

121 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 83.

122 Edwin Paul Hollander, Op. Cit., p. 11.

123 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 428.

124 George Levinger, "The Development of Perceptions and Behavior in Newly Formed Social Power Relationships", in Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., p. 84.

125 Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., p. 15-18.

126 Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, Op. Cit., p. 219.

127 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 76.

favorable impression, a debt or obligation that an influencer can collect according to Bell;¹²⁸ similarity, membership group, and communication according to King;¹²⁹ inspiration or appeal to emotions according to Wilson;¹³⁰ and norms underlying organic solidarity according to Parsons.¹³¹

C. Elements assigned to the dimension condition of the phenomenon of influence.

Common and complementary elements are identified under the dimension condition of the phenomenon of influence.

No divergent views amongst authors were identified.

Common elements: According to March and Simon,¹³² Parsons,¹³³ Bennis,¹³⁴ Katz and Kahn,¹³⁵ Simon,¹³⁶ and French and Snyder,¹³⁷ the exercise of influence is contingent on

128 Ibid., p. 26.

129 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 14-18.

130 Robert F. Wilson, Op. Cit., p. 55.

131 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 190.

132 James G. March and Herbert A. Simon, Organizations, New York, Wiley, 1967, p. 90.

133 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 418.

134 Warren G. Bennis, Op. Cit., p. 164.

135 Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, Op. Cit., p. 218.

136 Herbert A. Simon, Op. Cit., 1957, p. 70.

137 John R. P. French, Jr. and Richard Snyder, "Leadership and Interpersonal Power", in Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., p. 147.

acceptance of the influencing agent and his authority by those subjected to the influencing act. Hollander,¹³⁸ and King¹³⁹ consider that influence depends on the perceived competence of the influencing agent by the influencee, and in a more general way Simon,¹⁴⁰ and Litterer¹⁴¹ recognize the importance of a person's perception in determining whether he will react to an influence attempt from another person. An individual's reactions to an influence attempt will depend on his motivation according to Litterer,¹⁴² Simon,¹⁴³ and Cartwright and Zander.¹⁴⁴ According to Cartwright,¹⁴⁵ Gibb,¹⁴⁶ McClelland,¹⁴⁷ and Simon,¹⁴⁸ influence depends on

138 Edwin Paul Hollander, Op. Cit., p. 11.

139 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 123-124.

140 Herbert A. Simon, Op. Cit., 1957, p. 123.

141 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 104.

142 Ibid.

143 Herbert A. Simon, Op. Cit., 1957, p. 123.

144 Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, Eds., Op. Cit., p. 225.

145 Dorwin Cartwright, Eds., Op. Cit., p. 15-18.

146 Jack R. Gibb, "Defense Level and Influence Potential in Small Groups", in Luigi Petrullo and Bernard Bass, Eds., Leadership and Interpersonal Behavior, New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1967, p. 67.

147 David C. McClelland, Op. Cit., p. 261.

148 Herbert A. Simon, Op. Cit., 1965, p. 223.

the consonance between the act of influence and its apparent purpose and group goals.

While selection of resources constituting a base must be appropriate to the social setting under consideration for influence to be successful according to McGregor,¹⁴⁹ Cartwright,¹⁵⁰ and Merton,¹⁵¹ it is the manipulation of a person's environment especially in keeping with his needs which provides influence according to Miles,¹⁵² March and Simon,¹⁵³ Litterer,¹⁵⁴ and Levinger.¹⁵⁵ Influence can only occur according to McGregor,¹⁵⁶ and King¹⁵⁷ when there is dependence of one person on another, and according to King,¹⁵⁸ and Parsons¹⁵⁹ when the influencee is dependent on

¹⁴⁹ Douglas McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1960, p. 31.

¹⁵⁰ Dorwin Cartwright, Op. Cit., 1965, p. 5.

¹⁵¹ Robert King Merton, Op. Cit., p. 456.

¹⁵² Raymond E. Miles, Theories of Management: Implications for Organizational Behavior and Development, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1975, p. 15.

¹⁵³ James G. March and Herbert A. Simon, Op. Cit., p. 52.

¹⁵⁴ Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 169-170.

¹⁵⁵ George Levinger, "The Development of Perceptions and Behavior in Newly Formed Social Power Relationships", in Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., p. 83.

¹⁵⁶ Douglas McGregor, Op. Cit., p. 20.

¹⁵⁷ Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 54.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 27-31.

¹⁵⁹ Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 433.

information. Litterer¹⁶⁰ and Parsons¹⁶¹ consider that moral values and affect must be institutionalized for influence to take place, and Gamson¹⁶² and Likert¹⁶³ regard interaction as necessary for influence to occur. Kimbrough and Nunnery,¹⁶⁴ Litterer,¹⁶⁵ Cartwright,¹⁶⁶ and King¹⁶⁷ view influence as contingent upon control over resources, primarily rewards, while Leavitt¹⁶⁸ and King¹⁶⁹ contend that influence depends on the needs of the influencee. Finally, Hollander,¹⁷⁰ and Stogdill¹⁷¹ consider that the perception by others that the

160 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 427.

161 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 355.

162 William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 70.

163 Rensis Likert, Op. Cit., p. 69.

164 Ralph B. Kimbrough and Michael Y. Nunnery, Educational Administration: An Introduction, New York, Macmillan, 1976, p. 335.

165 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 170.

166 Dorwin Cartwright, "Influence, Leadership, Control", in Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., p. 1-44.

167 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 79-80.

168 Harold J. Leavitt, Op. Cit., p. 145.

169 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 77-78.

170 Edwin Paul Hollander, Op. Cit., p. 26.

171 Ralph M. Stogdill, Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research, New York, Macmillan, 1974, p. 230.

influencing agent is living up to the group's tasks and expectations serves as a source of influence.

Complementary elements: An influencing agent must operate on the intentions of the object of persuasion and through positive channels according to Parsons.¹⁷² Protection and enhancement of one's sphere of influence requires devoted subordinates and close alliances with other executives both at one's own level and above.¹⁷³ Locating centers of latent power is regarded as important by Kimbrough and Nunnery¹⁷⁴ in the development of educational influence strategies. The probable acceptance of an influence act depends on the consistency between the advocated premise and the receiver's cognitive state.¹⁷⁵ According to Reeves et al.,¹⁷⁶ influence must first obtain agreement before consent is given.

Various authors claim that influence is contingent upon: the adequacy of the means employed by the influencer

172 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 335.

173 Harold Lazarus and E. Kirby Warren, The Progress of Management, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1968, p. 127.

174 Ralph B. Kimbrough and Michael Y. Nunnery, Op. Cit., p. 336.

175 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 122-123.

176 Arthur W. Reeves, Harold C. Melsness, and John E. Cheal, Op. Cit., p. 28.

to act on influencee's motivations and expectations;¹⁷⁷ the attraction of a person to the influencing agent;¹⁷⁸ command over commitments;¹⁷⁹ access to skills, knowledge, tools;¹⁸⁰ combination of resources by individuals and groups;¹⁸¹ the effectiveness of the communication processes;¹⁸² the relation of the influence act to the functional equilibrium of the system on which it impinges;¹⁸³ informing the influencee of the rewards available to satisfy his needs;¹⁸⁴ knowledge about the consequences of behavior;¹⁸⁵ increasing the skills of people in an organization;¹⁸⁶ the behavior of a person in the use of a base;¹⁸⁷ a person's accurate view of

177 Edward Christie Banfield, Op. Cit., p. 4.

178 Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, Eds., Op. Cit., p. 225.

179 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 428.

180 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 169-170.

181 Robert A. Dahl, "Equality and Power in American Society", in Edward Keynes and David M. Ricci, Political Power, Community and Democracy, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1970, p. 147.

182 Rensis Likert, New Patterns of Management, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1961, p. 55.

183 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 133.

184 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 169-170.

185 Herbert A. Simon, Op. Cit., 1965, p. 77.

186 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 428.

187 Dorwin Cartwright, Op. Cit., 1959, p. 15-18.

reality;¹⁸⁸ and perceived adherence by the influencing agent to the normative behavior and attitudes of the group.¹⁸⁹

D. Elements assigned to the dimension purpose of the phenomenon of influence.

Only complementary elements are assigned to the dimension purpose of the phenomenon of influence since common and contradictory elements have not been identified by authors studied.

Complementary elements: Rosen¹⁹⁰ considers an aim of influence to be achievement of goals, while Zaltman et al. view influence as aiming to shape the attitudes and/or behavior of others. According to Cartwright,¹⁹² a person may exercise influence to increase his resources and thus strengthen his base of power, similarly Simon¹⁹³ contends that influence is employed to augment future influence.

188 Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, Eds., Op. Cit., p. 227.

189 Edwin Paul Hollander, Op. Cit., p. 194.

190 Sidney Rosen, "Effects of Adjustment on the Perception and Exertion of Social Power", in Dorwin Cartwright, Op. Cit., 1959, p. 70.

191 Gerald Zaltman, David A. Florio, and Linda A. Sikorski, Op. Cit., p. 225.

192 Dorwin Cartwright, Op. Cit., 1965, p. 7.

193 Herbert A. Simon, Op. Cit., 1957, p. 70.

Finally, Cartwright¹⁹⁴ stipulates that a person seeks to influence others in order to achieve some sort of gratification.

E. Elements assigned to the dimension function of the phenomenon of influence.

The elements identified by authors are assigned to the dimension function of the phenomenon of influence according to the classification utilized for the analysis of these elements. Since no contradictory elements have been identified, only common and complementary elements will be reported.

Common elements: According to Parsons,^{195,196} and Reeves et al.¹⁹⁷ influence is utilized to persuade others toward performance. McGregor,¹⁹⁸ and Lasswell and Kaplan¹⁹⁹ consider the role of influence as altering the ability of others to achieve their goals or satisfy their needs, and

194 Dorwin Cartwright, Op. Cit., 1965, p. 11.

195 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 337.

196 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 346.

197 Arthur W. Reeves, Harold C. Melsness, and John E. Cheal, Op. Cit., p. 178.

198 Douglas McGregor, Op. Cit., p. 20.

199 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 71.

Parsons,^{200,201} and Schein²⁰² see influence as a medium capable of integration of social systems.

Complementary elements: According to Parsons,²⁰³ influence serves to handle the tensions which arise continually in a dynamic society between the egalitarian and the elitist components. Zaltman et al.²⁰⁴ regard influence as helping to shape the attitudes and/or behavior of influencees, and Katz and Kahn²⁰⁵ consider that influence serves to bring about organizational change through the peer group. Influence is employed to augment future influence according to Simon,²⁰⁶ and it affects the motivation to produce according to March and Simon.²⁰⁷ Finally, the following roles are assigned to influence: regulation of communication in systems;²⁰⁸ mediation;²⁰⁹ mobilization of commitments of

200 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 129.

201 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 434.

202 Edgar H. Schein, Organizational Psychology, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1965, p. 77.

203 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 346.

204 Gerald Zaltman, David H. Floria, and Linda A. Sikorski, Op. Cit., p. 225.

205 Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, Op. Cit., p. 450.

206 Herbert A. Simon, Op. Cit., 1957, p. 70.

207 James G. March and Herbert A. Simon, Op. Cit., p. 82.

208 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 213.

209 Ibid., p. 357.

units to valued association;²¹⁰ regulation of the interplay between political support and identification by membership in solidary involvements;²¹¹ bringing about an allocation of subcollectivity organizations and their memberships, statuses, roles compatible with the interest of the collectivity and of the units;²¹² and enhancement of the capacity for solidarity of the societal community.²¹³

F. Elements assigned to the dimension limit of the phenomenon of influence.

Elements identified by authors and assigned to the dimension limit of the phenomenon of influence are classified according to their commonality and complementarity. No divergent views amongst authors were identified.

Common elements: According to Lippitt,²¹⁴ and Simon²¹⁵ influence is confined by the particular circumstances of situation and space within a system or a subsystem. Merton,²¹⁶

210 Ibid., p. 213-214.

211 Ibid.

212 Ibid., p. 358.

213 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 56.

214 Gordon L. Lippitt, Organizational Renewal: Achieving Viability in a Changing World, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969, p. 51.

215 Herbert A. Simon, Op. Cit., 1957, p. 8.

216 Robert King Merton, Op. Cit., p. 465.

and Leavitt²¹⁷ indicate that the influence of authorities or elites is likely to be contained by subordinates or low-ranking individuals within a system since they are in larger numbers and may see as irrelevant the threats posed by authorities, and Gamson,²¹⁸ Reeves et al,²¹⁹ and Simon²²⁰ consider that influence may vary in the amount of restriction it places on the behavior of those subjected to influence and on the degree of bindingness that it creates for them.

Complementary elements: Gamson²²¹ stipulates that authorities can confine the influence of potential partisans by regulating access to resources, by making rewards or punishments contingent on attempts at influence, and by altering attitudes and desires of potential partisans toward political objects. According to Lippitt,²²² influence is highly restricted with non-face-to-faceness of large formal organizations by comparison to the greater opportunity for full and complete influence of small work group decision-making.

217 Harold J. Leavitt, Op. Cit., p. 147.

218 William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 81.

219 Arthur W. Reeves, Harold C. Melsness, and John E. Cheal, Op. Cit., p. 33.

220 Herbert A. Simon, Op. Cit., 1965, p. 222-223.

221 William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 116-117.

222 Gordon L. Lippitt, Op. Cit., p. 51.

French and Raven²²³ contend that the resisting force of the person being influenced contains the influence exerted by the influencing agent, and Rosen²²⁴ states that maladjustment in a person reduces his capacity for influencing others. While Katz and Kahn²²⁵ advance that the degree of influence is restricted by the amount of control a person possesses, Miles²²⁶ indicates that environmental elements in an organization such as societal needs, available resources, state of knowledge, and socio-political values affect the capacity to influence. This same author²²⁷ also contends that an organization's technology restricts its range of alternatives and that the manager is constrained by the structure in which he operates. Moral limits have been related to the use of influence; Reeves et al.²²⁸ stress that influence on others, especially on students by teachers, must be exercised with

223 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, "The Bases of Social Power", in Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., p. 151-152.

224 Sidney Rosen, "Effects of Adjustment on the Perception and Exertion of Social Power", in Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., p. 69-70.

225 Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, Op. Cit., p. 219.

226 Raymond E. Miles, Op. Cit., p. 11.

227 Ibid., p. 13-14.

228 Arthur W. Reeves, Harold C. Melsness, and John E. Cheal, Op. Cit., p. 178.

scrupulous caution. Finally, Dahl²²⁹ states that differences in the amount of influence that persons exercise can be attributed directly to differences in the distribution of political resources, to variations in the efficiency with which individuals use their political resource, and in the extent to which persons use their resources toward political purposes.

G. Elements assigned to the dimension cause of the phenomenon of influence.

Only complementary elements assigned by authors studied to the dimension cause of the phenomenon of influence are reported since no common or contradictory elements have been assigned by authors studied to this dimension.

Complementary elements: Kimbrough²³⁰ recognizes that influence and decisions often originate through the informal group activity of a few leaders prior to formal action by authorities. This same author²³¹ further stipulates that influence is produced from the plurality of competing formal interest groups and associations which serves as a medium for effective expression of the people's self-interests.

229 Robert A. Dahl, Op. Cit., 1976, p. 37.

230 Ralph B. Kimbrough, Political Power and Educational Decision-Making, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1964, p. 208.

231 Ibid., p. 13.

According to Simon,²³² the behavior of the operative employee can be influenced by establishing in him attitudes, habits, and state of mind which will guide him toward decisions advantageous to the organization, and by imposing on him decisions reached in other parts of the organization. Finally, influence is viewed as originating from: ecological control by Cartwright;²³³ communication from King;²³⁴ highly specific capacities and achievement by Parsons;²³⁵ and exercise of influence which places the influencing agent in a favorable position over the influencee by Lasswell and Kaplan.²³⁶

H. Elements assigned to the dimension consequence of the phenomenon of power.

The elements identified by authors and assigned to the dimension consequence of the phenomenon of influence are classified according to their commonality, complementarity, and divergence.

232 Herbert A. Simon, Op. Cit., 1965, p. 11.

233 Dorwin Cartwright, Op. Cit., 1959, p. 1-44.

234 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 7-15.

235 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 363.

236 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 83.

Common elements: A number of authors^{237,238,239} consider that participation in acts of influence yield commitment, personal growth, and satisfaction. Gamson,²⁴⁰ Bell,²⁴¹ Cooper and McGaugh,²⁴² and Litterer²⁴³ indicate that the use of influence, especially if it is domineering and coercive may inspire hostility, alienation, and resentful acquiescence on the part of those subjected to influence, and Bell,²⁴⁴ and Gamson²⁴⁵ find that resources consumed in an influence transaction could be spent on alternative activity, which has been lost.

Complementary elements: According to Katz and Kahn,²⁴⁶ an influence attempt may result in producing an effect exactly opposite to the intent. Similarly, McClelland²⁴⁷ indicates

237 Gordon L. Lippitt, Op. Cit., p. 78.

238 Warren G. Bennis, Op. Cit., p. 196-198.

239 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 422.

240 William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 173.

241 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 31.

242 J. B. Cooper and J. L. McGaugh, "Leadership", in Cecil Austin Gidd, Ed., Op. Cit., p. 249.

243 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 442.

244 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 31.

245 William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 83-91.

246 Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, Op. Cit., p. 219.

247 David C. McClelland, Op. Cit., p. 255.

that whenever an individual succeeds in influencing people, although he considers that it is for their own good, he may be accused of manipulation. Parsons²⁴⁸ considers that the influencing agent through the use of influence, receives certain commitments which he can then use, and Rosen²⁴⁹ contends that because the achievement of many goals occurs through influence that inability to influence is a major liability. While Gamson²⁵⁰ recognizes that the use of a congruent means of influence increases the strength and stability of an existing orientation, especially if perceived as successful, Simon²⁵¹ states that a person may anticipate the expectations of the influence about the consequences of his behavior and he may act accordingly. Reeves et al.²⁵² suggest that influence which is not readily detected, such as the case of a teacher influencing a student, is easily subject to abuse. The effects of social influence are seen by King²⁵³ as: alteration of knowledge, belief about some aspect of the environment; alteration of attitudes, motivations,

248 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 431.

249 Sidney Rosen, Op. Cit., p. 70.

250 William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 73.

251 Herbert A. Simon, Op. Cit., 1957, p. 5.

252 Arthur W. Reeves, Harold C. Melsness, and John E. Cheal, Op. Cit., p. 178.

253 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 20.

values, feelings toward some aspect of the environment; and alteration of overt behavior toward some aspect of the environment.

Additional outcomes of influence are perceived as: affecting the influencing agent's reputation by Bell;²⁵⁴ formation of coalitions by Cartwright;²⁵⁵ relinquishing ownership or control of resources if, for example, money is paid for services, by Cartwright;²⁵⁶ contributing to higher morale, and greater participant commitment in the organization when there is an increase in the total influence of an organization.²⁵⁷ Lasswell and Kaplan²⁵⁸ claim that the permeability of a group varies inversely with its influence.

Contradictory elements: While Merton²⁵⁹ regards interpersonal influence as an asymmetrical relation between people, Litterer²⁶⁰ claims that the exercise of influence by a person does not necessarily alter the other person's influence.

254 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 31.

255 Dorwin Cartwright, Op. Cit., 1959, p. 1-44.

256 Ibid., p. 17.

257 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 442.

258 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 61.

259 Robert King Merton, Op. Cit., p. 464.

260 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 415.

I. Elements assigned to the dimension relation
of the phenomenon of influence.

Under the dimension relation of the phenomenon of influence, common and complementary elements are identified. No contradictory elements have been identified by authors.

Common elements: A number of authors have expressed similar views regarding the link between power and influence. Bierstedt,²⁶¹ and Martindale²⁶² regard influence as persuasive and power as coercive. King,²⁶³ Cartwright,²⁶⁴ Lippitt,²⁶⁵ and Katz and Kahn²⁶⁶ consider power to be potential for influence and influence to be the result of actualized power.

In their discussion of influence and authority, Bell,²⁶⁷ and Parsons²⁶⁸ regard the use of authority in the sense of respect accorded to the authority figure as implying influence.

261 Robert M. Bierstedt, "An Analysis of Social Power", in American Sociological Review, Vol. 15, December 1950, p. 731.

262 Don Martindale, Op. Cit., p. 292.

263 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 7.

264 Dorwin Cartwright, Op. Cit., 1965, p. 1-44.

265 Gordon L. Lippitt, Op. Cit., p. 51.

266 Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, Op. Cit., p. 220.

267 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 40.

268 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 373.

While attempting to differentiate influence from authority, control, and power, Banfield,²⁶⁹ and Katz and Kahn²⁷⁰ conclude that influence is a generic term including authority, control, and power.

According to Hollander,²⁷¹ Skibbins,²⁷² and Gregg,²⁷³ the process of influence is one of leadership.

Complementary elements: In discussing the association between influence and power, authors have expressed the following varied views: Lasswell and Kaplan²⁷⁴ state that forms of influence based on power are forms of power to the extent that the scope of the influence is included within that of the power; French and Raven²⁷⁵ view the phenomena of influence and power as involving a dyadic relationship; and Parsons²⁷⁶ contends that the medium focal to the societal

269 Edward Christie Banfield, Op. Cit., p. 348.

270 Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, Op. Cit., p. 219.

271 Edwin Paul Hollander, Leadership Dynamics: A Practical Guide to Effective Relationships, New York, Free Press, 1978, p. 1.

272 Gerald J. Skibbins, Op. Cit., p. 240.

273 Russell T. Gregg, "The Administrative Process", in Roald F. Campbell and Russell T. Gregg, Administrative Behavior in Education, New York, Harper & Row, p. 305.

274 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 85.

275 John R. P. French, Jr., and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 150.

276 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 201.

community is influence and that it is interchangeable for power, money, and value commitments.

While McGregor²⁷⁷ concludes that authority is but one of several forms of social influence or control, Blau and Scott²⁷⁸ state that influence over subordinates which is acquired by obligating them does not initially form an established authority over them, it may eventually lead to this.

Authors have expressed varied opinions about influence, power, authority, and control: Polsby²⁷⁹ indicates that in a general sense one can consider power, influence, and control as the capacity of one person to do something affecting another which changes the likely pattern of specified future events; Katz and Kahn²⁸⁰ regard authority as the most restricted of a set of related concepts, influence as including mostly any interpersonal transaction with a psychological or behavioral effect, control as including successful and intended influence attempts, and power as the potential for influence backed by the means to coerce

277 Douglas McGregor, Op. Cit., p. 18.

278 Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach, San Francisco, California, Chandler, 1962, p. 143.

279 Nelson W. Polsby, Community Power and Political Theory, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1963, p. 3.

280 Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, Op. Cit., p. 220.

compliance; and Hunter²⁸¹ views authority and influence as related concepts which are elements of power.

Finally, Bach²⁸² regards influence as a complex component of leadership, and King²⁸³ concludes that social influence and communication are inseparable and equivalent aspects of an undifferentiated social process.

In this section, an intradimensional analysis has been presented whereby elements identified by authors studied have been classified within each dimension of the phenomenon of influence according to their commonality, complementarity, and divergence. An interdimensional analysis of influence is presented in the next section.

2. Interdimensional analysis of the phenomenon of influence.

In this section, interdimensional elements of the phenomenon of influence are identified. These interdimensional elements are those which having been assigned to a dimension of the phenomenon of influence, by authors studied, are also assigned to another dimension of this same phenomenon.

281 Floyd Hunter, Community Power Structure, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1953, p. 164.

282 George R. Bach, "Scientific Concern for the Human Factor in Industry", in Robert Tannenbaum, Irving R. Weschler, and Fred Massarik, Leadership and Organization: A Behavioral Science Approach, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1961, p. 415.

283 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 7-15.

For purposes of this study, only common elements within each dimension of the phenomenon of influence will be utilized for the interdimensional analysis.

A. Interdimensional elements assigned to definitions and bases of the phenomenon of influence.

Interdimensional elements, that is, those assigned to a definition of the phenomenon of influence and equally assigned to a basis of the same phenomenon are identified in this subsection.

Interdimensional elements: Reeves et al.,²⁸⁴ Parsons,^{285,286} and Hills²⁸⁷ regard medium of persuasion as a definition of influence, and Banfield,²⁸⁸ Dahl,²⁸⁹ Parsons,²⁹⁰ and Wilson²⁹¹ consider persuasion to be a basis of this phenomenon.

²⁸⁴ Arthur W. Reeves, Harold C. Melsness, and John E. Cheal, Op. Cit., p. 28.

²⁸⁵ Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 415.

²⁸⁶ Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 199.

²⁸⁷ R. Jean Hills, Op. Cit., p. 248.

²⁸⁸ Edward Christie Banfield, Op. Cit., p. 4.

²⁸⁹ Robert A. Dahl, Op. Cit., 1976, p. 45.

²⁹⁰ Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 212.

²⁹¹ Robert F. Wilson, Op. Cit., p. 55.

B. Interdimensional elements assigned to definitions and functions of the phenomenon of influence.

In this subsection, interdimensional elements which have been assigned to a definition of the phenomenon of influence and which have equally been assigned to a function of this phenomenon are reported.

Interdimensional elements: A medium ~~of persuasion~~ is regarded as a definition of the phenomenon of influence by Reeves et al.,²⁹² Parsons,^{293,294} and Hills.²⁹⁵ It is also regarded as a function of influence by Parsons,^{296,297} and Reeves et al.²⁹⁸

C. Interdimensional elements assigned to definitions and relations of the phenomenon of influence.

Under this heading, interdimensional elements are presented which having been assigned to a definition of the

292 Arthur W. Reeves, Harold C. Melsness, and John E. Cheal, Op. Cit., p. 28.

293 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 199.

294 Ibid., 1969, p. 415.

295 R. Jean Hills, Op. Cit., p. 248.

296 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 337.

297 Ibid., 1977, p. 346.

298 Arthur W. Reeves, Harold C. Melsness, and John E. Cheal, Op. Cit., p. 178.

phenomenon of influence are also assigned to a relation of this phenomenon.

Interdimensional elements: A medium of persuasion is perceived as an element assigned to a definition of the phenomenon of influence by Reeves et al.,²⁹⁹ Parsons,^{300,301} and Hills;³⁰² it is seen as an element assigned to a relation of influence by Bierstedt,³⁰³ and Martindale.³⁰⁴

D. Interdimensional elements assigned to bases and conditions of the phenomenon of influence.

Interdimensional elements, that is, those assigned to bases of the phenomenon of influence and equally assigned to conditions of the same phenomenon are reported in this subsection.

Interdimensional elements: Control over resources has been assigned to bases of the phenomenon of influence by

299 Ibid., p. 28.

300 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 199.

301 Ibid., 1969, p. 415.

302 R. Jean Hills, Op. Cit., p. 248.

303 Robert M. Bierstedt, Op. Cit., p. 731.

304 Don Martindale, Op. Cit., p. 292.

Cartwright,³⁰⁵ Gamson,³⁰⁶ and Zaltman et al.,³⁰⁷ while Kimbrough and Nunnery,³⁰⁸ Litterer,³⁰⁹ Cartwright,³¹⁰ and King³¹¹ have assigned this element to the dimension condition of this phenomenon. Interpersonal transaction or interaction is viewed by Katz and Kahn,³¹² Cartwright,³¹³ and Levinger³¹⁴ as an element assigned to bases of the phenomenon of influence, and it is seen by Gamson,³¹⁵ and Likert³¹⁶ as a condition of this phenomenon.

305 Dorwin Cartwright, Op. Cit., 1965, p. 12-13.

306 William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 72-73.

307 Gerald Zaltman, David H. Florio, and Linda H. Sikorski, Op. Cit., p. 73.

308 Ralph B. Kimbrough and Michael Y. Nunnery, Op. Cit., p. 335.

309 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 170.

310 Dorwin Cartwright, Op. Cit., 1959, p. 1-44.

311 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 77-78.

312 Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, Op. Cit., p. 218-219.

313 Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., p. 15-18.

314 George Levinger, Op. Cit., p. 84.

315 William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 70.

316 Rensis Likert, Op. Cit., p. 69.

E. Interdimensional elements assigned to bases and functions of the phenomenon of influence.

Under this heading, interdimensional elements are presented which having been assigned to bases of the phenomenon of influence are also assigned to functions of influence.

Interdimensional elements: According to Banfield,³¹⁷ Dahl,³¹⁸ Parsons,³¹⁹ and Wilson,³²⁰ persuasion is an element of bases of the phenomenon of influence, while Parsons,^{321,322} and Reeves et al.,³²³ assign this element to functions of this phenomenon.

F. Interdimensional elements assigned to bases and relations of the phenomenon of influence.

Interdimensional elements, that is, those elements assigned to the dimension basis of the phenomenon of influence and equally assigned to the dimension relation of

317 Edward Christie Banfield, Op. Cit., p. 4.

318 Robert A. Dahl, Op. Cit., 1976, p. 45.

319 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 212.

320 Robert F. Wilson, Op. Cit., p. 55.

321 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 346.

322 Ibid., 1969, p. 337.

323 Arthur W. Reeves, Harold C. Melsness, and John E. Cheal, Op. Cit., p. 178.

this phenomenon are identified under this heading.

Interdimensional elements: Banfield,³²⁴ Dahl,³²⁵ Parsons,³²⁶ and Wilson³²⁷ regard persuasion as an element of basis of the phenomenon of influence and Bierstedt,³²⁸ and Martindale³²⁹ assign this element to relations of influence.

G. Interdimensional elements assigned to functions and relations of the phenomenon of influence.

In this subsection, elements which have been identified as functions of the phenomenon of influence and which have also been assigned to relations of this phenomenon are reported.

Interdimensional elements: Persuasion is recognized as a function of influence by Parsons,^{330,331} and Reeves et al.;³³² it is also seen as a relation of this phenomenon by

324 Edward Christie Banfield, Op. Cit., p. 4.

325 Robert A. Dahl, Op. Cit., 1976, p. 45.

326 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 212.

327 Robert F. Wilson, Op. Cit., p. 55.

328 Robert M. Bierstedt, Op. Cit., p. 731.

329 Don Martindale, Op. Cit., p. 292.

330 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 346.

331 Ibid., 1969, p. 337.

332 Arthur W. Reeves, Harold C. Melsness, and John E. Cheal, Op. Cit., p. 178.

Bierstedt,³³³ and Martindale.³³⁴

In the above section, an interdimensional analysis has been presented which consisted in the identification of elements common to more than one dimension of the phenomenon of influence. In the following section, findings from intradimensional and interdimensional analyses will be presented.

3. Presentation of findings resulting from the intradimensional and interdimensional analyses of the phenomenon of influence.

Findings from the intradimensional and interdimensional analyses of the phenomenon of influence are presented in this section in a ranked order according to their degree of adherence to each dimension. The findings of these analyses will therefore be presented according to the following ranked categories: elements assigned to a dimension of the phenomenon of influence which are mentioned by more than one author and previously identified as common elements will comprise the first category; elements assigned to a dimension of the phenomenon of influence, mentioned by only one author and previously identified as complementary elements will be part of the second category; the third category will contain contradictory elements or those assigned to a

³³³ Robert M. Bierstedt, Op. Cit., p. 731.

³³⁴ Don Martindale, Op. Cit., p. 292.

dimension of the phenomenon of influence and which gave rise to divergent views from authors; and the fourth category will include the elements assigned to at least two dimensions of the phenomenon of influence and previously reported as inter-dimensional elements.

A. Constituent elements of the essential definition of the phenomenon of influence.

First category or common elements: The following elements constitute essential definitions of the phenomenon of influence and are mentioned by more than one author: social causation, that is, a behavior causing behavior, and a behavior producing an effect in behavior, psychological state or any other condition; control over the behavior of another person or persons; a medium of persuasion; a process which induces a change in the state of another individual or group of individuals; and, whenever a behavior is attempted by an influencee to meet an intention of an influencer without any action on the part of the latter or implicit influence.

Second category or complementary elements: The following elements constitute essential definitions of the phenomenon of influence and are mentioned by only one author: a capacity, by a person, to have an impact on the events of the organization or the behavior of a person or group; the value position and potential of a person or group; the result

of actualized power; the kind of power which changes attitudes; kinetic power; a symbolic medium; an effort to change behavior; a process implicating two or more people; an alteration of behavior and a maintenance of behavior, other than it would have been without an intervention of the influencer; a transferable process from one solidary grouping to another in a way similar to the transfer of wage income from the employer to the household; a process which consists in affecting policies of others than the self; ideas or a plan of action sponsored by some and followed by others in preference to alternatives; the resultant force on a system in the life of a person which has its source in an act of the influencer; this resultant force induced by the influencer consists of a force to change the system in the direction desired by the influencer and an opposing resistance initiated by this same act; voluntary acceptance of guidance; giving another the premises for action, attitudes, habits, etc., leading to organizational goals; and a sort of prediction in the form of advice, encouragement, warning, etc., that given certain actions, certain outcomes will occur.

Third category or contradictory elements: Various authors have expressed divergent opinions regarding the following elements which constitute essential definitions of the phenomenon of influence: the likelihood of a give-and-take communication ending with the person who accepts advice

potentially influencing the outcome to some minor extent; and control over the premises of decisions whereby the decision of the subordinate must be consistent with premises selected for him by his superior.

Fourth category of interdimensional elements: The following element constituting an essential definition of the phenomenon of influence is part of at least another dimension of this phenomenon: a medium of persuasion.

B. Constituent elements of the bases of the phenomenon of influence.

First category or common elements: The following elements constitute bases of the phenomenon of influence and are mentioned by more than one author: the possession of resources such as wealth, power, status, prestige and reputation, competence, achievements, knowledge, personality, physical strength and well-being, motivation and self-esteem, access to communication channels, ability to promote, hire and fire, the ability to allocate corporate money to civic projects, the ability to influence large numbers of voters, and the ability to enhance or damage reputation; the control over resources such as control over gains and costs, physical control over another's body, control over funding, legal sanctions, and communication; inducements; sanctions or constraints in the form of threats or appeals; the possession

and control of information; customs, beliefs, and values; interpersonal transactions; rational persuasion which entails improving logic and/or information of the influencee; the solidarity of a group which gives rise to loyalty and belongingness; friendship; the legitimate authority of a position; respect; authority; and acceptance of role within an organization.

Second category or complementary elements: The following elements constitute the bases of the phenomenon of influence and are mentioned by only one author: the use of supportive relationships and group methods of decision-making and supervision; the strengthening and inspiring of an audience; environmental influences such as laws, governmental regulations, professional organizations, trade unions, and customer reactions; possession of influence over another person places someone in a favorable position vis-à-vis the other, thereby sustaining his capacity to exercise influence; the adherence of an individual to agreed upon procedures; the command over commitments; the established rules of organization; the temporal features, that is, the time dimension; control over another; knowledge about the environment; insight into the decision-making process; selection of symbols and words that create a favorable impression; a debt or obligation that an influencer can collect; similarity; membership group; communication; inspiration or appeal to emotions; and

norms underlying organic solidarity.

Third category or contradictory elements: Elements have not been identified as part of bases of the phenomenon of influence which would express contradictory views on the part of authors.

Fourth category or interdimensional elements: The following elements constituting bases of the phenomenon of influence are part of at least another dimension of this same phenomenon: persuasion; control over resources; and interpersonal transaction or interaction.

C. Constituent elements of conditions
of the phenomenon of influence.

First category or common elements: The following elements constitute conditions of the phenomenon of influence and are mentioned by more than one author: acceptance of the influencing agent and his authority by those subjected to the influencing act; the perceived competence of the influencing agent by the influencee; a person's perception in determining whether he will react to an influence attempt from another person; an influencee's motivation; the consonance between the act of influence and its apparent purpose and group goals; the resources constituting a base must be appropriate to the social setting under consideration; the manipulation of a person's environment especially in keeping with his needs;

dependence of one person on another; dependence of the influencee on information; institutionalization of moral values and effect; interaction; control over resources, primarily rewards; the needs of the influencee; and the perception by others that the influencing agent is living up to the group's tasks and expectancies.

Second category or complementary elements: The following elements constitute the conditions of the phenomenon of influence and are mentioned by only one author: operation by the influencing agent on the intentions of the object of persuasion and through positive channels; devotion of subordinates and close alliances with other executives, both at one's own level and above; locating centers of latent power; consistency between the advocated premise and the receiver's cognitive state; obtention of agreement followed by consent; the adequacy of the means employed by the influencer to act on the influencee's motivations and expectations; the attraction of a person to the influencing agent; command over commitments; access to skills, knowledge, tools; combination of resources by individuals and groups; the effectiveness of the communication processes; the relation of the influence act to the functional equilibrium of the system on which it impinges; on informing the influencee of the rewards available to satisfy his needs; knowledge about the consequences of behavior; increasing the skills of the

people in an organization; the behavior of a person in the use of a base; a person's accurate view of reality; and perceived adherence by the influencing agent to the normative behavior and attitudes of the group.

Third category or contradictory elements: No element has been identified which constitutes one of the conditions of the phenomenon of influence which gave rise to divergent views among authors.

Fourth category or interdimensional elements: The following elements constituting conditions of the phenomenon of influence are part of at least another dimension of this phenomenon: control over resources; and interpersonal transaction or interaction.

D. Constituent elements of purposes
of the phenomenon of influence.

First category or common elements: No element has been identified which constitutes one of the purposes of the phenomenon of influence and which is mentioned by more than one author.

Second category or complementary elements: The following elements constitute the purposes of the phenomenon of influence and are mentioned by only one author: to achieve goals; to shape the attitudes and/or behavior of others; to increase a person's resources and thus strengthen his base

of power; to augment future influence; and to achieve some sort of gratification.

Third category or contradictory elements: No element has been identified which constitutes one of the purposes of the phenomenon of influence which gave rise to divergent views among authors.

Fourth category or interdimensional elements: No element has been identified which constitutes one of the purposes of the phenomenon of influence while also being part of another dimension of this phenomenon.

E. Constituent elements of functions
of the phenomenon of influence.

First category or common elements: The following elements constitute functions of the phenomenon of influence and are mentioned by more than one author: to persuade others toward performance; to alter the ability of others to achieve their goals or satisfy their needs; and as a medium capable of integration of social systems.

Second category or complementary elements: The following elements constitute the functions of the phenomenon of influence and are mentioned by only one author: handles the tensions which arise continually in a dynamic society between the egalitarian and the elitist components; helps in shaping the attitudes and/or behavior of influencees; serves

to bring about organizational change through the peer group; augments future influence; affects the motivation to produce; regulates communication in systems; mobilizes commitments of units to valued associations; regulates the interplay between political support and identification by membership in solidary involvements; brings about an allocation of subcollectivity organizations and their memberships, statuses, roles compatible with the interests of the collectivity and of the units; and enhances the capacity for solidarity of the societal community.

Third category or contradictory elements: No element has been identified which constitutes one of the functions of the phenomenon of influence which gave rise to divergent views among authors.

Fourth category or interdimensional elements: The following element constituting a function of the phenomenon of influence is part of at least another dimension of this same phenomenon: persuasion.

F. Constituent elements of limits of the phenomenon of influence.

First category or common elements: The following elements constitute limits of the phenomenon of influence and are mentioned by more than one author: the particular circumstances of situation and space within a system or

subsystem; the subordinates or low-ranking individuals within a system may see as irrelevant the threats posed by authorities due to their larger numbers; and there is a varying amount of restriction that influence places on the behavior of those subjected to it and on the degree of bindingness that it creates for them.

Second category or complementary elements: The following elements constitute the limits of the phenomenon of influence and are mentioned by only one author: the regulation of access to resources by making rewards or punishments contingent on attempts at influence and by altering attitudes and desires of potential partisans toward political objects; the non-face-to-faceness of large formal organizations by comparison to the greater opportunity for full and complete influence of small work group decision-making; the resisting force of the person being influenced; a maladjustment in a person; the amount of control that a person possesses; the environmental elements in an organization such as societal needs, available resources, state of knowledge, and sociopolitical values; an organization's technology; the structure in which a manager operates; morality in the exercise of influence; differences in the distribution of political resources, variations in the efficiency with which individuals use their political resources, and the extent to which persons use their resources toward their political purposes.

Third category or contradictory elements: No element has been identified which constitutes one of the limits of the phenomenon of influence which gave rise to divergent views among authors.

Fourth category or interdimensional elements: No element has been identified which constitutes one of the limits of the phenomenon of influence while also being part of at least another dimension of this phenomenon.

G. Constituent elements of causes of the phenomenon of influence.

First category or common elements: No element has been identified which constitutes one of the causes of the phenomenon of influence and which is mentioned by more than one author.

Second category or complementary elements: The following elements constitute the causes of the phenomenon of influence and are mentioned by only one author: influence is produced from the plurality of competing formal interest groups and associations which serves as a medium for effective expression of the people's self-interests; the behavior of the operative employee can be influenced by establishing in him attitudes, habits, and state of mind which will guide him toward decisions advantageous to the organization and by imposing on him decisions reached in other parts of the

organization; and influence originates from ecological control, communication, highly specific capacities and achievements, exercise of influence which places the influencing agent in a favorable position over the influencee.

Third category or contradictory elements: No element has been identified which constitutes one of the causes of the phenomenon of influence which gave rise to divergent opinions among authors.

Fourth category or interdimensional elements: No element has been identified which constitutes one of the causes of the phenomenon of influence while also being part of at least another dimension of this phenomenon.

H. Constituent elements of consequences of the phenomenon of influence.

First category or common elements: The following elements constitute the consequences of the phenomenon of influence and are mentioned by more than one author: commitment, personal growth, and satisfaction; domineering and coercive influence may inspire hostility, alienation, and resentful acquiescence on the part of those subjected to influence; and resources consumed in an influence transaction could be spent on alternative activity, which has been lost.

Second category or complementary elements: The following elements constituting consequences of the phenomenon

of influence are mentioned by only one author: the production of an effect exactly opposite to the intent; the successful influencer, although he considers that it is for others' own good, may be accused of manipulation; the receipt of certain commitments by the influencing agent, which he can then use; because the achievement of many goals occurs through influence, inability to influence is a major liability; the use of a congruent means of influence increases the strength and stability of an existing orientation especially if perceived as successful; a person may anticipate the expectations of the influence about the consequences of his behavior and he may act accordingly; influence which is not readily detected, such as the case of a teacher influencing a student is easily subject to abuse; alteration of knowledge, belief about some aspect of the environment; alteration of attitudes, motivations, values, feelings towards some aspect of the environment; alteration of overt behavior toward some aspect of the environment; affectation of the influencing agent's reputation; formation of coalitions; relinquishing ownership or control of resources if, for example, money is paid for services; contribution to higher morale, and greater participation in commitment in the organization; an increase in the total influence of an organization; and the permeability of a group varies inversely with its influence.

Third category or contradictory elements: Various authors have expressed divergent opinions regarding the following element which constitutes a consequence of the phenomenon of influence: the symmetry or asymmetry in relations between people.

Fourth category or interdimensional elements: No element has been identified which constitutes a consequence of the phenomenon of influence while at the same time being part of another dimension of this phenomenon.

I. Constituent elements of relations of the phenomenon of influence.

First category or common elements: The following elements constitute the relations of the phenomenon of influence which are mentioned by more than one author: influence is persuasive while power is coercive; power is potential for influence and influence is the result of actualized power; authority in the sense of respect accorded to the authority figure implies influence; influence is a generic term including authority, control, and power; and the process of influence is one of leadership.

Second category or complementary elements: The following elements constituting relations of the phenomenon of influence are mentioned by only one author: the forms of influence based on power are forms of power to the extent

that the scope of the influence is included within that of the power; influence and power involve a dyadic relationship; the medium focal to the societal community is influence and it is interchangeable for power, money, and value commitments; authority is but one of several forms of social influence or control; influence over subordinates which is acquired by obligating them does not initially form an established authority over them, it may eventually lead to this; in a general sense, one can consider power, influence, and control as the capacity of one person to do something affecting another which changes the likely pattern of specified future events; authority is the most restricted of a set of related concepts, influence includes mostly any interpersonal transaction with a psychological or behavioral effect, control includes successful and intended influence attempts, and power is the potential for influence backed by the means to coerce compliance; authority and influence are related concepts which are elements of power; influence is a complex component of leadership; and social influence and communication are inseparable and equivalent aspects of an undifferentiated social process.

Third category or contradictory elements: No element has been identified which constitutes one of the relations of the phenomenon of influence which gave rise to divergent views among authors.

Fourth category or interdimensional elements: The following element constituting a relation of the phenomenon of influence is part of at least another dimension of this same phenomenon: persuasion.

4. Interpretation of findings.

All dimensions of the phenomenon of influence with two exceptions contained elements where there was agreement on the part of authors studied. Complementary elements or elements identified by only one author were found in large numbers in all dimensions.

Divergent views on the part of authors were infrequent. Contradictory elements were identified in only two dimensions and there were few elements in each case. Of the nine dimensions studied five contained elements which were part of at least another dimension.

An intraphenomenal intradimensional and an intraphenomenal interdimensional analysis of influence was presented in this chapter. An intraphenomenal intradimensional and an intraphenomenal interdimensional analysis of power will be presented in the next chapter.

CHAPTER. III

PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS: INTRAPHENOMENAL ANALYSIS OF POWER

Like the previous chapter, this one is comprised of four sections: an intradimensional analysis of the phenomenon of power; an interdimensional analysis of the phenomenon of power; presentation of findings arising from the intradimensional analysis and from the interdimensional analysis; and interpretation of findings.

1. Intradimensional analysis of the phenomenon of power.

In this section, elements are assigned to each dimension of the phenomenon of power according to commonality, complementarity and divergence: common elements are those assigned to a dimension of the phenomenon of power and which are mentioned by more than one author; complementary elements, that is those assigned to a dimension of the phenomenon of power and mentioned by only one author; and contradictory elements or those assigned to a dimension of the phenomenon of power and for which various authors have divergent views.

A. Elements assigned to the dimension essential definition of the phenomenon of power

Common, complementary and contradictory elements are identified under the dimension essential definition of the

phenomenon of power.

Common elements: Power is explained as potential for influence by the following authors: Tannenbaum et al.,¹ Cartwright and Zander,² King,³ French and Raven,⁴ Katz and Kahn,⁵ Cartwright,^{6,7} Levinger,⁸ Litter,^{9,10} and Skibbins.¹¹

1 Robert Tannenbaum, Irving R. Weschler, and Fred Massarik, Leadership and Organization: A Behavioral Science Approach, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1961, p. 26.

2 Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, Eds., Group Dynamics: Research and Theory, 3rd Ed., New York, Harper & Row, 1968, p. 216.

3 Stephen W. King, Communication and Social Influence, Don Mills, Ontario, Addison-Wesley, 1975, p. 7.

4 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, "The Bases of Social Power", in Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Studies in Social Power, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan, 1959, p. 152.

5 Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organizations, New York, Wiley, 1966, p. 220.

6 Dorwin Cartwright, "Influence, Leadership, Control", in James G. March, Ed., Handbook of Organizations, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1965, p. 4.

7 Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Studies in Social Power, Ann Arbor, Institute for Social Research, 1959(b), in Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, Op. Cit., p. 3.

8 George Levinger, "The Development of Perceptions and Behavior in Newly Formed Social Power Relationships", in Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., 1959, p. 83.

9 Joseph A. Litterer, The Analysis of Organizations, New York, Wiley, 1973, p. 70.

10 Ibid., p. 413.

11 Gerald J. Skibbins, Organizational Evolution: A Program for Managing Radical Change, New York, AMACOM (American Management Associations), 1974, p. 240.

Other authors refer to power as the ability to control others and events: Hollander,¹² and d'Antonio and Ehrlich¹³ regard power as the ability to control others and events; Blau¹⁴ and Scott¹⁵ view power as the ability to control the reward and punishment system, while Homans¹⁶ limits power to the control of rewards; power is seen by Adams^{17,18} as the ability to control processes that are part of the meaningful environment of a person; and Cohen¹⁹ claims that power consists of the potential to permit or withhold gratification of a need.

12 Edwin Paul Hollander, Leadership Dynamics: A Practical Guide to Effective Relationships, New York, Free Press, 1978, p. 84.

13 William V. d'Antonio and Howard J. Ehrlich, Eds., Power and Democracy in America, Notre Dame, Indiana, University of Notre Dame Press, 1961, p. 132.

14 P. M. Blau, Exchange and Power in Social Life, New York, Wiley, 1964, in Ralph M. Stogdill, Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research, New York, Macmillan, 1974, p. 276.

15 William G. Scott, Organization Theory A Behavior Analysis for Management, Illinois, Irwin, 1967, p. 420.

16 George Caspar Homans, Social Behavior Its Elementary Forms, New York, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1974, p. 276.

17 Richard Newbold Adams, Energy and Structure, Austin, University of Texas Press, 1975, p. 121.

18 Ibid., p. 12.

19 Arthur R. Cohen, "Situational Structure, Self-Esteem, and Threat-Oriented Reactions to Power", in Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., 1959, p. 36.

Power is construed in terms of decisions made by the power-holder by Griffiths,²⁰ Lutz and Iannacone,²¹ Parsons,^{22,23} and by Lasswell and Kaplan²⁴ in terms of participation in the decisions affecting another. Stogdill,²⁵ Cartwright,^{26,27} Lutz and Iannacone,²⁸ McClelland,²⁹ Bell,³⁰ French and Raven,³¹

20 Daniel E. Griffiths, Administrative Theory, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959, p. 87.

21 Frank W. Lutz and Laurence Iannacone, Understanding Educational Organizations: A Field Study Approach, Columbus, Ohio, Charles E. Merrill, 1969, p. 4.

22 Talcott Parsons, Politics and Social Structure, New York, The Free Press, 1969, p. 46.

23 Talcott Parsons, Social Systems and the Evolution of Action Theory, New York, The Free Press, 1977, p. 209.

24 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Power and Society, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1969, p. 75.

25 Ralph M. Stogdill, Op. Cit., p. 292.

26 Dorwin Cartwright, "A Field Theoretical Conception of Power", in Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., 1959, p. 196.

27 Ibid., p. 218.

28 Frank W. Lutz and Laurence Iannacone, Op. Cit., p. 11.

29 David C. McClelland, Power, The Inner Experience, New York, Irvington, 1975, p. 255.

30 David V. J. Bell, Power, Influence and Authority, New York, Oxford University Press, 1975, p. 21.

31 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 153.

Presthus,³² Hunter,³³ Dahl,³⁴ Emerson,³⁵ and Adams³⁶ state that power is an influence relationship between people.

According to Merton,³⁷ McCarty and Ramsey,³⁸ Bach,³⁹ Cartwright,⁴⁰ Blau,⁴¹ and Weber,^{42,43,44} power means a

32 Robert Presthus, Men at the Top: A Study in Community Power, New York, Oxford University Press, 1964, p. 5.

33 Floyd Hunter, Community Power Structure, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1953, p. 6.

34 Robert A. Dahl, "Power", in International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Vol. 12, 1968, p. 407.

35 Richard M. Emerson, "Power-Dependence Relations", in American Sociological Review, Vol. 17, February 1962, p. 31-41.

36 Richard Newbold Adams, Op. Cit., p. 27.

37 Robert King Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, Toronto, Collier-Macmillan, 1968, p. 426.

38 Donald J. McCarty and Charles E. Ramsey, The School Managers, Westport, Connecticut, Greenwood, 1971, p. 11-12.

39 Kurt W. Back, "Power, Influence and Patterns of Communication", in Luigi Petrullo and Bernard Bass, Eds., Leadership and Interpersonal Behavior, New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1967, p. 139.

40 Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., 1959, p. 188.

41 P. M. Blau, Exchange and Power in Social Life, New York, Wiley, 1964, p. 117.

42 Max Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons (trans.) and Talcott Parsons, Ed., Glencoe, Illinois, Free Press and Falcon's Wing Press, 1947, p. 180.

43 Max Weber, Basic Concepts in Sociology, Connecticut, Greenwood Press, 1962, p. 117.

44 Max Weber, Op. Cit., 1947, p. 152.

capacity within a relationship of imposing one's own will even against resistance; while Nagel,⁴⁵ Homans,^{46,47} Etzioni,⁴⁸ Polsby,⁴⁹ Goldhamer and Shils,⁵⁰ Mechanic,⁵¹ Hunter,⁵² McFarland,^{53,54} Griffiths,⁵⁵ and Morphet, Johns, and Reller⁵⁶ use

45 Jack H. Nagel, The Descriptive Analysis of Power, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1975, p. 29.

46 George Caspar Homans, Op. Cit., 1974, p. 83.

47 Ibid., p. 89.

48 Amitai Etzioni, A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations, New York, The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961, p. 4.

49 Nelson W. Polsby, Community Power and Political Theory, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1963, p. 5.

50 Herbert Goldhamer and Edward A. Shils, "Types of Power and Status", in American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 45, September 1939, p. 171.

51 D. Mechanic, "Sources of Power of Lower Participants in Complex Organizations", in Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 7, 1962, p. 353.

52 Floyd Hunter, Op. Cit., p. 2-3.

53 Andrew S. McFarland, Power and Leadership in Pluralist Systems, Stanford, California, Stanford University Press, 1969, p. 156.

54 Ibid., p. 6-7.

55 Daniel E. Griffiths, "Toward a Theory of Administrative Behavior", in Roald F. Campbell and Russell T. Gregg, Administrative Behavior in Education, New York, Harper & Row, 1957, p. 384.

56 Edgar Morphet, Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller, Educational Organization and Administration: Concepts, Practices and Issues, 3rd Ed., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1974, p. 190.

power as social causation, that is the capacity of a person to change the behavior of another. Power is seen as the ability to secure the achievement of goals by Wilson,⁵⁷ Parsons,^{58,59} Lucio and McNeil,⁶⁰ Kimbrough,⁶¹ Deutsch,⁶² and Russell.⁶³

Finally power is viewed: as potential ability to use force by Lane et al.,⁶⁴ Griffiths,⁶⁵ Wolfe,⁶⁶ and Lewin;⁶⁷

⁵⁷ Robert F. Wilson, Educational Administration, Columbus, Ohio, Merrill, 1966, p. 90.

⁵⁸ Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 361.

⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 206.

⁶⁰ William H. Lucio and John D. McNeil, Supervision: A Synthesis of Thought and Action, 2nd Ed., New York, McGraw-Hill, 1969, p. 82.

⁶¹ Ralph B. Kimbrough, Political Power and Educational Decision-Making, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1964, p. 7.

⁶² Karl Deutsch, The Nerves of Government, New York, The Free Press, 1966, p. 248.

⁶³ Bertrand Russell, Power: A New Social Analysis, New York, Norton, 1938, p. 35.

⁶⁴ Willard R. Lane, et al., Foundations of Educational Administration: A Behavioral Analysis, New York, Macmillan, 1967, p. 201.

⁶⁵ Daniel E. Griffiths, Human Relations in School Administration, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1956, p. 96.

⁶⁶ Donald M. Wolfe, "Power as Authority in the Family", in Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., 1959, p. 99.

⁶⁷ Kurt Lewin, Field Theory in Social Science, New York, Harper & Row, 1951, p. 40.

as capacity for action by Hicks and Gullett,⁶⁸ Netzer et al.,⁶⁹ and Parsons;⁷⁰ as the exercise of coerciveness by Lasswell and Kaplan,⁷¹ Litterer,⁷² and Dahl;⁷³ as part of human action by Berle,⁷⁴ and Chin and Benne;⁷⁵ and as influencing others to behave in terms of one's own goals and interests by Gregg,⁷⁶ and Cohen.⁷⁷

Complementary elements: Parsons⁷⁸ interprets power as a functional-relational system which is controlled by

68 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Organizations: Theory and Behavior, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1975, p. 73.

69 Lanore A. Netzer, et al., Interdisciplinary Foundations of Supervision, Boston, Allyn and Bacon, 1970, p. 214.

70 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 205.

71 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 98.

72 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 413.

73 Robert A. Dahl, Modern Political Analysis, 3rd Ed., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1976, p. 47.

74 Adolf A. Berle, Power, New York, Harcourt, Brace & World, 1969, p. 60.

75 Robert Chin and Kenneth D. Benne, "General Strategies for Affecting Changes in Human Systems", in Warren G. Bennis, Kenneth D. Benne and Robert Chin, The Planning of Change, New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969, p. 52.

76 Russell T. Gregg, "Political Dimensions of Educational Administration", in Walter G. Hack, et al., Educational Administration: Selected Readings, 2nd Ed., Boston, Allyn & Bacon, 1971, p. 218.

77 Arthur R. Cohen, Op. Cit., p. 36.

78 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 206.

institutional patterns, collectivities and roles, while Gamson⁷⁹ contends that power refers to authorities influencing potential partisans and on partisans influencing authorities. As postulated by Bell⁸⁰ power is a declared intent to shift an individual's value position either in the direction of more or less enjoyment depending on the use of promise or threat. The power of a person is described by Hobbes⁸¹ as a present means which serves to obtain some future apparent good.

Finally, power is recognized: as a force that makes organizations operate by Hicks and Gullett;⁸² as the basis of responsible action by Parsons;⁸³ as a latent force by Griffiths;⁸⁴ as authority by Blau;⁸⁵ as influence over

79 William A. Gamson, Power and Discontent, Illinois, Dorsey, 1968, p. 59.

80 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 22-23.

81 Thomas Hobbes, Leviathan, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1957, p. 56.

82 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit., p. 231.

83 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 205.

84 Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1956, p. 96.

85 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 200.

thought by Kolb;⁸⁶ as the enhancement of others by Erikson;⁸⁷ as the ability of a person or group to impose its will on others in a recurrent manner by Blau;⁸⁸ and as the cement which holds a society by Griffiths.⁸⁹

Contradictory elements: While Rosen⁹⁰ views power as a relative ability of people to influence each other, Blau,⁹¹ and Mechanic⁹² consider power to be asymmetrical with one person dependent on another. On one hand, Hicks and Gullett,⁹³ and Bell⁹⁴ refer to power as an ability to provide sanctions or to give rewards, while Blau⁹⁵ rules out the use of rewards in the exercise of power; instead he relates the use of rewards to influence.

86 Eugene J. Kolb, A Framework for Political Analysis, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, 1978, p. 32.

87 Erik H. Erikson, Childhood and Society, 1st Ed., New York, Norton, 1950, 397 p., in Benjamin M. Sachs, Educational Administration: A Behavioral Approach, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1966, p. 75.

88 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 117.

89 Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1956, p. 105.

90 Sidney Rosen, "Effects of Adjustment on the Perception of Social Power", in Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., 1959, p. 70.

91 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 117.

92 D. Mechanic, Op. Cit., p. 353.

93 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit., p. 230.

94 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 21.

95 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 141.

B. Elements assigned to the dimension
basis of the phenomenon of power.

Under the dimension basis of the phenomenon of power, common and complementary elements are identified. No contradictory elements have been identified by authors.

Common elements: Several authors recognize that an actor's power rests on possession of resources: Kolb⁹⁶ and Dahl⁹⁷ state that a person's power rests on resources that he can use in order to affect others. These resources are identified as: wealth by Homans,⁹⁸ Kolb,⁹⁹ Lasswell and Kaplan,¹⁰⁰ Kimbrough and Nunnery,¹⁰¹ Hicks and Gullett,¹⁰² Litterer,¹⁰³ and Charters et al;¹⁰⁴ prestige and reputation by

96 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., 1978, p. 32.

97 Robert A. Dahl, "The Concept of Power", in Behavioral Science, Vol. 2, June 1957, p. 203.

98 George Caspar Homans, Op. Cit., p. 74-75.

99 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 39-49.

100 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 83.

101 Ralph B. Kimbrough and Michael Y. Nunnery, Educational Administration: An Introduction, New York, Macmillan, 1976, p. 335.

102 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit., p. 245-248.

103 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 70.

104 W. W. Charters, et al., Perspectives on Educational Administration and the Behavioral Sciences, Eugene, University of Oregon, Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1965, p. 114.

Kolb,^{105,106} Lasswell and Kaplan,¹⁰⁷ Leavitt,¹⁰⁸ Gregg,¹⁰⁹ Hobbes,¹¹⁰ and Charters et al.;¹¹¹ knowledge by Kolb,¹¹² Kimbrough and Nunnery,¹¹³ Charters et al.,¹¹⁴ Gregg,¹¹⁵ Hicks and Gullett,¹¹⁶ and Chin and Benne;¹¹⁷ competence, skill and expertise by Kolb,¹¹⁸ Mechanic,¹¹⁹ Lasswell and

105 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 32.

106 Ibid., p. 39-49.

107 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 83.

108 Harold J. Leavitt, Managerial Psychology, Chicago, The Chicago of University Press, 1972, p. 136.

109 Russell T. Gregg, "The Administrative Process", in Roald F. Campbell and Russell T. Gregg, Op. Cit., p. 305.

110 Thomas Hobbes, Op. Cit., p. 56-57.

111 W. W. Charters, et al., Op. Cit., p. 114.

112 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 39-49.

113 Ralph B. Kimbrough and Michael Y. Nunnery, Op. Cit., p. 335.

114 W. W. Charters, et al., Op. Cit., p. 114.

115 Russell T. Gregg, Op. Cit., p. 305.

116 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit., p. 245-248.

117 Robert Chin and Kenneth B. Benne, Op. Cit., p. 52.

118 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 39-49.

119 D. Mechanic, Op. Cit., p. 356-361.

Kaplan,¹²⁰ Kimbrough and Nunnery,¹²¹ Hicks and Gullett,¹²² Leavitt,¹²³ Zaleznik,¹²⁴ Blau and Scott,¹²⁵ French and Raven,¹²⁶ Litterer,¹²⁷ Scott,¹²⁸ and Lippitt;¹²⁹ physical strength by Homans,¹³⁰ Hicks and Gullett,¹³¹ and Russell;¹³² physical force by Litterer;¹³³ personality by Wilson,¹³⁴ Hicks

3

120 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 83.

121 Ralph B. Kimbrough and Michael Y. Nunnery, Op. Cit., p. 335.

122 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit., p. 245-248.

123 Harold J. Leavitt, Op. Cit., p. 136.

124 Abraham Zaleznik, "Power and Politics in Organizational Life", in Harvard Business Review, May-June 1970, p. 60.

125 Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach, San Francisco, California, Chandler, 1962, p. 176.

126 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 155-156.

127 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 428-429.

128 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 205-206.

129 Gordon L. Lippitt, Organizational Renewal, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969, p. 44.

130 George Caspar Homans, Op. Cit., p. 74-75.

131 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit., p. 245-248.

132 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., p. 36.

133 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 70.

134 L. Craig Wilson, School Leadership Today: Strategies for the Educator, Boston, Allyn & Bacon, 1978, p. 337.

and Gullett,¹³⁵ Leavitt,¹³⁶ and Mechanic;¹³⁷ popularity by Lasswell and Kaplan,¹³⁸ and Hobbes;¹³⁹ charisma by Kimbrough and Nunnery;¹⁴⁰ social status by Kimbrough and Nunnery,¹⁴¹ Leavitt,¹⁴² Charters et al.,¹⁴³ Hobbes,¹⁴⁴ and Zander et al.;¹⁴⁵ intellectual ability by Homans,¹⁴⁶ and Berle;¹⁴⁷ legal authority by Kolb;¹⁴⁸ effort and interest by Mechanic;¹⁴⁹ personal

¹³⁵ Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit., p. 245-248.

¹³⁶ Harold J. Leavitt, Op. Cit., p. 136.

¹³⁷ D. Mechanic, Op. Cit., p. 356-361.

¹³⁸ Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 83.

¹³⁹ Thomas Hobbes, Op. Cit., p. 56.

¹⁴⁰ Ralph B. Kimbrough and Michael Y. Nunnery, Op. Cit., p. 335.

¹⁴¹ Ibid.

¹⁴² Harold J. Leavitt, Op. Cit., p. 136.

¹⁴³ W. W. Charters, et al., Op. Cit., p. 114.

¹⁴⁴ Thomas Hobbes, Op. Cit., p. 57.

¹⁴⁵ Alvin Zander, Arthur R. Cohen, and Ezra Stotland, "Power and the Relations Among Professions", in Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., 1959, p. 17.

¹⁴⁶ George C. Homans, Op. Cit., p. 74-75.

¹⁴⁷ Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 63-64.

¹⁴⁸ Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 39-49.

¹⁴⁹ D. Mechanic, Op. Cit., p. 356-361.

ambition by Russell;¹⁵⁰ leadership ability by Kimbrough and Nunnery,¹⁵¹ and Gregg;¹⁵² access to mass media, family ties, leadership in informal groups, friendship ties and knowledge of the political system by Kimbrough and Nunnery;¹⁵³ ownership by Leavitt.¹⁵⁴

In a general way, control over resources has been seen as a source of power by a number of authors: Adams,¹⁵⁵ King,¹⁵⁶ Lasswell and Kaplan,¹⁵⁷ Newcomb et al.,¹⁵⁸ Charters et al.,¹⁵⁹ and Bell.¹⁶⁰ In a more specific manner, control over resources as a source of power is identified as: control over jobs and control over credit by Kimbrough and

150 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., p. 157.

151 Ralph B. Kimbrough and Michael Y. Nunnery, Op. Cit., p. 335.

152 Russell T. Gregg, Op. Cit., p. 305.

153 Ralph B. Kimbrough and Michael Y. Nunnery, Op. Cit., p. 335.

154 Harold J. Leavitt, Op. Cit., p. 149.

155 Richard Newbold Adams, Op. Cit., p. 19.

156 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 67-71.

157 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 76.

158 M. Newcomb, R. H. Turner, and P. E. Converse, "Leadership Roles in Goal Achievement", in Cecil Austin Gibb, Ed., Leadership: Selected Readings, Harmondsworth, England, Penguin, 1979, p. 330-331.

159 W. W. Charters, et al., Op. Cit., p. 114.

160 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 26.

Nunnery,¹⁶¹ and Charters et al.; ¹⁶² control over votes by Kimbrough and Nunnery; ¹⁶³ control over income by Leavitt,¹⁶⁴ and Etzioni; ¹⁶⁵ control over terms of relationship by Leavitt; ¹⁶⁶ control over information by Pettigrew; ^{167, 168} and control over economic power such as production, delivery of goods and services by Berle.¹⁶⁹

Power rests on coercion according to French and Raven,¹⁷⁰ Litterer,¹⁷¹ Scott,¹⁷² Lippitt,¹⁷³ Wolfe,¹⁷⁴

¹⁶¹ Ralph B. Kimbrough and Michael Y. Nunnery, Op. Cit., p. 335.

¹⁶² W. W. Charters; et al., Op. Cit., p. 114.

¹⁶³ Ralph B. Kimbrough and Michael Y. Nunnery, Op. Cit., p. 335.

¹⁶⁴ Harold J. Leavitt, Op. Cit., p. 136.

¹⁶⁵ Amitai Etzioni, Op. Cit., p. 5.

¹⁶⁶ Harold J. Leavitt, Op. Cit., p. 136.

¹⁶⁷ Andrew M. Pettigrew, The Politics of Organizational Decision-Making, U.S.A., Harper & Row, 1973, p. 28.

¹⁶⁸ A. M. Pettigrew, "Information as a Power Source", in Sociology, Vol. 6, 1976, p. 187-204.

¹⁶⁹ Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 223.

¹⁷⁰ John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 155-156.

¹⁷¹ Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 428-429.

¹⁷² William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 205-206.

¹⁷³ Gordon L. Lippitt, Op. Cit., p. 44.

¹⁷⁴ Donald M. Wolfe, Op. Cit., p. 101.

Zaltman et al.,¹⁷⁵ Blau,^{176,177} Dahl,¹⁷⁸ Weber,¹⁷⁹ Kolb,¹⁸⁰ and Russell.¹⁸¹ Other authors recognize reward as a support of power: French and Raven,¹⁸² Litterer,¹⁸³ Scott,¹⁸⁴ Lippitt,¹⁸⁵ Wolfe,¹⁸⁶ Zaltman et al.,¹⁸⁷ Kolb,¹⁸⁸ and Russell.¹⁸⁹ Another source of power recognized by authors

175 Gerald Zaltman, David H. Florio, and Linda Sikorski, Dynamic Educational Change: Models, Strategies, Tactics, and Management, New York, Free Press, 1977, p. 73.

176 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 22.

177 Ibid., p. 116.

178 Robert A. Dahl, Op. Cit., 1976, p. 48-49.

179 Max Weber, referred to in Stephen J. Knezevich, Administration of Public Education, New York, Harper & Row, 1975, p. 45.

180 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 54-56.

181 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., p. 36.

182 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 155-156.

183 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 428-429.

184 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 205-206.

185 Gordon L. Lippitt, Op. Cit., p. 44.

186 Donald M. Wolfe, Op. Cit., p. 101.

187 Gerald Zaltman, David H. Florio, and Linda Sikorski, Op. Cit., p. 73.

188 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 54-56.

189 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., p. 36.

is legitimacy: French and Raven,¹⁹⁰ Litterer,¹⁹¹ Scott,¹⁹² Lippitt,¹⁹³ Pettigrew,^{194,195} Parsons,^{196,197} McClelland,¹⁹⁸ Scott,¹⁹⁹ and Gregg.²⁰⁰ Power is seen as arising from reference by Raven and French,²⁰¹ Litterer,²⁰² Scott,²⁰³ and Lippitt.²⁰⁴

The source of power of an individual is derived from the official position or office that he occupies according

¹⁹⁰ John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 155-156.

¹⁹¹ Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 428-429.

¹⁹² William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 205-206.

¹⁹³ Gordon L. Lippitt, Op. Cit., p. 44.

¹⁹⁴ Andrew M. Pettigrew, Op. Cit., 1973, p. 231.

¹⁹⁵ Ibid., p. 144.

¹⁹⁶ Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 12.

¹⁹⁷ Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 190.

¹⁹⁸ David C. McClelland, Op. Cit., p. 23.

¹⁹⁹ William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 383.

²⁰⁰ Russell T. Gregg, Op. Cit., 1957, p. 305.

²⁰¹ John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 155-156.

²⁰² Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 428-429.

²⁰³ William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 205-206.

²⁰⁴ Gordon L. Lippitt, Op. Cit., p. 44.

to Kimbrough,²⁰⁵ Gamson,²⁰⁶ Parsons,²⁰⁷ Newcomb et al.,²⁰⁸ Etzioni,²⁰⁹ Pettigrew,²¹⁰ Kolb,²¹¹ Mechanic,²¹² Lasswell and Kaplan,²¹³ Kimbrough and Nunnery,²¹⁴ Hicks and Gullett,²¹⁵ and Zander et al.²¹⁶ Power is exercised through and depends on institutions or organizations according to Zaleznik,²¹⁷ Wilson,²¹⁸ Berle,²¹⁹ Kolb,²²⁰ and Mechanic.²²¹

205 Ralph B. Kimbrough, Op. Cit., p. 13.

206 William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 13.

207 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 482.

208 T. M. Newcomb, R. H. Turner, and P. E. Converse, Op. Cit., p. 330-331.

209 Amitai Etzioni, Op. Cit., p. 89-90.

210 Andrew M. Pettigrew, Op. Cit., 1973, p. 29.

211 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 39-49.

212 D. Mechanic, Op. Cit., p. 356-361.

213 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 83.

214 Ralph B. Kimbrough and Michael Y. Nunnery, Op. Cit., p. 335.

215 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit., p. 245-248.

216 Alvin Zander, Arthur R. Cohen, and Ezra Stotland, Op. Cit., p. 17.

217 Abraham Zaleznik, Op. Cit., p. 48.

218 L. Craig Wilson, Op. Cit., p. 178.

219 Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 37.

220 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 39-49.

221 D. Mechanic, Op. Cit., p. 37.

Griffiths,²²² Russell,²²³ Berle,²²⁴ and Litterer²²⁵ stipulate that power is dependent on beliefs and a system of morals. Finally, power rests: on persuasion according to Kolb,²²⁶ Wilson,²²⁷ Hobbes,²²⁸ Russell,²²⁹ and Reedy;²³⁰ on the relationship between two individuals according to French and Raven,²³¹ Wolfe,²³² and Emerson;²³³ on the needs or values of the person to whom a power act is being directed according to Bell,²³⁴ Newman and Warren,²³⁵ and Cartwright and

222 Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1956, p. 98.

223 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 145.

224 Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 29.

225 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 70.

226 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 54-56.

227 L. Craig Wilson, Op. Cit., p. 337.

228 Thomas Hobbes, Op. Cit., p. 57.

229 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 141.

230 George Reedy, The Twilight of the Presidency, New York, Wold, 1970, p. 33, in Edwin Paul Hollander, Op. Cit., 1978, p. 153.

231 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 153.

232 Donald M. Wolfe, Op. Cit., p. 100.

233 Richard M. Emerson, "Power-Dependence Relations", American Sociological Review, Vol. 27, February 1962, p. 31-40, in James D. Thompson, Organizations in Action, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1967, p. 107.

234 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 30.

235 William Herman Newman and E. Kirby Warren, The Process of Management: Concepts, Behavior, and Practice, 4th Ed., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1977, p. 247.

Zander;²³⁶ and, on violent force according to Kolb,²³⁷ and Etzioni.²³⁸

Complementary elements: According to Berle,²³⁹ power rests on the coalescence of three elements: men, a philosophy, and a group capable of organization into institutions. Scribner²⁴⁰ states that power depends on a system of inequalities that permits influence of lower class by coalitions. Service is seen as the administrator's source of power by Sachs.²⁴¹ According to Pettigrew,²⁴² power rests on the distribution of resources. Presthus²⁴³ indicates that a leader's power depends primarily on his associations with various collective systems of power, on subsystems,²⁴⁴ and

²³⁶ Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, Eds., Op. Cit., p. 216-217.

²³⁷ Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 39-49.

²³⁸ Amitai Etzioni, Op. Cit., p. 5.

²³⁹ Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 50.

²⁴⁰ Jay D. Scribner, Eds., "The Politics of Education", in The 76th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II, Chicago, University of Chicago, 1977, p. 33.

²⁴¹ Benjamin M. Sachs, Op. Cit., p. 65.

²⁴² Andrew M. Pettigrew, Op. Cit., 1973, p. 229.

²⁴³ Robert Presthus, Op. Cit., p. 8.

²⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 29.

on his ability to manipulate the larger system.²⁴⁵ Griffiths²⁴⁶ claims that control of the decision-making process develops and sustains power. Power is granted according to Scott²⁴⁷ when controls over it are available or accountability is present.

According to Kolb,²⁴⁸ power appears to rest on the interaction among: 1) the possession or control of resources, 2) the target's needs or values, 3) credibility, and 4) good will and responsiveness. Further sources of power are viewed as political symbols by Lasswell and Kaplan;²⁴⁹ implied terms of statutes, rules and regulations by Roe and Drake;²⁵⁰ creed by Russell;²⁵¹ plurality in kinds of power by Banfield;²⁵² anonymity by Leavitt;²⁵³ fear, tradition, interaction between creeds and other sources of power, and substitution of a new

245 Ibid., p. 5.

246 Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1959, p. 87.

247 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 402.

248 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 37-38.

249 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 103-104.

250 William H. Roe and Thelbert L. Drake, The Principals, New York; Macmillan, 1974, p. 52.

251 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 154.

252 Edward Christie Banfield, Political Influence, New York, Free Press, 1965, p. 320.

253 Harold J. Leavitt, Op. Cit., p. 149.

creed for an old one by Russell;²⁵⁴ political alliance by Wilson;²⁵⁵ sensitivity to the needs of others by Leavitt;²⁵⁶ numbers by Leavitt;²⁵⁷ manipulation of symbolic rewards by Etzioni;²⁵⁸ success by Hobbes;²⁵⁹ and a system of ideas or philosophy by Berle.²⁶⁰

C. Elements assigned to the dimension
condition of the phenomenon
of power.

Elements identified by authors and assigned to the dimension condition of the phenomenon of power are classified according to their commonality and complementarity. No divergent views amongst authors were identified.

Common elements: The exercise of power is contingent on the possession of one or more resources of power according

254 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 157.

255 L. Craig Wilson, Op. Cit., p. 337.

256 Harold J. Leavitt, Op. Cit., p. 136.

257 Ibid., p. 149.

258 Amitai Etzioni, Op. Cit., p. 5.

259 Thomas Hobbes, Op. Cit., p. 56.

260 Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 37.

to Litterer,²⁶¹ Kolb,²⁶² Blau,²⁶³ Newcomb et al.,²⁶⁴ and Lane et al.²⁶⁵ The following authors: Lucio and McNeil,²⁶⁶ Bell,²⁶⁷ Mechanic,^{268,269} and Parsons²⁷⁰ state that the successful exercise of power presupposes control of some resource or access to resources which could serve as sanction or means to ends being sought. Blau,²⁷¹ Cartwright,²⁷² Leavitt,²⁷³ Wolfe²⁷⁴ indicate that power depends on persons having needs that could be satisfied by resources that the influencing agent has to offer. Further, other authors:

261 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 71.

262 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 49.

263 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 22.

264 T. M. Newcomb, R. H. Turner, and P. E. Converse, Op. Cit., p. 330.

265 Willard R. Lane et al., Op. Cit., p. 202.

266 William H. Lucio and John D. McNeil, Op. Cit., p. 82.

267 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 26.

268 D. Mechanic, Op. Cit., p. 352.

269 Ibid., p. 355.

270 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 205.

271 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 122.

272 Dorwin Cartwright, "A Field Theoretical Conception of Power", in Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., 1959, p. 204-206.

273 Harold J. Leavitt, Op. Cit., p. 146.

274 Donald M. Wolfe, Op. Cit., p. 101.

Zaltman et al.,²⁷⁵ Homans,^{276,277} Newman,²⁷⁸ and Kolb²⁷⁹ stipulate that the success of power depends on the marginal value the person attaches to the resources being utilized by the power-wielder. Still in relation to the successful use of resources by influencing agents, these resources must be low in relation to demand according to Bell,²⁸⁰ and Homans.²⁸¹

A number of authors regard power as contingent on the perception of those being influenced of the number of rewards that an influencing agent can mobilize, his ability to mediate punishments, and his right to prescribe behavior from a position of authority: French and Raven,²⁸²

²⁷⁵ Gerald Zaltman, David H. Florio, and Linda A. Sikorski, Op. Cit., p. 74.

²⁷⁶ George Caspar Homans, Op. Cit., 1974, p. 74-75.

²⁷⁷ George C. Homans, The Human Group, New York, Harcourt, Brace, 1950, p. 87.

²⁷⁸ William Herman Newman and E. Kirby Warren, Op. Cit., p. 247.

²⁷⁹ Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 32.

²⁸⁰ David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 30.

²⁸¹ George Caspar Homans, Op. Cit., 1974, p. 74-75.

²⁸² John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 155-156.

Litterer,²⁸³ Levinger,²⁸⁴ Russell,²⁸⁵ Wolfe²⁸⁶ claim that power depends on the perception by those influenced of the number of positive rewards they think a potential social agent can mobilize; French and Raven,²⁸⁷ Litterer,^{288,289} Levinger,²⁹⁰ and Wolfe²⁹¹ view power as dependent on the perception by those influenced of the ability of the influencing agent to mediate punishment; and French and Raven,²⁹² Litterer,²⁹³ Parsons,²⁹⁴ and Cartwright²⁹⁵ indicate that power depends on the perception by a person that the influencing agent has a legitimate right to prescribe behavior

283 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 428-429.

284 George Levinger, Op. Cit., p. 84.

285 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 139.

286 Donald M. Wolfe, Op. Cit., p. 101.

287 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 155-156.

288 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 428-429.

289 Ibid., p. 413.

290 George Levinger, Op. Cit., p. 84.

291 Donald M. Wolfe, Op. Cit., p. 101.

292 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 155-156.

293 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 428-429.

294 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 205.

295 Dorwin Cartwright, "Power: A Neglected Variable in Social Psychology", in Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., 1959, p. 5-7.

for him, thereby sanctioning the authority of the position.

Some authors regard the integration of the system including unifying of staff, and binding of units, individual and collective as necessary for effective exercise of power: Parsons,²⁹⁶ Hicks and Gullett,²⁹⁷ Berle,²⁹⁸ Lazarus and Warren,²⁹⁹ Kimbrough,^{300,301} Russell,^{302,303} Griffiths,³⁰⁴ and Rosen.³⁰⁵ Other authors state that power depends on the ability of individuals to command the loyalty of those that they wish to influence: Blau,³⁰⁶ Goldhamer and Shils,³⁰⁷

296 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 205.

297 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit., p. 270.

298 Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 63.

299 Harold Lazarus and E. Kirby Warren, The Progress of Management, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1968, p. 126.

300 Ralph B. Kimbrough, Op. Cit., p. 196.

301 Ibid., p. 215.

302 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 28.

303 Bertrand Russell, Authority and the Individual, London, George Allen & Unwin, 1949, p. 101.

304 Daniel E. Griffiths, Ed., "Behavioral Science and Educational Administration", in Sixty-Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1964, p. 236.

305 Sidney Rosen, Op. Cit., p. 70.

306 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 23.

307 Herbert Goldhamer and Edward A. Shils, Op. Cit., p. 174.

Scott,³⁰⁸ French and Raven,³⁰⁹ and Blau and Scott.³¹⁰ According to Russell,³¹¹ Lasswell and Kaplan,³¹² Zander and Cohen,³¹³ and Rosen,³¹⁴ a power-holder has a stronger likelihood of ensuring that events will occur as he wishes if he has a realistic appraisal of his power relative to that of others.

Some authors contend that power is governed by a system of more or less accepted ideas and morals: Berle,³¹⁵ and McCarty and Ramsey.³¹⁶ Finally, power is viewed: as directly dependent on the number of available alternatives by Lane et al.,³¹⁷ and Pettigrew;³¹⁸ as directly related to

308 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 207.

309 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 155-156.

310 Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Op. Cit., p. 144.

311 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 18-19.

312 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 110.

313 Alvin Zander, Arthur R. Cohen, and Ezra Stotland, Op. Cit., p. 18.

314 Sidney Rosen, Op. Cit., p. 70.

315 Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 31.

316 Donald J. McCarty and Charles E. Ramsey, Op. Cit., p. 56.

317 Willard R. Lane, et al., Op. Cit., p. 202.

318 Andrew M. Pettigrew, Op. Cit., 1973, p. 26.

the degree of threat and fear of an individual by Cohen,³¹⁹ Russell,³²⁰ and Cartwright and Zander;³²¹ as contingent on a structured institutional framework, by Presthus,³²² and Hunter;³²³ and, as dependent on the effective use of resources that is on the degree of congruence with goals, cultural norms, etc., by Kimbrough and Nunnery,³²⁴ Parsons,³²⁵ and Kolb.³²⁶

Complementary elements: According to Blau,³²⁷ a person who has command of and who renders services to others establishes their dependence on and obligation to him. Closely associated with this is the indication by Pettigrew³²⁸ that power structures depend primarily on the distribution of the resources by means of which compliance can be enforced, and

319 Arthur R. Cohen, Op. Cit., p. 37.

320 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 19.

321 Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, Eds., Op. Cit., p. 225.

322 Robert Presthus, Op. Cit., p. 5.

323 Floyd Hunter, Op. Cit., p. 6.

324 Ralph B. Kimbrough and Michael Y. Nunnery, Op. Cit., p. 335.

325 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 199.

326 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 120.

327 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 118.

328 Andrew M. Pettigrew, Op. Cit., 1973, p. 26.

by Bell³²⁹ that compliance is contingent on the power-holder coming through with the promised reward. While Roe³³⁰ recognizes that there must be a wide range of implied powers in order to arrive at the exercise of expressed powers, Bell³³¹ indicates that power requires the maintenance of a threat capability. The perception by the subordinated individuals of the legitimacy of the power-holders' acts are seen as important: Goldhamer and Shils³³² speak of the recognition of legitimate power as resting on a belief in the sanctity of traditions by which the power-holder exercises power, and in the legalities of the laws, decrees, and directives promulgated by the power-holder; and Laswell and Kaplan³³³ state that the maintenance of power depends on an apparent conformity by the influencing agent to the political formula.

Various authors have expressed the following views. They claim that power is contingent upon: the relationship of good will that prevails between the power-holder and the

329 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 30.

330 William H. Roe and Thelbert L. Drake, Op. Cit., p. 52.

331 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 30.

332 Herbert Goldhamer and Edward A. Shils, Op. Cit., p. 173.

333 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 126.

target, Kolb;³³⁴ a deep feeling of creed or sentiment by the great majority of the population, Russell;³³⁵ some demand for reward, Homans;³³⁶ a generalized capacity to secure compliance along with use of symbolic means, Parsons;³³⁷ a cultural recognition by others of an actor's control of the environment, Adams;³³⁸ the existence of a time lag between the actions of the person exerting power and the responses of the respondent, Dahl;³³⁹ the existence of some connection between the actor and the respondent, Dahl;³⁴⁰ a uniformity which depends upon sentiment and habit, Russell;³⁴¹ the making of decisions by a person which affect the course of action of an enterprise to a greater extent than do decisions of others, and which influence other decisions, Griffiths;³⁴² the right of expulsion and its related financial hardship, Russell;³⁴³

334 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 32.

335 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 154.

336 George Caspar Homans, Op. Cit., 1974, p. 74-75.

337 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 362.

338 Richard Newbold Adams, Op. Cit., p. 13.

339 Robert A. Dahl, Op. Cit., 1957, p. 204.

340 Ibid.

341 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 150.

342 Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1959, p. 87.

343 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 179-180.

communication about the relevant rewards and punishments and about the specific behavior upon which they depend, Zaltman et al.; ³⁴⁴ the perception and understanding of the power communication, Bell; ³⁴⁵ the size of the unit governed by the power-holder, Russell; ³⁴⁶ an individual's perception that the influencing agent has some special knowledge or expertise, French and Raven; ³⁴⁷ the power-holder remaining indifferent to the benefits that others can offer him in exchange for his benefits, Blau; ³⁴⁸ and a recognition that subdominants as well as dominants operate in the community power structure of the school by Willie. ³⁴⁹

D. Elements assigned to the dimension purpose
of the phenomenon of power..

Elements identified by authors are assigned according
to their commonality and complementarity to the dimension

³⁴⁴ Gerald Zaltman, David H. Florio, and Linda Sikorski, Op. Cit., p. 74.

³⁴⁵ David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 74.

³⁴⁶ Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1949, p. 28.

³⁴⁷ John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 155-156.

³⁴⁸ P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 121.

³⁴⁹ Charles V. Willie, "New Perspectives in School Community Relations", Journal of Negro Education, Vol. 37, Summer 1968, p. 220-226, in William H. Roe and Thelbert L. Drake, Op. Cit., p. 8.

purpose of the phenomenon of power. No contradictory elements have been assigned to this dimension by authors studied.

Common elements: According to Wilson,³⁵⁰ Gregg,³⁵¹ and Pettigrew³⁵² power is essential to keep individuals and organizations moving toward their respective goals.

Griffiths,^{353,354} on the other hand, contends that power is sought in order to control people and the decision-making process.

Complementary elements: Hicks and Gullett³⁵⁵ indicate that power is necessary for coordinated human activity which is important for effective organizations. While Wilson³⁵⁶ contends that power serves to enforce laws and decisions, Lasswell and Kaplan³⁵⁷ claim that every power group seeks to acquire authority. According to Fleisher on

350 Robert F. Wilson, Op. Cit., p. 54.

351 Russell T. Gregg, Op. Cit., 1957, p. 302.

352 Andrew M. Pettigrew, Op. Cit., 1973, p. 265.

353 Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1959, p. 86.

354 Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1956, p. 95.

355 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit., p. 231.

356 Robert F. Wilson, Op. Cit., p. 55.

357 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 137.

Machiavelli,³⁵⁸ power serves to obtain and secure the objects of one's desires, and according to Scott³⁵⁹ power is useful to perpetuate interests already vested in an organization. Finally, McClelland³⁶⁰ states that the goal of power motivation is to feel powerful, and Sachs³⁶¹ indicates that autocratic power aspires to the ideal of conformity.

E. Elements assigned to the dimension function of the phenomenon of power.

Elements identified by authors and assigned to the dimension function of the phenomenon of power are classified according to their commonality and complementarity. No divergent views amongst authors were identified.

Common elements: Power serves to control the behavior of others by an individual or by an organization according to Griffiths,^{362,363} Scott,³⁶⁴ Netzer et al.,³⁶⁵

³⁵⁸ Martin Fleisher, Ed., Machiavelli and the Nature of Political Thought, Canada, McClelland and Stewart, 1972, p. 134.

³⁵⁹ William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 389.

³⁶⁰ David C. McClelland, Op. Cit., p. 17.

³⁶¹ Benjamin M. Sachs, Op. Cit., p. 75.

³⁶² Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1959, p. 86.

³⁶³ Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1956, p. 95.

³⁶⁴ William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 389.

³⁶⁵ Lanore A. Netzer, et al., Op. Cit., p. 84.

Blau and Scott,³⁶⁶ Kolb,³⁶⁷ and Galbraith.³⁶⁸ In an organization the primary role of power is to stabilize the organization in the face of a changing environment, Lane et al.,³⁶⁹ and Parsons.³⁷⁰ According to Newman,³⁷¹ and Blau,³⁷² power enables the coordination of activities in the pursuit of a purposeful course of action. While Blau and Scott,³⁷³ and Sachs³⁷⁴ view power as the capacity to provide services to others, Parsons,^{375,376} and Hicks and Gullett,³⁷⁷ and Adams³⁷⁸

366 Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Op. Cit., p. 142.

367 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 36-37.

368 John Kenneth Galbraith, American Capitalism. The Concept of Countervailing Power, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1956, p. 25.

369 Willard R. Lane, et al., Op. Cit., p. 207.

370 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 343.

371 William Herman Newman and E. Kirby Warren, Op. Cit., p. 245.

372 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 135.

373 Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Op. Cit., p. 142.

374 Benjamin M. Sachs, Op. Cit., p. 75.

375 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 200.

376 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 190.

377 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit., p. 270.

378 Richard Newbold Adams, Op. Cit., p. 121.

describe the role of power as the capacity to mobilize resources and capacities, it can be seen as the energy of an organization.

Complementary elements: Several authors view power as playing an important role in the inception and functioning of organizations. Bierstedt³⁷⁹ regards power as essential to the inauguration, guaranteed continuance, and order of an association. Roe³⁸⁰ states that implied powers allow progress, growth and experimentation in an organization by providing a frontier where imaginative and dynamic administration can occur. According to Blau and Scott³⁸¹ power is important in determining to whose demand the organization will yield. While Hicks and Gullett³⁸² view power as a vital determinant of the nature and quality of the interaction of persons, Crozier³⁸³ contends that the allocation of power and the system of power arrangements have a decisive

³⁷⁹ Robert M. Bierstedt, "An Analysis of Social Power", in American Sociological Review, Vol. 15, December 1950, p. 735.

³⁸⁰ William H. Roe and Thelbert L. Drake, Op. Cit., p. 52-53.

³⁸¹ Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Op. Cit., p. 196.

³⁸² Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit., p. 229.

³⁸³ M. Crozier, The Bureaucratic Phenomenon, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1964, p. 147.

influence over the kind of adjustment people reach in an organization and over the outcomes and efficiency of such an organization. Berle³⁸⁴ regards organization and recognition of the field of responsibility as essential tasks of power at any level. This same author³⁸⁵ also states that institutions give power in order to secure institutional action in their power. While Russell³⁸⁶ claims that power provides the bargaining strength of an organization, Hicks and Gullett³⁸⁷ declare that power determines the criteria to be used in measuring organizational effectiveness and the means for evaluating such criteria. According to Parsons³⁸⁸ people with power have legitimated rights to make and implement decisions which are collectively binding.

Other authors relate the functions of power specifically to school administration: Scribner³⁸⁹ states that power shapes the process in building a school system; Lucio and McNeil³⁹⁰ indicate that the exercise of power by

384 Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 117.

385 Ibid., p. 101.

386 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1949, p. 103-104.

387 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit., p. 256.

388 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 210.

389 Jay D. Scribner, Ed., Op. Cit., p. 59.

390 William H. Lucio and John D. McNeil, Op. Cit., p. 83.

educational decision-makers serves to change the way people perceive education and to supply them with information and opinion which is in keeping with national policy; and Mort and Ross³⁹¹ find that school authorities utilize and have power to levy taxes, determine scope of programs, determine curriculum and to establish rules and regulations relating to the operation of schools.

Finally, power is seen as: supporting the fundamental order of society and its social organization by Bierstedt;³⁹² dominating and controlling the environment allowing societies to survive by Adams;³⁹³ serving basic needs of the entire society by Merton, Broom, and Cottrell;³⁹⁴ the medium with political primacy which can serve to acquire both human services and the demands for collective action by Parsons;³⁹⁵ contributing to developing a desirable pattern of behavior by Newman;³⁹⁶ capable of affecting the

391 Paul R. Mort and Donald H. Ross, Principles of School Administration: A Synthesis of Basic Concepts, 2nd Ed., New York, McGraw-Hill, 1957, p. 275.

392 Robert M. Bierstedt, Op. Cit., p. 730-736.

393 Richard Newbold Adams, Op. Cit., p. 28.

394 Robert K. Merton, Leonard Broom, and Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., Eds., Sociology Today: Problems and Prospects. New York, Basic Books, under the auspices of the American Sociological Society, 1965, p. 107.

395 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 201.

396 William Herman Newman and E. Kirby Warren, Op. Cit., p. 642.

distribution of resources by having an effect on the setting of objectives and on the operation of the political-economic system by Hicks and Gullett;³⁹⁷ and as a means of attempting to satisfy one's desire for more by these same authors;³⁹⁸ serving to monopolize needed rewards, and discouraging coalitions by Blau.³⁹⁹

F. Elements assigned to the dimension limit
of the phenomenon of power.

Under the dimension limit of the phenomenon of power, common, complementary and contradictory elements are identified.

Common elements: According to Merton,⁴⁰⁰ Scott,⁴⁰¹ and Miles⁴⁰² the capacity of a group or an organization to enforce or influence decisions is constrained by its environment. Newman,⁴⁰³ and Hunter⁴⁰⁴ indicate that power is

³⁹⁷ Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit., p. 251-253.

³⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 241.

³⁹⁹ P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 121.

⁴⁰⁰ Robert King Merton, Op. Cit., p. 378.

⁴⁰¹ William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 207.

⁴⁰² Raymond E. Miles, Theories of Management: Implications for Organizational Behavior and Development, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1975, p. 11.

⁴⁰³ William Herman Newman and E. Kirby Warren, Op. Cit., p. 246.

⁴⁰⁴ Floyd Hunter, Op. Cit., p. 7.

confined and directed by policies and actions permissible by a framework of socially sanctioned authority. Power is controlled by extraneous facts, indeed decisions are subject to challenge Berle,⁴⁰⁵ and Lasswell and Kaplan.⁴⁰⁶ While Scott,⁴⁰⁷ and Russell⁴⁰⁸ contend that power is constrained by public opinion, French and Raven,⁴⁰⁹ and Wolfe⁴¹⁰ state that the magnitude of power changes from one system to another, or from region to region. Finally private economic power or corporate management is constrained by the counter-vailing power of those who are subject to it according to Scott,⁴¹¹ Galbraith,⁴¹² and Leavitt.⁴¹³

Complementary elements: Various authors have presented a variety of views on the limits of power. Berle⁴¹⁴

405 Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 60.

406 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, in Benjamin M. Sachs, Op. Cit., p. 61.

407 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 207.

408 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 127.

409 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 153.

410 Donald M. Wolfe, Op. Cit., p. 100.

411 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 207.

412 John Kenneth Galbraith, Op. Cit., p. 111.

413 Harold J. Leavitt, Op. Cit., p. 127.

414 Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 88.

recognizes that the philosophy of a power system confines the exercise of power, and Gamson⁴¹⁵ states that the means utilized to achieve the collective goals of a power system contain influence. Lane et al.⁴¹⁶ indicate that the conditions of legitimacy restrain the use of power, and Berle⁴¹⁷ contends that conscience and intellectual restraint also restrain power. While Newman⁴¹⁸ stipulates that power is ineffective in generating in others feelings of personal obligation and initiative required for many jobs, Blau and Scott⁴¹⁹ state that a supervisor who resorts to sanctions in relating with his subordinates will create alienation and eventually undermine his authority.

According to Blau⁴²⁰ power that rests on coercion is more limited in scope than power resulting from met needs; this same author⁴²¹ states that the power of a supervisor diminishes if subordinates can turn to coercion, do without

415 William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 180.

416 Willard R. Lane, et al., Op. Cit., p. 202.

417 Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 60.

418 William Herman Newman and E. Kirby Warren, Op. Cit., p. 246.

419 Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Op. Cit., p. 142.

420 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 22.

421 Ibid., p. 22.

benefits he has to offer, or have access to equally viable alternatives. Power based on expertise is fragile and constantly shifting since it rests on the frontier of progress, Crozier.⁴²² When an individual secures the advantages of superior status and makes stringent demands on others he depletes his power according to Blau.⁴²³ While Newman⁴²⁴ claims that an executive's ability to enforce his will is reduced by counter-powers that companies impose on the use of power, Hollander⁴²⁵ declares that social exchange checks the abuse of power. According to Sachs,⁴²⁶ the external power of an administrator is often reduced when authority is viewed as service. Russell⁴²⁷ states that whenever a creed is used as a source of power, it eventually produces weariness and skepticism especially if the great efforts that it may inspire are not very successful. This same author⁴²⁸ contends that love of power, as a motive, is confined by

422 M. Crozier, Op. Cit., p. 165.

423 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 135.

424 William Herman Newman and E. Kirby Warren, Op. Cit., p. 247.

425 Edwin Paul Hollander, Op. Cit., 1978, p. 85.

426 Benjamin M. Sachs, Op. Cit., p. 65.

427 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 155.

428 Ibid., p. 24.

timidity which in turn contains the desire for self-direction. Finally a person's power is confined by the amount of perceived power that a person attributes to himself in relation to another, according to Zander et al.⁴²⁹

Contradictory elements: For Homans,⁴³⁰ Rosen,⁴³¹ and Morphet et al.,⁴³² the power of an individual is extremely limited whereas groups and organizations are organized to be more powerful through collective action and by influencing the magnitude and direction of communications thereby controlling the effectiveness of one person to influence another. On the other hand, Berle⁴³³ claims that no collective category, or class, or group in and of itself can wield or use power.

G. Elements assigned to the dimension cause
of the phenomenon of power.

The elements identified by authors are assigned to the dimension cause of the phenomenon of power according to

⁴²⁹ Alvin Zander, Arthur R. Cohen, and Ezra Stotland, Op. Cit., p. 17.

⁴³⁰ George Caspar Homans, Op. Cit., 1974, p. 109.

⁴³¹ Sidney Rosen, Op. Cit., p. 70.

⁴³² Edgar Morphet, Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller, Op. Cit., p. 190.

⁴³³ Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 63.

the classification utilized for the analysis of these elements. Since no contradictory elements have been identified, only common and complementary elements are reported.

Common elements: A number of authors, Blau,⁴³⁴ Griffiths,⁴³⁵ Sachs,⁴³⁶ and Parsons^{437,438} view the mobilization and enhancement of power as originating with the organization of collective effort as would be seen in processes of leadership. According to Cartwright,⁴³⁹ McClelland,⁴⁴⁰ and Berle⁴⁴¹ a person who builds his resources, personal and material is more likely to become powerful.

Complementary elements: According to Berle,⁴⁴² power is brought into existence by the coalescence of men, a philosophy and a group capable of organization into institutions. While Lane et al.⁴⁴³ regard power as evolving from control

434 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 223.

435 Daniel E. Griffiths, Ed., Op. Cit., 1964, p. 239.

436 Benjamin M. Sachs, Op. Cit., p. 65.

437 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 129.

438 Ibid., p. 211.

439 Dorwin Cartwright, Op. Cit., 1965, p. 7.

440 David C. McClelland, Op. Cit., p. 78.

441 Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 19.

442 Ibid., p. 69.

443 Willard R. Lane, Op. Cit., p. 203.

over rules, Balandier⁴⁴⁴ views power as resulting from the need to fight against entropy that threatens society with disorder. Power on one side of a market situation creates the need for countervailing power to be exercised from the other side, Galbraith.⁴⁴⁵ According to French and Raven,⁴⁴⁶ the stronger the basis of power, the greater is the capacity to exercise power. The granting of authority by united consent, and passing of powers to one man gives rise to the greatest powers according to Hobbes.⁴⁴⁷ Finally, Lasswell and Kaplan⁴⁴⁸ stipulate that identification with others enhances the potential and position of power.

H. Elements assigned to the dimension consequence
of the phenomenon of power.

The elements identified by authors and assigned to the dimension consequence of the phenomenon of power are classified according to their commonality, complementarity and divergence.

444 Georges Balandier, Political Anthropology, translated by A. M. Sheridan Smith, New York, Random House, 1970, p. 36.

445 John Kenneth Galbraith, Op. Cit., p. 113.

446 John R. P. French and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 165.

447 Thomas Hobbes, Op. Cit., p. 56.

448 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 78.

Common elements: Illegitimate, coercive and unfair exercise of power gives rise to disapproval, frustration of needs, anger, aggression, hostility, retaliation, and reduction in power on the part of the power-holder, according to Blau,^{449,450} French and Raven,⁴⁵¹ Bell,⁴⁵² Etzioni,⁴⁵³ Pettigrew,⁴⁵⁴ and Zaleznik.⁴⁵⁵ Whenever two kinds of power are emphasized at the same time or with repeated exchanges between men, there is a tendency for equalization or neutralization of power to occur.^{456,457} Power results in an uncomfortable psychological position of dependence on a power-holder by the person subjected to his power according to Blau,⁴⁵⁸ and Hicks and Gullett.⁴⁵⁹

449 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 22-23.

450 Ibid., p. 135.

451 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 165.

452 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 31.

453 Amitai Etzioni, Op. Cit., p. 15-16.

454 Andrew M. Pettigrew, Op. Cit., 1973, p. 24.

455 Abraham Zaleznik, Op. Cit., p. 53.

456 George Caspar Homans, Op. Cit., 1974, p. 76.

457 Amitai Etzioni, Op. Cit., p. 6-7.

458 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 116.

459 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit., p. 234.

Complementary elements: Different authors have expressed varying views about the consequence of power. These are expressed in the following manner: managerial use of power stifles initiative, enthusiasm and self-expression;⁴⁶⁰ authority is created from acceptance and institutionalization of power;⁴⁶¹ power allows a person to withdraw from an authority figure and to establish his own independence;⁴⁶² the mechanization of power suppresses ambiguities;⁴⁶³ power widens the field of responsibility with a resultant impact on the personality of a man;⁴⁶⁴ whenever new power enters a system it increases the amount of power at the top with an increased possibility of forming further levels;⁴⁶⁵ when mobilized, power changes through the redistribution of old power and formation of new equilibria;⁴⁶⁶ power use results in an expenditure of time and energy which could conceivably be spent on alternative activity thus resulting in loss of

⁴⁶⁰ William Herman Newman and E. Kirby Warren, Op. Cit., p. 248.

⁴⁶¹ Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit., p. 271.

⁴⁶² Benjamin M. Sachs, Op. Cit., p. 77.

⁴⁶³ Ibid., p. 69.

⁴⁶⁴ Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 121.

⁴⁶⁵ Richard Newbold Adams, Op. Cit., p. 81.

⁴⁶⁶ Lanore A. Netzer, et al., Op. Cit., p. 84.

opportunity;⁴⁶⁷ the outcome of power interaction may affect the power-holder's reputation positively or negatively in relation to future interactions;⁴⁶⁸ a person in an administrative position of power has access to certain privileges such as information, control of appraisals, channels of promotion;⁴⁶⁹ business power yields command over wealth;⁴⁷⁰ all sources of power yield influence;⁴⁷¹ power creates the need for more power;⁴⁷² power reduces uncertainty in securing control;⁴⁷³ power visions expressed as a revolt against established authority can stir social movements;⁴⁷⁴ in a relationship, the person with greatest power gets the least from the exchanges;⁴⁷⁵ the enjoyment of power gives ascendancy;⁴⁷⁶ power over opinions tends to result in coalescence,

467 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 31.

468 Ibid.

469 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 207.

470 Ibid., p. 389.

471 Ralph M. Stogdill, Op. Cit., p. 292.

472 Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1956, p. 100.

473 Edward Christie Banfield, Op. Cit., p. 320.

474 David C. McClelland, Op. Cit., p. 170.

475 George Caspar Homans, Op. Cit., 1974, p. 73.

476 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 82.

concentration and eventually a State monopoly;⁴⁷⁷ expert power is self-defeating and disappears with the end results of the rationalization process that is rules, programs, etc.;⁴⁷⁸ highly monopolistic and conservative power makes dynamic supervision very difficult;⁴⁷⁹ and reciprocal power relationships result in an increased systemic complexity and pluralism, whereas power relationships with low reciprocity give rise to systemic simplicity and elitism.⁴⁸⁰

Contradictory elements: Whereas Lippitt,⁴⁸¹ and Sachs⁴⁸² indicate that ambivalence, suspicion and mistrust result from the exercise of administrative power in an organization, Stogdill⁴⁸³ states that powerful members of a group tend to be better liked than members with less power.

I. Elements assigned to the dimension relation of the phenomenon of power.

Common, complementary and contradictory elements are identified by authors and are assigned to the dimension

477 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 143.

478 M. Crozier, Op. Cit., p. 165.

479 Ben M. Harris, Supervisory Behavior in Education, 2nd Ed., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1975, p. 274.

480 Andrew S. McFarland, Op. Cit., p. 22.

481 Gordon L. Lippitt, Op. Cit., p. 51.

482 Benjamin M. Sachs, Op. Cit., p. 67.

483 Ralph M. Stogdill, Op. Cit., p. 282.

relation of the phenomenon of power.

Common elements: Several authors have discussed the relation of power and authority. According to Etzioni,⁴⁸⁴ Homans,⁴⁸⁵ Griffiths,⁴⁸⁶ Blau,⁴⁸⁷ Leavitt,⁴⁸⁸ Skibbins,⁴⁸⁹ Leavitt et al.,⁴⁹⁰ Bell,⁴⁹¹ Adams,⁴⁹² Morphet et al.,⁴⁹³ Hicks and Gullett,⁴⁹⁴ legitimate power is the same as authority. Providing greater precision, Hicks and Gullett,⁴⁹⁵ Homans,⁴⁹⁶ and Lane et al.,⁴⁹⁷ regard power as the ability

484 Amitai Etzioni, Op. Cit., p. 14.

485 George Caspar Homans, Op. Cit., 1974, p. 91-92.

486 Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1956, p. 120.

487 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 200.

488 Harold J. Leavitt, Op. Cit., p. 141.

489 Gerald J. Skibbins, Op. Cit., p. 240.

490 Harold J. Leavitt, William R. Dill, and Henry B. Eyring, The Organizational World, Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1973, p. 43.

491 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 40.

492 Richard Newbold Adams, Op. Cit., p. 36.

493 Edgar Morphet, Roe J. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller, Op. Cit., p. 141.

494 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit., p. 271.

495 Ibid., p. 230.

496 George Caspar Homans, Op. Cit., 1976, p. 276.

497 Willard R. Lane, et al., Op. Cit., p. 201.

to use force, sanctions or rewards while viewing authority as a legitimate right. Finally, Wolfe,⁴⁹⁸ and Kolb⁴⁹⁹ both regard power and authority as similar concepts, both referring to a relationship which deals with the ability of one to influence or persuade another.

In the case of the relation between power and influence, power is seen as coercive while influence is viewed as persuasive.^{500,501}

Leadership and power are regarded as two closely related concepts by McClelland,⁵⁰² and French and Raven.⁵⁰³

Complementary elements: The following elements have been identified as authors have related power to other phenomena: authority derived from status settles the terms on which power will be exchanged with influence;⁵⁰⁴ authority and influence are related concepts, they are elements of

498 Donald M. Wolfe, Op. Cit., p. 101.

499 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 36.

500 Robert M. Bierstedt, Op. Cit., p. 731.

501 Don Martindale, Institutions, Organizations, and Mass Society, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1966, p. 292.

502 David C. McClelland, Op. Cit., p. 254.

503 John R. P. French, Jr. and Richard Snyder, "Leadership and Interpersonal Power", in Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., p. 118.

504 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 373.

power;⁵⁰⁵ power is seen as the capacity to exert influence;⁵⁰⁶ while power is the potential for influence supported by the means to coerce compliance, influence includes about any interpersonal transaction with behavioral or psychological effects and control includes successful influence attempts;⁵⁰⁷ the phenomena of power and influence involve a dynamic relationship between two agents;⁵⁰⁸ in a general sense, power, influence and control can be conceived as the capacity for one person to do something affecting another with a resulting change in probable pattern of future events;⁵⁰⁹ power involves control and resistance to it;⁵¹⁰ and while it is viewed as capacity to influence behavior, authority is seen as legitimized power.⁵¹¹

Contradictory elements: On one hand, Litterer⁵¹² describes power as resting on legitimate authority, while

505 Floyd Hunter, Op. Cit., p. 164.

506 Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, Op. Cit., p. 220.

507 Ibid.

508 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 150.

509 Nelson W. Polsby, Op. Cit., p. 3.

510 Edwin Paul Hollander, Op. Cit., 1978, p. 84.

511 Gordon L. Lippitt, Op. Cit., p. 51.

512 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 413.

on the other hand Hicks and Gullett⁵¹³ argue that power is frequently recognized as the basis of authority. While Adams⁵¹⁴ indicates that the exercise of control and power are often interchanged, within a system, Berle⁵¹⁵ distinguishes between these two phenomena by stating that the power to cause an event has little relation to the capacity to control feelings and opinions of men. According to Lasswell and Kaplan⁵¹⁶ power can be exchanged for influence, while according to Parsons⁵¹⁷ power must be distinguished from influence.

2. Interdimensional analysis of the phenomenon of power.

In this section interdimensional elements of the phenomenon of power are identified. These interdimensional elements are those which have been assigned to one dimension of this phenomenon and which are also assigned to another dimension of this same phenomenon.

513 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit., p. 231.

514 Richard Newbold Adams, Op. Cit., p. 26.

515 Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 67.

516 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 84.

517 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 46.

For purposes of this study, only common elements within each dimension of the phenomenon of power are utilized for the interdimensional analysis.

A. Interdimensional elements assigned to definitions and bases of the phenomenon of power.

In this subsection, interdimensional elements which have been assigned to definitions of the phenomenon of power and which have equally been assigned to bases of this phenomenon are reported.

Interdimensional elements: An interaction or relationship between people is regarded as a definition of power by Stogdill,⁵¹⁸ Cartwright,^{519,520} Lutz and Iannacone,⁵²¹ McClelland,⁵²² Bell,⁵²³ French and Raven,⁵²⁴ Presthus,⁵²⁵

518 Ralph M. Stogdill, Op. Cit., p. 292.

519 Dorwin Cartwright, "A Field Theoretical Conception of Power", in Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., 1959, p. 196.

520 Ibid., p. 218.

521 Frank W. Lutz and Laurence Iannacone, Op. Cit., p. 11.

522 David C. McClelland, Op. Cit., p. 255.

523 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 21.

524 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 153.

525 Robert Presthus, Op. Cit., p. 5.

Hunter,⁵²⁶ Dahl,⁵²⁷ Emerson,⁵²⁸ and Adams.⁵²⁹ It is also regarded as a basis of power by French and Raven,⁵³⁰ Wolfe,⁵³¹ and Emerson.⁵³²

While Lasswell and Kaplan,⁵³³ Litterer,⁵³⁴ and Dahl⁵³⁵ stipulate that the exercise of coercion is a definition of the phenomenon of power, French and Raven,⁵³⁶ Litterer,⁵³⁷ Scott,⁵³⁸ Lippitt,⁵³⁹ Wolfe,⁵⁴⁰ Zaltman et al.,⁵⁴¹

526 Floyd Hunter, Op. Cit., p. 6.

527 Robert A. Dahl, Op. Cit., 1968, p. 407.

528 Richard M. Emerson, Op. Cit., p. 31-41.

529 Richard Newbold Adams, Op. Cit., p. 27.

530 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 153.

531 Donald M. Wolfe, Op. Cit., p. 100.

532 Richard M. Emerson, Op. Cit., 1967, p. 107.

533 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 98.

534 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 413.

535 Robert A. Dahl, Op. Cit., 1976, p. 47.

536 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 155-156.

537 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 428-429.

538 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 205-206.

539 Gordon L. Lippitt, Op. Cit., p. 44.

540 Donald M. Wolfe, Op. Cit., p. 101.

541 Gerald Zaltman, David H. Florio, and Linda Sikorski, Op. Cit., p. 73.

Blau,^{542,543} Dahl,⁵⁴⁴ Weber,⁵⁴⁵ Kolb,⁵⁴⁶ and Russell⁵⁴⁷ identify this element as part of the bases of this phenomenon.

B. Interdimensional elements assigned to definitions and purposes of the phenomenon of power.

Interdimensional elements, that is those assigned to definitions of the phenomenon of power and equally assigned to purposes of the same phenomenon are identified in this subsection.

Interdimensional elements: While Hollander,⁵⁴⁸ d'Antonio and Ehrlich,⁵⁴⁹ Blau,⁵⁵⁰ Scott,⁵⁵¹ Homans,⁵⁵²

542 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 22.

543 Ibid., p. 116.

544 Robert A. Dahl, Op. Cit., 1976, p. 48-49.

545 Max Weber, referred to in Stephen Knezevich, Op. Cit., p. 45.

546 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 54-56.

547 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 36.

548 Edwin Paul Hollander, Op. Cit., 1978, p. 84.

549 William V. d'Antonio and Howard J. Ehrlich, Eds., Op. Cit., p. 132.

550 P. M. Blau, Exchange and Power in Social Life, in Ralph M. Stogdill, Op. Cit., p. 276.

551 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 420.

552 George Caspar Homans, Op. Cit., 1976, p. 276.

Adams,^{553,554} and Cohen⁵⁵⁵ view the control of others, events and decision-making as a definition of the phenomenon of power, Griffiths,^{556,557} identifies this element as part of purpose.

Securement of individual and collective goals is assigned to definitions by Wilson,⁵⁵⁸ Parsons,⁵⁵⁹ Lucio and McNeil,⁵⁶⁰ Kimbrough,⁵⁶¹ Deutsch,⁵⁶² and Russell⁵⁶³ while it is assigned to purposes by Wilson,⁵⁶⁴ Gregg,⁵⁶⁵ and Pettigrew.⁵⁶⁶

553 Richard Newbold Adams, Op. Cit., p. 121.

554 Ibid., p. 12.

555 Arthur R. Cohen, Op. Cit., p. 36.

556 Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1956, p. 95.

557 Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1959, p. 86.

558 Robert F. Wilson, Op. Cit., p. 90.

559 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 361.

560 William H. Lucio and John D. McNeil, Op. Cit.,
p. 82.

561 Ralph B. Kimbrough, Op. Cit., p. 7.

562 Karl Deutsch, Op. Cit., 1966, p. 248.

563 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 35.

564 Robert F. Wilson, Op. Cit., p. 54.

565 Russell T. Gregg, Op. Cit., 1957, p. 302.

566 Andrew M. Pettigrew, Op. Cit., 1973, p. 265.

C. Interdimensional elements assigned to definitions and functions of the phenomenon of power.

Interdimensional elements, that is those assigned to definitions of the phenomenon of power and equally assigned to functions of the same phenomenon are identified in this subsection.

Interdimensional elements: While the control of others is perceived as an element assigned to a definition of the phenomenon of power by Hollander,⁵⁶⁷ d'Antonio and Ehrlich,⁵⁶⁸ Blau,⁵⁶⁹ Scott,⁵⁷⁰ Homans,⁵⁷¹ Adams,⁵⁷² and Cohen,⁵⁷³ it is seen as an element assigned to a function of this phenomenon by Griffiths,⁵⁷⁴ Scott,⁵⁷⁵ Netzer et al.,⁵⁷⁶

567 Edwin Paul Hollander, Op. Cit., 1978, p. 84.

568 William d'Antonio and Howard J. Ehrlich, Eds., Op. Cit., p. 132.

569 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 276.

570 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 420.

571 George Caspar Homans, Op. Cit., 1976, p. 276.

572 Richard Newbold Adams, Op. Cit., p. 121.

573 Arthur R. Cohen, Op. Cit., p. 36.

574 Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1959, p. 86.

575 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 389.

576 Lanore A. Netzer, et al., Op. Cit., p. 84.

Blau and Scott,⁵⁷⁷ Kolb,⁵⁷⁸ and Galbraith.⁵⁷⁹

Power as securing achievement of goals is seen by Wilson,⁵⁸⁰ Parsons,⁵⁸¹ Lucio and McNeil,⁵⁸² Kimbrough,⁵⁸³ Deutsch,⁵⁸⁴ and Russell⁵⁸⁵ as assigned to definitions of the phenomenon of power, while it is viewed as assigned to functions by Newman and Warren,⁵⁸⁶ and Blau.⁵⁸⁷

D. Interdimensional elements assigned to bases and conditions of the phenomenon of power.

In this subsection, interdimensional elements are presented which having been assigned to bases of the phenomenon

577 Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Op. Cit., p. 142.

578 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 36-37.

579 John Kenneth Galbraith, Op. Cit., p. 25.

580 Robert F. Wilson, Op. Cit., p. 90.

581 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 361.

582 William H. Lucio and John D. McNeil, Op. Cit., p. 82.

583 Ralph B. Kimbrough, Op. Cit., p. 7.

584 Karl Deutsch, Op. Cit., 1966, p. 248.

585 Bertrans Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 35.

586 William Herman Newman and E. Kirby Warren, Op. Cit., p. 245.

587 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 135.

of power are also assigned to conditions of this phenomenon.

Interdimensional elements: While mentioned by Kolb,⁵⁸⁸ and Dahl⁵⁸⁹ as an element assigned to a basis of the phenomenon of power, possession of resources is regarded by Litterer,⁵⁹⁰ Kolb,⁵⁹¹ Blau,⁵⁹² Newcomb et al.,⁵⁹³ and Lane et al.⁵⁹⁴ as assigned to conditions of this phenomenon.

Control over resources has been assigned to bases of the phenomenon of power by Adams,⁵⁹⁵ King,⁵⁹⁶ Lasswell and Kaplan,⁵⁹⁷ Newcomb et al.,⁵⁹⁸ Charters et al.,⁵⁹⁹ Bell,⁶⁰⁰

588 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 32.

589 Robert A. Dahl, Op. Cit., 1957, p. 203.

590 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 71.

591 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 49.

592 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 22.

593 T. M. Newcomb, R. H. Turner, and P. E. Converse, Op. Cit., p. 330.

594 Willard R. Lane, et al., Op. Cit., p. 202.

595 Richard Newbold Adams, Op. Cit., p. 19.

596 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 67-71.

597 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 76.

598 T. M. Newcomb, R. H. Turner and P. E. Converse, Op. Cit., p. 330-331.

599 W. W. Charters, et al., Op. Cit., p. 114.

600 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 26.

and Berle,⁶⁰¹ while Lucio and McNeil,⁶⁰² Bell,⁶⁰³ and Mechanic⁶⁰⁴ have assigned this element to the dimension condition of this phenomenon.

Legitimacy is recognized as a basis of power by Pettigrew,⁶⁰⁵ Parsons,^{606,607} McClelland,⁶⁰⁸ Scott,⁶⁰⁹ and French and Raven,⁶¹⁰ it is also seen as a condition of the phenomenon of power by French and Raven,⁶¹¹ Litterer,⁶¹² Scott,⁶¹³ and Cartwright.⁶¹⁴ While Kolb,⁶¹⁵

601 Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 223.

602 William H. Lucio and John D. McNeil, Op. Cit., p. 82.

603 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 26.

604 D. Mechanic, Op. Cit., p. 352-355.

605 Andrew M. Pettigrew, Op. Cit., 1973, p. 231.

606 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 12.

607 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 190.

608 David C. McClelland, Op. Cit., p. 29.

609 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 29.

610 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 165.

611 Ibid., p. 155-156.

612 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 428-429.

613 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 205-206.

614 Dorwin Cartwright, "Power: A Neglected Variable in Social Psychology", in Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., p. 5-7.

615 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 39-49.

Mechanic,⁶¹⁶ Berle,⁶¹⁷ Zaleznik,⁶¹⁸ and Wilson⁶¹⁹ regard dependence on institutions as a basis of power, it is identified by Presthus,⁶²⁰ and Hunter⁶²¹ as a condition of power.

A system of morals and beliefs is viewed as one of the bases of the phenomenon of power by Griffiths,⁶²² Russell,⁶²³ Berle,⁶²⁴ and Litterer⁶²⁵ while being regarded as a condition of this same phenomenon by Berle,⁶²⁶ McCarty and Ramsey,⁶²⁷ and Lasswell and Kaplan.⁶²⁸

616 D. Mechanic, Op. Cit., p. 356-361.

617 Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 37.

618 Abraham Zaleznik, Op. Cit., p. 48.

619 L. Craig Wilson, Op. Cit., p. 178.

620 Robert Presthus, Op. Cit., p. 5.

621 Floyd Hunter, Op. Cit.; p. 6.

622 Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1956, p. 98.

623 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 145.

624 Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 29.

625 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 70.

626 Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 31.

627 Donald J. McCarty and Charles E. Ramsey, Op. Cit.,
p. 56.

628 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit.,
p. 77.

E. Interdimensional elements assigned to
bases and relation of the
phenomenon of power.

Under this heading, interdimensional elements are presented which having been assigned to bases of the phenomenon of power are also assigned to relations of this phenomenon.

According to Kolb,⁶²⁹ Wilson,⁶³⁰ Hobbes,⁶³¹ Russell,⁶³² and Reedy,⁶³³ capacity for persuasion is an element of definitions of the phenomenon of power while Wolfe,⁶³⁴ and Kolb⁶³⁵ assign this element to relation as they relate power and authority as similar concepts.

Coercion is regarded as a basis of the phenomenon of power by French and Raven,⁶³⁶ Litterer,⁶³⁷ Scott,⁶³⁸

629 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 54-56.

630 L. Craig Wilson, Op. Cit., p. 337.

631 Thomas Hobbes, Op. Cit., p. 57.

632 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 141.

633 George Reedy, Op. Cit., p. 153.

634 Donald M. Wolfe, Op. Cit., p. 101.

635 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 36.

636 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 155-156.

637 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 428-429.

638 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 205-206.

Lippitt,⁶³⁹ Wolfe,⁶⁴⁰ Zaltman et al.,⁶⁴¹ Blau,^{642,643} Dahl,⁶⁴⁴ Weber,⁶⁴⁵ Kolb,⁶⁴⁶ and Russell⁶⁴⁷ while it is identified as part of the relation dimension of this phenomenon by Bierstedt,⁶⁴⁸ and Martindale⁶⁴⁹ as they relate power and influence, and by Hicks and Gullett,⁶⁵⁰ Homans,⁶⁵¹ and Lane et al.⁶⁵² as they relate power and authority.

639 Gordon L. Lippitt, Op. Cit., p. 44.

640 Donald M. Wolfe, Op. Cit., p. 101.

641 Gerald Zaltman, David H. Florio, and Linda Sikorski, Op. Cit., p. 73.

642 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 22.

643 Ibid., p. 116.

644 Robert A. Dahl, Op. Cit., 1976, p. 48-49.

645 Max Weber, referred to in Stephen Knezevich, Op. Cit., p. 45.

646 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 54-56.

647 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 36.

648 Robert M. Bierstedt, Op. Cit., p. 731.

649 Don Martindale, Op. Cit., p. 292.

650 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit., p. 230.

651 George Caspar Homans, Op. Cit., 1976, p. 276.

652 Willard R. Lane, et al., Op. Cit., p. 201.

F. Interdimensional elements assigned to conditions and causes of the phenomenon of power.

In this subsection, elements which have been identified as conditions of the phenomenon of power and which have also been assigned to causes of this phenomenon are reported.

While Parsons,⁶⁵³ Hicks and Gullett,⁶⁵⁴ Berle,⁶⁵⁵ Lazarus and Warren,⁶⁵⁶ Kimbrough,^{657,658} Russell,^{659,660} Griffiths,⁶⁶¹ and Rosen⁶⁶² regard unifying of staff and organization of collective efforts as a condition essential to the exercise of effective power, Blau⁶⁶³ Griffiths,⁶⁶⁴

653 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 205.

654 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit., p. 270.

655 Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 63.

656 Harold Lazarus and E. Kirby Warren, Op. Cit., p. 126.

657 Ralph B. Kimbrough, Op. Cit., p. 196.

658 Ibid., p. 215.

659 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 28.

660 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1949, p. 101.

661 Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1964, p. 236.

662 Sidney Rosen, Op. Cit., p. 70.

663 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 223.

664 Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1964, p. 239.

Sachs,⁶⁶⁵ Parsons⁶⁶⁶ view this element as part of causes.

G. Interdimensional elements assigned to
purposes and functions of the
phenomenon of power.

Interdimensional elements, that is, those assigned to the dimension purpose of the phenomenon of power and equally assigned to the dimension function of this phenomenon are identified under this heading.

Interdimensional elements: Control of people's behavior is assigned to purposes of the phenomenon of power by Griffiths,^{667,668} while being assigned to functions of this phenomenon by Galbraith,⁶⁶⁹ Kolb,⁶⁷⁰ Blau and Scott,⁶⁷¹ Netzer et al.,⁶⁷² Scott,⁶⁷³ Griffiths.^{674,675} While

⁶⁶⁵ Benjamin M. Sachs, Op. Cit., p. 65.

⁶⁶⁶ Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 129.

⁶⁶⁷ Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1959, p. 86.

⁶⁶⁸ Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1956, p. 95.

⁶⁶⁹ John Kenneth Galbraith, Op. Cit., p. 25.

⁶⁷⁰ Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 36-37.

⁶⁷¹ Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Op. Cit., p. 142.

⁶⁷² Lanore A. Netzer, et al., Op. Cit., p. 84.

⁶⁷³ William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 389.

⁶⁷⁴ Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1956, p. 95.

⁶⁷⁵ Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1959, p. 86.

Wilson,⁶⁷⁶ Gregg,⁶⁷⁷ and Pettigrew⁶⁷⁸ regard pursuit of goals as purposes of the phenomenon of power, Newman,⁶⁷⁹ and Blau⁶⁸⁰ regard this element as part of functions of this phenomenon.

In the first two sections of this chapter, intradimensional and interdimensional analyses have been presented whereby elements identified by authors studied have been classified within each dimension of the phenomenon of power according to their commonality, complementarity, and divergence. In addition, elements common to more than one dimension have also been identified.

3. Presentation of findings resulting from the intradimensional and interdimensional analyses of the phenomenon of power.

Findings from the intradimensional and interdimensional analyses of the phenomenon of power are presented in this section in a ranked order according to their degree of adherence to each dimension. The findings of these analyses

⁶⁷⁶ Robert F. Wilson, Op. Cit., p. 34.

⁶⁷⁷ Russell T. Gregg, Op. Cit., 1957, p. 302.

⁶⁷⁸ Andrew M. Pettigrew, Op. Cit., 1973, p. 265.

⁶⁷⁹ William Herman Newman and E. Kirby Warren, Op. Cit., p. 245.

⁶⁸⁰ P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 135.

will therefore be presented according to the following ranked categories: elements assigned to a dimension of the phenomenon of power which are mentioned by more than one author and previously identified as common elements will comprise the first category; elements assigned to a dimension of the phenomenon of power and mentioned by only one author and previously identified as complementary elements will be part of the second category; the third category will list contradictory elements or those assigned to a dimension of the phenomenon of power and which gave rise to divergent views from authors; finally, the fourth category will contain the elements assigned to at least two dimensions of the phenomenon of power and previously reported as interdimensional elements.

A. Constituent elements of the essential definition of the phenomenon of power.

First category or common elements: The following elements constitute essential definitions of the phenomenon of power and are mentioned by more than one author: the potential for influence; the ability to control others and events, more specifically, the ability to control the reward and punishment system, the control of rewards, the control of processes that are part of the meaningful environment of a person, and the potential to permit or to withhold gratification of a need; the capacity of the power-holder to make

decisions; participation in the decisions affecting another; an influence relationship between people; a capacity within a relationship of imposing one's own will even against resistance; social causation, that is the capacity of a person to change the behavior of another; the ability to secure the achievement of goals; the potential ability to use force; a capacity for action; the exercise of coerciveness; a part of human action; and influencing others to behave in terms of one's own goals and interests.

Second category or complementary elements: The following elements constitute essential definitions of the phenomenon of power and are mentioned by only one author: a functional-relational system which is controlled by institutional patterns, collectivities and roles; an interinfluence between authorities and potential partisans; a declared intent to shift an individual's value position either in the direction of more or less enjoyment depending on the use of promise or threat; a present means which serves to obtain some future apparent good; a force that makes organizations operate; the basis of responsible action; a latent force; as authority; influence over thought; the ability of a person or group to impose its will on others in a recurrent manner; and the cement which holds a society.

Third category or contradictory elements: Various authors have expressed divergent opinions regarding the

following elements which constitute essential definitions of the phenomenon of power: the relative ability of people to influence each other, that is the dependence or interdependence of one person on another; and the provision of sanctions or rewards.

Fourth category or interdimensional elements: The following elements constituting essential definitions of the phenomenon of power are part of at least another dimension of this same phenomenon; an interaction or relationship between people; the exercise of coercion; the control of others, events and decision-making; and securement of individual and collective goals.

B. Constituent elements of the bases
of the phenomenon of power.

First category or common elements: The following elements constitute bases of the phenomenon of power and are mentioned by more than one author: the possession of resources; the resources that a person can use in order to affect others such as wealth, prestige and reputation, knowledge, competence, skill and expertise, physical strength, physical force, personality, popularity, charisma, intellectual ability, legal authority, effort and interest, personal ambition, leadership ability, access to mass media, family ties, leadership in informal groups, friendship ties,

knowledge of the political system, and ownership; control over resources generally and more specifically control over jobs, credit, votes, income, terms of relationship, information, and economic power such as production and delivery of goods and services; coercion; rewards; legitimacy; an official position or office; institutions or organizations; beliefs and a system of morals; a system of ideas or philosophy; persuasion; the relationship between two individuals; the needs or values of the person to whom a power act is being directed; and violent force.

Second category or complementary elements: The following elements constitute the bases of the phenomenon of power and are mentioned by only one author: coalescence of three elements that is men, a philosophy, and a group capable or organization into institutions; a system of inequalities that permits influence of lower class by coalitions; provision of service; distribution of resources; a leader's association with various collective systems of power, on subsystems, and on his ability to manipulate the larger system; control of the decision-making process; availability of controls over power or accountability; the interaction among 1) the possession or control of resources, 2) the target's needs or values, 3) credibility, and 4) good will and responsiveness; political symbols; implied terms of statutes, rules and regulations; creed; plurality in kinds of power;

anonymity; fear; tradition; interaction between creeds and other sources of power; substitution of a new creed for an old one; political alliance; sensitivity to the needs of others; numbers; manipulation of symbolic rewards; and success.

Third category or contradictory elements: Elements have not been identified as part of bases of the phenomenon of power which would express contradictory views by authors.

Fourth category or interdimensional elements: The following elements constituting bases of the phenomenon of power are part of at least another dimension of this same phenomenon: an interaction or relationship between people; the exercise of coercion; possession of resources; control over resources; legitimacy; dependence on institutions; a system of morals and beliefs; and capacity for persuasion.

C. Constituent elements of conditions
of the phenomenon of power.

First category or common elements: The following elements constitute conditions of the phenomenon of power and are mentioned by more than one author: the possession of one or more resources; control of some resources or access to resources which could serve as sanction or means to ends being sought; person's needs that could be satisfied by resources that the influencing agent has to offer; the marginal value the person attaches to the resources being

utilized by the power-wielder; resources must be low in relation to demand; the perception of those being influenced of the number of rewards that an influencing agent can mobilize; the perception by those influenced of the ability of the influencing agent to mediate punishment; a person's perception that the influencing agent has a legitimate right to prescribe behavior for him thereby sanctioning the authority of the position; integration of the system including unifying of staff, and binding of units, individual and collective; the ability of individuals to command the loyalty of those that they wish to influence; a realistic appraisal by the power-holder of his power relative to that of others; a more or less accepted system of ideas and morals; the number of available alternatives; the degree of threat and fear experienced by an individual; a structured institutional framework; and the effective use of resources that is on the degree of congruence with goals, cultural norms, etc.

Second category or complementary elements: The following elements constitute the conditions of the phenomenon of power and are mentioned by only one author: the command over and rendering of services others need by the influencing agent establishes their dependence on and obligation to him; the distribution of resources, within power structures, by means of which compliance can be enforced; coming through with promised reward by the power-holder; the need for a wide

range of implied powers; the maintenance of a threat capability; the perception by the subordinated individuals of the legitimacy of the power-holder's acts; a belief in the sanctity of traditions by which the power-holder exercises power; a belief in the legalities of the laws, decrees and directives promulgated by the power-holder; an apparent conformity by the influencing agent to the political formula; the relationship of good will that prevails between the power-holder and the target; a deep feeling of creed or sentiment by the majority of the population; some demand for reward; a generalized capacity to secure compliance along with use of symbolic means; a cultural recognition by others of an actor's control of the environment; the existence of a time lag between the actions of the person exerting power and the responses of the respondent; the existence of some connection between the actor and the respondent; the making of decisions by a person which affect the course of action of an enterprise to a greater extent than do decisions of others and which influence other decisions; the right of expulsion and its related financial hardship; communication about the relevant rewards and punishments and about the specific behavior upon which they depend; the perception and understanding of the power communication; the size of the unit governed by the power-holder; an individual's perception that the influencing agent has some special knowledge or expertise; and the power-holder

remaining indifferent to the benefits that others can offer him in exchange for his benefits.

Third category or contradictory elements: no element has been identified which constitutes one of the conditions of the phenomenon of power which gave rise to divergent views among authors.

Fourth category or interdimensional elements: The following elements constituting conditions of the phenomenon of power are part of at least another dimension of this phenomenon: the possession of resources; control over resources; legitimacy; dependence on institutions; a system of morals and beliefs; and unifying of staff and organization of collective efforts.

D. Constituent elements of purposes
of the phenomenon of power.

First category or common elements: The following elements constitute purposes of the phenomenon of power and are mentioned by more than one author: to keep individuals and organizations moving toward their respective goals; and to control people and the decision-making process.

Second category or complementary elements: The following elements constitute the purposes of the phenomenon of power and are mentioned by only one author: to coordinate human activity which is important for effective organizations;

to enforce laws and decisions; to seek to acquire authority; to obtain and secure the objects of one's desires; to perpetuate interests already vested in an organization; to feel powerful; and to aspire to the ideal of conformity.

Third category or contradictory elements: No element has been identified which constitutes one of the purposes of the phenomenon of power which gave rise to divergent views among authors.

Fourth category or interdimensional elements: The following elements constituting purposes of the phenomenon of power are part of at least another dimension of this phenomenon: the control of others, events, and decision-making; securement of individual and collective goals; control of people's behavior; and pursuit of goals.

E. Constituent elements of functions
of the phenomenon of power.

First category or common elements: The following elements constitute functions of the phenomenon of power and are mentioned by more than one author: control of the behavior of others by an individual or by an organization; stabilization of the organization in the face of a changing environment; the coordination of activities in the pursuit of a purposeful course of action; the capacity to provide services to others; and the capacity to mobilize resources and

capacities, it can be seen as the energy of an organization.

Second category or complementary elements: The following elements constitute the functions of the phenomenon of power and are mentioned by only one author: essential to the inauguration, guaranteed continuance and order of an association; to allow growth, progress and experimentation in an organization by providing a frontier where imaginative and dynamic administration can occur; to determine to whose demand the organization will yield; to serve as a vital determinant of the nature and quality of the interaction of persons; to influence the kind of adjustment people reach in an organization, and the outcomes and efficiency of such an organization; organization and recognition of the field of responsibility; to secure institutional action; to provide the bargaining strength of an organization; to determine the criteria to be used in measuring organizational effectiveness and the means for evaluating such criteria; to provide legitimate rights to make and implement decisions which are collectively binding; to shape the process in building a school system; to change the way that people perceive education and to supply them with information and opinion which is in keeping with national policy; to allow the operation of schools by levying taxes, determining scope of programs, determining curriculum, and to establish rules and regulations; to support the fundamental order of society and its

social organizations; to dominate and control the environment allowing societies to survive; to serve basic needs of the entire society; to serve as the medium with political primacy which can serve to acquire both human services and the demands for collective action; to contribute to the development of a desirable pattern of behavior; to affect the distribution of resources by having an effect on the setting of objectives and on the operation of the political-economic system; to satisfy one's desire for more; and to monopolize needed rewards and to discourage coalitions.

Third category or contradictory elements: No element has been identified which constitutes one of the functions of the phenomenon of power which gave rise to divergent views among authors.

Fourth category or interdimensional elements: The following elements constituting functions of the phenomenon of power are part of at least another dimension of this same phenomenon: the control of others; securement of goal achievement; and the control of people's behavior.

F. Constituent elements of limits
of the phenomenon of power.

First category or common elements: The following elements constitute limits of the phenomenon of power and are mentioned by more than one author: the capacity of a

group to enforce or influence decisions is constrained by its environment; power is confined and directed by policies and actions permissible by a framework of socially sanctioned authority; power is controlled by extraneous facts, indeed decisions are subject to challenge; power is constrained by public opinion; the magnitude of power changes from one system to another, or from region to region; and private economic power or corporate management is constrained by the countervailing power of those who are subject to it.

Second category or complementary elements: The following elements constitute the limits of the phenomenon of power and are mentioned by only one author: the philosophy of a power system confines the exercise of power; the means utilized to achieve the collective goals of a power system contain influence; the conditions of legitimacy restrain the use of power; conscience and intellectual restraint contain power; power is ineffective in generating in others feelings of personal obligation and initiative required for many jobs; a supervisor who resorts to sanctions in relating with his subordinates will create alienation and eventually undermine his authority; power resting on coercion is more limited in scope than power resting on unmet needs; the power of a supervisor diminishes if subordinates can turn to coercion, do without benefits he has to offer, or have access to equally viable alternatives; power based on expertise is fragile and

constantly shifting since it rests on the frontier of progress; power is depleted when an individual secures the advantages of superior status and makes stringent demands on others; an executive's ability to enforce his will is reduced by counter powers that companies impose on the use of power; social change checks the abuse of power; the external power of an administration is often reduced when authority is viewed as service; whenever a creed is used as a source of power, it eventually produces weariness and skepticism especially if the great efforts that it may inspire are not very successful; love of power, as a motive, is confined by timidity which in turn contains the desire for self-direction; and a person's power is confined by the amount of perceived power that a person attributes to himself in relation to another.

Third category or contradictory elements: Various authors have expressed divergent opinions regarding the following element which constitutes a limit of the phenomenon of power: the relative power of an individual and of a collectivity.

Fourth category or interdimensional elements: No element has been identified which constitutes one of the limits of the phenomenon of power while also being part of at least another dimension of this phenomenon.

G. Constituent elements of causes
of the phenomenon of power.

First category or common elements: The following elements constitute the causes of the phenomenon of power and are mentioned by more than one author: the mobilization and enhancement of power ~~as~~ originating with the organization of collective effort; the building of a person's resources, personal and material, is likely to generate power.

Second category or complementary elements: The following elements constitute the causes of the phenomenon of power and are mentioned by only one author: power is brought into existence by the coalescence of men, a philosophy and a group capable of organization into institutions; power evolves from control over rules; power results from the need to fight against entropy that threatens society with disorder; power on one side of a market situation creates the need for countervailing power to be exercised from the other side; a strong basis of power provides a stronger capacity to exercise power; the granting of authority by united consent and passing of powers to one man gives rise to the greatest powers; and identification with others enhances the potential and the position of power.

Third category or contradictory elements: No element has been identified which constitutes one of the causes of the phenomenon of power which gave rise to divergent views

among authors.

Fourth category or interdimensional elements: The following element constituting one of the causes of the phenomenon of power is part of at least another dimension of this phenomenon: unification of staff and organization of collective efforts.

H. Constituent elements of consequences
of the phenomenon of power.

First category or common elements: The following elements constitute the consequences of the phenomenon of power and are mentioned by more than one author: illegitimate, coercive and unfair exercise of power gives rise to disapproval, frustration of needs, anger, aggression, hostility, retaliation, and reduction in power on the part of the power-holder; whenever two kinds of power are emphasized at the same time or with repeated exchanges between men, there is a tendency for equalization or neutralization of power to occur; and power results in an uncomfortable psychological position of dependence on a power-holder by the person subjected to his power.

Second category or complementary elements: The following elements constituting consequences of the phenomenon of power are mentioned by only one author: the managerial use of power stifles initiative, enthusiasm and self-expression; authority is created from acceptance and

institutionalization of power; power allows a person to withdraw from one authority figure and to establish his own independence; the mechanization of power suppresses ambiguities; power widens the field of responsibility with a resultant impact on the personality of a man; whenever new power enters a system it increases the amount of power at the top with an increased possibility of forming further levels; when mobilized, power changes through the redistribution of old power and formation of new equilibria; power use results in an expenditure of time and energy which could conceivably be spent on alternative activity thus resulting in loss of opportunity; the outcome of power interaction may affect the power-holder's reputation positively or negatively in relation to future interactions; a person in an administrative position of power has access to certain privileges, such as information, control of appraisals, channels of promotion; business power yields command over wealth; power creates the need for more power; power reduces uncertainty in securing control; power visions expressed as a revolt against established authority can stir social movements; in a relationship, the person with greatest power gets the least from the exchanges; enjoyment of power gives ascendancy; power over opinions tends to result in coalescence, concentration, and eventually in a State monopoly; expert power is self-defeating and disappears with the end results of the rationalization

process that is rules, programs, etc.; highly monopolistic and conservative power makes dynamic supervision very difficult; and reciprocal power relationships result in increased systemic complexity and pluralism, whereas power relationships with low reciprocity give rise to systemic simplicity and elitism.

Third category or contradictory elements: Various authors have expressed divergent opinions regarding the following element which constitutes a consequence of the phenomenon of power: the exercise of power results in ambivalence, suspicion and mistrust or alternatively in increased liking of the powerful members by those members with less power.

Fourth category or interdimensional elements: No element has been identified which constitutes a consequence of the phenomenon of power while at the same time being part of another dimension of this phenomenon.

I. Constituent elements of relations of the phenomenon of power.

First category or common elements: The following elements constitute the relations of the phenomenon of power which are mentioned by more than one author: legitimate power is the same as authority; power is the ability to use force, sanctions or rewards while authority is a legitimate right; both power and authority refer to a relationship

which deals with the ability of one to influence or persuade another; power is coercive while influence is persuasive; and leadership and power are regarded as two closely related concepts.

Second category or complementary elements: The following elements constituting relations of the phenomenon of power are mentioned by only one author: authority derived from status settles the terms on which power will be exchanged with influence, they are elements of power; power is the capacity to exert influence; while power is the potential for influence supported by the means to coerce compliance, influence includes about any interpersonal transaction with behavioral or psychological effect and control includes successful influence attempts; the phenomena of power and influence involve a dyadic relationship between two agents; in a general sense, power, influence and control can be conceived as the capacity for one person to do something affecting another with a resulting change in probable pattern of future events; power involves control and resistance to it; and while power is viewed as capacity to influence behavior, authority is seen as legitimized power.

Third category or contradictory elements: Various authors have expressed divergent opinions on the following elements of limits of power: power as resting on authority or alternatively as a basis of authority; the interchangeability or noninterchangeability of the exercise of controls and of power; and the exchangeability or

distinctiveness of power and influence.

Fourth category or interdimensional elements: The following elements constituting relations of the phenomenon of power are part of at least another dimension of this same phenomenon: a capacity for persuasion; and coercion.

4. Interpretation of findings.

For each of the nine dimensions of the phenomenon of power, elements have been identified where there was agreement on the part of authors studied. Although the number of such elements varied from one dimension to the other, all dimensions had a number of common elements. The same findings apply to the complementary elements with the only difference being in the larger number of complementary elements identified by authors under each dimension.

Few authors presented divergent views. Contradictory elements were identified in four of the nine dimensions and under each of the four dimensions where contradictory elements were identified, their number varied from one to three. All dimensions with the exception of two contain elements which are also part of at least another dimension.

This chapter contained an intraphenomenal intradimensional, and an intraphenomenal interdimensional analysis of the phenomenon of power. The following chapter consists of an interphenomenal analysis of the phenomena of influence and power.

CHAPTER IV

INTERPHENOMENAL ANALYSIS OF THE PHENOMENA OF INFLUENCE AND POWER

An interphenomenal intradimensional analysis of influence and power is presented in this chapter. An interphenomenal intradimensional analysis of influence and power is presented in the first section, followed by a presentation of general results arising from this analysis in the second section, and ending by an interpretation of findings in the third section.

1. Interphenomenal and intradimensional analysis of the phenomena of influence and power.

In this section, an attempt is made to identify, at the level of each dimension, elements which are specific to each phenomenon under study and those which are common to both phenomena. Specific elements are therefore those assigned to a dimension of the phenomenon of influence and not found in the corresponding dimension of the phenomenon of power, and those which having been assigned to a dimension of the phenomenon of power are not found in the corresponding dimension of the phenomenon of influence. Common elements are those elements which having been assigned to a dimension of the phenomenon of influence are also found in the

corresponding dimension of the phenomenon of power. This analysis will be carried out at the level of the nine dimensions utilized in this study: the essential definition, the basis, the condition, the purpose, the function, the limit, the cause, the consequence, and the relation.

A. Elements assigned to essential definitions of the phenomena of influence and power.

Specific elements: The following elements are assigned to essential definitions of the phenomenon of influence and are not found as elements of essential definitions of the phenomenon of power: a medium of persuasion;^{1,2,3,4} a process which induces a change in the state of another individual or group of individuals;^{5,6} whenever a behavior

1 Arthur W. Reeves, Harold C. Melsness, and John E. Cheal, Educational Administration: The Role of the Teacher, Toronto, MacMillan, 1962, p. 28.

2 Talcott Parsons, Politics and Social Structure, New York, The Free Press, 1969, p. 415.

3 Talcott Parsons, Social Systems and the Evolution of Action Theory, New York, The Free Press, 1977, p. 199.

4 R. Jean Hills, "What Educators Really Do: A Parsonian View of Education", in William G. Monahan, Theoretical Dimensions of Educational Administration, New York, MacMillan, 1975, p. 248.

5 Stephen W. King, Communication and Social Influence, Don Mills, Ontario, Addison-Wesley, 1975, p. 7-15.

6 Robert King Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, Toronto, Collier-MacMillan, 1968, p. 420.

is attempted by an influencee to meet an intention of an influencer without any action on the part of the latter or implicit influence;^{7,8} a capacity to have an impact on the events of the organization or the behavior of a person or group;⁹ the value position and potential of a person or group;¹⁰ the result of actualized power;¹¹ the kind of power that changes attitudes;¹² kinetic power;¹³ a symbolic medium;¹⁴ an effort to change behavior;¹⁵ a process implicating two or more people;¹⁶ both an alteration of behavior

7 Robert H. Dahl, Modern Political Analysis, 3rd Ed., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1976, p. 91.

8 William A. Gamson, Power and Discontent, Homewood, Illinois, The Dorsey Press, 1968, p. 69.

9 Joseph A. Litterer, The Analysis of Organizations, New York, Wiley, 1973, p. 413.

10 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Power and Society, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1969, p. 55.

11 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 7.

12 Kurt W. Back, "Power, Influence and Pattern of Communication", in Luigi Petrullo and Bernard Bass, Eds., Leadership and Interpersonal Behavior, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967, p. 139.

13 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, "The Bases of Social Power", in Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Studies in Social Power, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan, 1959, p. 152.

14 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 417.

15 Harold J. Leavitt, Managerial Psychology, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1972, p. 110.

16 Robert King Merton, Op. Cit., p. 464.

and maintenance of behavior, other than it would have been without an intervention of the influencer;¹⁷ a transferable process from one solidary grouping to another in a way similar to the transfer of wage income from the employer to the householder;¹⁸ a process consisting in affecting policies of others than the self;¹⁹ ideas or a plan of action sponsored by some and followed by others in preference to alternatives;²⁰ the resultant force on a system in the life of a person which has its course in an act of the influencer, this resultant force induced by the influencer consists of a force to change the system in the direction desired by the influencer and an opposing resistance initiated by this same act;²¹ voluntary acceptance of guidance;²² leadership;²³ giving

17 Herbert Goldhamer and Edward A. Shils, "Types of Power and Status", in American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 45, September 1939, p. 171.

18 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 434.

19 Herbert A. Simon, Models of Man, New York, Wiley, 1957, p. 65.

20 Don Martindale, Institutions, Organizations and Mass Society, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1966, p. 292.

21 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 151.

22 William Herman Newman and E. Kirby Warren, The Process of Management: Concepts, Behavior and Practice, 4th Ed., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1977, p. 579.

23 Gerald J. Skibbins, Organizational Evolution: A Program for Managing Radical Change, New York, AMACOM, 1974, p. 240.

another the premises for action, attitudes, habits, etc., leading to organizational goals;²⁴ a sort of prediction in the form of advice, encouragement, warning, etc., that given certain actions certain outcomes will occur;²⁵ the likelihood of a give-and-take communication ending with the person who accepts advice potentially influencing the outcome to some minor extent;²⁶ and control over the premises of decisions, with the decisions of the subordinate being consistent with premises selected for him by his superior.²⁷

The following elements are assigned to essential definitions of the phenomenon of power and are not found as elements of essential definitions of the phenomenon of influence: potential for influence;^{28,29,30}

²⁴ William H. Lucio and John D. McNeil, Supervision, A Synthesis of Thought and Action, 2nd Ed., New York, McGraw-Hill, 1969, p. 26.

²⁵ David V. J. Bell, Power, Influence and Authority, New York, Oxford University Press, 1975, p. 25.

²⁶ William Herman Newman and E. Kirby Warren, Op. Cit., p. 250.

²⁷ Herbert A. Simon, Administrative Behavior, New York, MacMillan, 1965, p. 223.

²⁸ Robert Tannenbaum, Irving R. Weschler, and Fred Massarik, Leadership and Organization: A Behavioral Science Approach, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1961, p. 26.

²⁹ Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, Eds., Group Dynamics: Research and Theory, 3rd Ed., New York, Harper & Row, 1968, p. 216.

³⁰ Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 7.

31,32,33,34,35,36,37,38 decisions made by the power-holder; 39,40,41,42 an influence relationship; 43,44,45

31 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 152.

32 Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organizations, New York, Wiley, 1966, p. 220.

33 Dorwin Cartwright, "Influence, Leadership, Control", in James G. March, Ed., Handbook of Organizations, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1965, p. 4.

34 Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Studies in Social Power, Ann Arbor, Institute for Social Research, 1959(b), in Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, Op. Cit., p. 3.

35 George Levinger, "The Development of Perceptions and Behavior in Newly Formed Social Power Relationships", in Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., 1959, p. 83.

36 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., 1973, p. 70.

37 Ibid., p. 413.

38 Gerald J. Skibbins, Op. Cit., p. 240.

39 Daniel E. Griffiths, Administrative Theory, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959, p. 87.

40 Frank W. Lutz and Laurence Iannacone, Understanding Educational Organizations: A Field Study Approach, Columbus, Ohio, Charles E. Merrill, 1969, p. 4.

41 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 46.

42 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 209.

43 Ralph M. Stogdill, Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research, New York, MacMillan, 1974, p. 292.

44 Dorwin Cartwright, "A Field Theoretical Conception of Power", in Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., 1959, p. 196.

45 Ibid., p. 218.

46,47,48,49,50,51,52,53,54 a capacity within a relationship of imposing one's own will even against resistance; 55,56,57,58,59

46 Frank W. Lutz and Laurence Iannacone, Op. Cit., p. 11.

47 David C. McClelland, Power, The Inner Experience, New York, Irvington, 1975, p. 255.

48 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 21.

49 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 153.

50 Robert Presthus, Men at the Top: A Study in Community Power, New York, Oxford University Press, 1964, p. 5.

51 Floyd Hunter, Community Power Structure, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1953, p. 6.

52 Robert A. Dahl, "Power", in International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, New York, MacMillan and Free Press, Vol. 12, 1968, p. 407.

53 Richard M. Emerson, "Power-Dependence Relations", in American Sociological Review, Vol. 17, February 1962, p. 31-41.

54 Richard Newbold Adams, Energy and Structure, Austin, University of Texas Press, 1975, p. 121.

55 Robert King Merton, Op. Cit., p. 426.

56 Donald J. McCarty, Op. Cit., p. 11-12.

57 Kurt W. Back, Op. Cit., p. 139.

58 Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., 1959, p. 188.

59 P. M. Blau, Exchange and Power in Social Life, New York, Wiley, 1964, p. 117.

60,61,62 the ability to secure the achievement of goals;^{63,64}
65,66,67,68,69 potential ability to use force;^{70,71,72,73} a

60 Max Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons (Trans.) and Talcott Parsons, Ed., Glencoe, Illinois, Free Press and Falcon's Wing, 1947, p. 180.

61 Max Weber, Basic Concepts in Sociology, Connecticut, Greenwood Press, 1962, p. 117.

62 Max Weber, Op. Cit., 1947, p. 152.

63 Robert F. Wilson, Educational Administration, Columbus, Ohio, Charles E. Merrill, 1966, p. 90.

64 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 361.

65 Ibid., p. 206.

66 William H. Lucio and John D. McNeil, Op. Cit., p. 82.

67 Ralph B. Kimbrough, Political Power and Educational Decision-Making, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1964, p. 7.

68 Karl Deutsch, The Nerves of Government, New York, The Free Press, 1966, p. 248.

69 Bertrand Russell, Power: A New Social Analysis, New York, Norton, 1938, p. 35.

70 Willard R. Lane et al., Foundations of Educational Administration: A Behavioral Analysis, New York, MacMillan, 1967, p. 201.

71 Daniel E. Griffiths, Human Relations in School Administration, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1956, p. 96.

72 Donald M. Wolfe, "Power as Authority in the Family", in Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., 1959, p. 99.

73 Kurt Lewin, Field Theory in Social Science, New York, Harper & Row, 1951, p. 40.

capacity for action;^{74,75,76} the exercise of coerciveness;^{77,78,79} a part of human action;^{80,81} the influence of others to behave in terms of one's own goals and interests;^{82,83} participation in the decisions affecting another;⁸⁴ a functional-relational system which is controlled by institutional patterns, collectivities, and roles;⁸⁵ a mutual influence

74 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Organizations: Theory and Behavior, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1975, p. 73.

75 Lanore A. Netzer et al., Interdisciplinary Foundations of Supervision, Boston, Allyn and Bacon, 1970, p. 214.

76 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 205.

77 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 98.

78 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 413.

79 Robert A. Dahl, Op. Cit., 1976, p. 47.

80 Adolf A. Berle, Power, New York, Harcourt, Brace & World, 1969, p. 60.

81 Robert Chin and Kenneth D. Benne, "General Strategies in Affecting Changes in Human Systems", in Warren G. Bennis, Kenneth D. Benne, and Robert Chin, The Planning of Change, New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969, p. 52.

82 Russell T. Gregg, "Political Dimensions of Educational Administration", in Walter G. Hack et al., Educational Administration: Selected Readings, 2nd Ed., Boston, Allyn and Bacon, 1971, p. 218.

83 Arthur R. Cohen, "Situational Structure, Self-Esteem, and Threat-Oriented Reactions to Power", in Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., 1959, p. 36.

84 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 75.

85 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 206.

between authorities and potential partisans;⁸⁶ a declared intent to shift an individual's value position either in the direction of more or less enjoyment depending on the use of promise or threat;⁸⁷ a present means which serves to obtain some future apparent good;⁸⁸ a force that makes organizations operate;⁸⁹ the basis of responsible action;⁹⁰ a latent force;⁹¹ authority;⁹² influence over thought;⁹³ the enhancement of others;⁹⁴ the ability of a person or group to impose its will on others in a recurrent manner;⁹⁵ the cement which holds a society;⁹⁶ a relative ability of people to influence

86 William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 59.

87 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 22-23.

88 Thomas Hobbes, Leviathan, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1957, p. 56.

89 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit., p. 231.

90 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 205.

91 Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1956, p. 96.

92 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 200.

93 Eugene J. Kolb, A Framework for Political Analysis, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, 1978, p. 32.

94 Erik H. Erikson, Childhood and Society, New York, Norton, 1950, in Benjamin Sachs, Educational Administration: A Behavioral Approach, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1966, p. 75.

95 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 117.

96 Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1956, p. 105.

each other;⁹⁷ an asymmetrical relationship with one person dependent on another;^{98,99} an ability to provide sanctions or to give rewards;^{100,101} and the use of sanctions.¹⁰²

Common elements: The following elements are assigned to essential definitions of the phenomenon of influence and are found as elements assigned to essential definitions of the phenomenon of power: a behavior causing behavior,^{103, 104,105,106,107,108}

97 Sidney Rosen, "Effects of Adjustments on the Perception of Social Power", in Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., 1959, p. 70.

98 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 117.

99 D. Mechanic, "Sources of Power of Lower Participants in Complex Organizations", in Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 7, 1962, p. 353.

100 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit., p. 230.

101 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 21.

102 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 141.

103 Herbert A. Simon, Op. Cit., 1957, p. 8.

104 Andrew S. McFarland, Power and Leadership in Pluralist Systems, Stanford, California, Stanford University Press, 1969, p. 6.

105 Ibid., p. 154.

106 Robert A. Dahl, Op. Cit., 1976, p. 30.

107 Cecil Austin Gibb, Ed., Leadership: Selected Readings, Harmondsworth, Eng., Penguin, 1979, p. 11.

108 Frank W. Lutz and Laurence Iannacone, Op. Cit., p. 11.

109,110,111,112,113,114,115,116,117,118,119,120,121,122,123,124

109 Gerald J. Skibbins, Op. Cit., p. 240.

110 William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 60.

111 Dorwin Cartwright, "Influence, Leadership, Control", in James G. March, Ed., Op. Cit., p. 4.

112 James G. March, "An Introduction to the Theory and Measurement of Influence", in APSR, Vol. 49, June 1955, p. 437.

113 Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, Op. Cit., p. 218-221.

114 Jack H. Nagel, The Descriptive Analysis of Power, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1975, p. 29.

115 George Caspar Homans, Social Behavior Its Elementary Forms, New York, Harcourt Brace Ivanovich, 1974, p.276.

116 Ibid., p. 89.

117 Amitai Etzioni, A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations, New York, The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961, p. 4.

118 Nelson W. Polsby, Community Power and Political Theory, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1963, p. 5.

119 Herbert Goldhamer and Edward A. Shils, Op. Cit., p. 171.

120 D. Mechanic, Op. Cit., p. 353.

121 Floyd Hunter, Op. Cit., p. 2-3.

122 Andrew S. McFarland, Op. Cit., p. 156.

123 Ibid., p. 6-7.

124 Daniel E. Griffiths, "Toward a Theory of Administrative Behavior", in Roald F. Campbell and Russell T. Gregg, Administrative Behavior in Education, New York, Harper & Row, 1957, p. 384.

125 and control over the behavior of another person or persons. 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138

125 Edgar Morphet, Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller, Educational Organization and Administration: Concepts, Practices and Issues, 3rd Ed., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1974, p. 190.

126 George Caspar Homans, Op. Cit., 1974, p. 70.

127 William G. Scott, Organization Theory A Behavior Analysis for Management, Illinois, Irwin, 1967, p. 200.

128 Edward Christie Banfield, Political Influence, New York, Free Press, 1965, p. 3.

129 Herbert A. Simon and Chester I. Barnard, Administrative Behavior, New York, Macmillan, 1968, p. 222.

130 Herbert A. Simon, Op. Cit., 1965, p. 222-223.

131 Edwin Paul Hollander, Leadership Dynamics: A Practical Guide to Effective Relationships, New York, Free Press, 1978, p. 84.

132 William V. d'Antonio and Howard J. Ehrlich, Eds., Power and Democracy in America, Notre Dame, Indiana, University of Notre Dame Press, 1961, p. 132.

133 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., in Ralph M. Stogdill, Op. Cit., p. 276.

134 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 420.

135 George Caspar Homans, Op. Cit., 1974, p. 276.

136 Richard Newbold Adams, Op. Cit., p. 121.

137 Ibid., p. 12.

138 Arthur R. Cohen, Op. Cit., p. 36.

B. Elements assigned to bases of the phenomena of influence and power.

Specific elements: The following elements are assigned to bases of the phenomenon of influence and are not found as elements of bases of the phenomenon of power: possession of specific resources such as power,^{139,140,141,142} achievements,¹⁴³ motivation and self-esteem,¹⁴⁴ access to communication channels,¹⁴⁵ the ability to hire, promote and fire, the ability to allocate corporation money to civic projects, the ability to influence large numbers of voters and the ability to enhance or damage reputation,¹⁴⁶ information;^{147,148,149} control over specific resources such as

139 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 436.

140 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 83.

141 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 17-18.

142 William Herman Newman and E. Kirby Warren, Op. Cit., p. 256.

143 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 363.

144 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 17-18.

145 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 200.

146 William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 72-73.

147 William Herman Newman and E. Kirby Warren, Op. Cit., p. 252.

148 Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., 1959, p. 12-13.

149 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 200.

controls over gains and costs and physical control over another's body,¹⁵⁰ control over funding and control over legal sanctions,¹⁵¹ and control over communication;¹⁵² rational persuasion which entails improving logic and/or information of the influencee;^{153,154,155,156} the solidarity of a group which gives rise to loyalty and belongingness;^{157,158} friendship;^{159,160,161} respect;^{162,163} authority;^{164,165}

150 Dorwin Cartwright, Op. Cit., 1965, p. 12-13.

151 Gerald Zaltman, David H. Florio, and Linda A. Sikorski, Dynamic Educational Change: Models, Strategies, Tactics and Management, New York, Free Press, 1977, p. 73.

152 William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 72-73.

153 Edward Christie Banfield, Op. Cit., p. 4.

154 Robert A. Dahl, Op. Cit., 1976, p. 45.

155 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 212.

156 Robert F. Wilson, Op. Cit., p. 55.

157 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 418.

158 William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 145-147.

159 Edward Christie Banfield, Op. Cit., p. 4.

160 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 17-18.

161 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 83.

162 Ibid.

163 Edward Christie Banfield, Op. Cit., p. 4.

164 Ibid.

165 Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, Op. Cit., p. 458.

acceptance of role within an organization;^{166,167} the use of supportive relationships and group methods of decision-making and supervision;¹⁶⁸ the strengthening and inspiring of an audience by a leader;¹⁶⁹ environmental matters such as laws, governmental regulations, professional organizations, trade unions, and customer reactions;¹⁷⁰ the exercise of influence over another sustains the capacity of the influencer to exercise influence by placing him in a favorable position vis-à-vis the influencee;¹⁷¹ the adherence of an individual to agreed upon procedures;¹⁷² the command over commitments;¹⁷³ the established rules of an organizations;¹⁷⁴ temporal features, that is, the time dimension;¹⁷⁵ control over

166 Ibid., p. 218.

167 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 17-18.

168 Rensis Likert, The Human Organization, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1967, p. 69.

169 David C. McClelland, Op. Cit., p. 260.

170 Stephen J. Bennett, The School: An Organizational Analysis, Glasgow, Blackie, 1974, p. 18-19.

171 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 83.

172 Edwin Paul Hollander, Leaders, Groups, and Influence, New York, Oxford University Press, 1964, p. 11.

173 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 428.

174 George Levinger, Op. Cit., p. 84.

175 Dörwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., 1959, p. 15-18.

another;¹⁷⁶ knowledge about the environment;¹⁷⁷ insight into the decision-making process;¹⁷⁸ selection of symbols and words that create a favorable impression;¹⁷⁹ a debt or obligation that an influencer can collect;¹⁸⁰ similarity;¹⁸¹ membership group;¹⁸² communication;¹⁸³ inspiration or appeal to emotions;¹⁸⁴ and norms underlying organic solidarity.¹⁸⁵

The following elements are assigned to bases of the phenomenon of power and are not found as elements of bases of the phenomenon of influence: the possession of resources,¹⁸⁶ such resources being physical force,¹⁸⁸ popularity,^{189,190}

176 Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, Op. Cit., p. 219.

177 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 76.

178 Ibid.

179 Ibid., p. 26.

180 Ibid.

181 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 14-18.

182 Ibid.

183 Ibid.

184 Robert F. Wilson, Op. Cit., p. 55.

185 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 190.

186 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., 1978, p. 32.

187 Robert A. Dahl, "The Concept of Power", in Behavioral Science, Vol. 2, June 1957, p. 203.

188 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 70.

189 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 83.

190 Thomas Hobbes, Op. Cit., p. 56.

charisma,¹⁹¹ intellectual ability,^{192,193} legal authority,¹⁹⁴ effort and interest,¹⁹⁵ personal ambition,¹⁹⁶ leadership ability,^{197,198} access to mass media, family ties, leadership in informal groups, friendship ties, knowledge of the political system,¹⁹⁹ and ownership;²⁰⁰ control over specific resources such as jobs and credits,²⁰¹ votes,²⁰² income,^{203,204} terms of relationship,²⁰⁵ and economic power such as

191 Ralph B. Kimbrough and Michael Y. Nunnery, Educational Administration: An Introduction, New York, Macmillan, 1976, p. 335.

192 George C. Homans, Op. Cit., 1974, p. 74-75.

193 Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 63-64.

194 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 39-49.

195 D. Mechanic, Op. Cit., p. 356-361.

196 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 157.

197 Ralph B. Kimbrough and Michael Y. Nunnery, Op. Cit., p. 335.

198 Russell T. Gregg, Op. Cit., 1957, p. 305.

199 Ralph B. Kimbrough and Michael Y. Nunnery, Op. Cit., p. 335.

200 Harold J. Leavitt, Op. Cit., p. 149.

201 Ralph B. Kimbrough and Michael Y. Nunnery, Op. Cit., p. 335.

202 Ibid.

203 Harold J. Leavitt, Op. Cit., p. 136.

204 Amitai Etzioni, Op. Cit., p. 5.

205 Harold J. Leavitt, Op. Cit., p. 136.

production and delivery of goods and services;²⁰⁶ legiti-
macy;^{207,208,209,210,211,212,213,214,215,216,217}
reference;^{218,219,220,221} institutions or

206 Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 223.

207 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven,
Op. Cit., p. 155-156.

208 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 428-429.

209 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 205-206.

210 Gordon L. Lippitt, Organizational Renewal, New
York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969, p. 44.

211 Andrew M. Pettigrew, The Politics of Organiza-
tional Decision-Making, U.S.A., Harper & Row, 1973, p. 231.

212 Ibid., p. 144.

213 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 12.

214 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 190.

215 David C. McClelland, Op. Cit., p. 23.

216 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 383.

217 Russell T. Gregg, Op. Cit., 1957, p. 305.

218 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven,
Op. Cit., p. 155-156.

219 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 428-429.

220 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 205-206.

221 Gordon L. Lippitt, Op. Cit., p. 44.

organizations;^{222,223,224,225,226} persuasion;^{227,228,229,230,}
²³¹ the needs or values the power act is being directed;^{232,}
^{233,234} violent force;^{235,236} coalescence of three elements,
 men, a philosophy, and a group capable of organization into
 institutions;²³⁷ a system of inequalities that permits

²²² Abraham Zaleznik, "Power and Politics in Organizational Life", in Harvard Business Review, May-June, 1970, p. 48.

²²³ L. Craig Wilson, School Leadership Today: Strategies for the Educator, Boston, Allyn & Bacon, 1978, p. 178.

²²⁴ Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 37.

²²⁵ Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 39-49.

²²⁶ D. Mechanic, Op. Cit., p. 37.

²²⁷ Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 54-56.

²²⁸ L. Craig Wilson, Op. Cit., p. 337.

²²⁹ Thomas Hobbes, Op. Cit., p. 57.

²³⁰ Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 141.

²³¹ George Reedy, The Twilight of the Presidency, New York, World, 1970, p. 33, in Edwin Paul Hollander, Op. Cit., 1978, p. 153.

²³² David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 30.

²³³ William Herman Newman and E. Kirby Warren, Op. Cit., p. 247.

²³⁴ Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, Eds., Op. Cit., p. 216-217.

²³⁵ Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 39-49.

²³⁶ Amitai Etzioni, Op. Cit., p. 5.

²³⁷ Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 50.

influence of lower class by coalitions;²³⁸ the provision of service;²³⁹ the distribution of resources;²⁴⁰ a leader's association with various collective systems of power,²⁴¹ on subsystems,²⁴² and on his ability to manipulate the larger system;²⁴³ control of the decision-making process;²⁴⁴ availability of controls over power or accountability;²⁴⁵ an interaction among 1) the possession or control of resources, 2) the target's needs or values, 3) credibility, and 4) good will and responsiveness;²⁴⁶ political symbols;²⁴⁷ implied terms of statutes, rules and regulations;²⁴⁸ creed;²⁴⁹

²³⁸ Jay D. Scribner, Ed., "The Politics of Education", in The 76th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II, Chicago, University of Chicago, 1977, p. 33.

²³⁹ Benjamin Sachs, Educational Administration: A Behavioral Approach, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1966, p. 65.

²⁴⁰ Andrew M. Pettigrew, Op. Cit., 1973, p. 229.

²⁴¹ Robert Presthus, Op. Cit., p. 8.

²⁴² Ibid., p. 29.

²⁴³ Ibid., p. 5.

²⁴⁴ Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1959, p. 87.

²⁴⁵ William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 402.

²⁴⁶ Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 37-38.

²⁴⁷ Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 103-104.

²⁴⁸ William H. Roe and Thelbert L. Drake, The Principship, New York, Macmillan, 1974, p. 52.

²⁴⁹ Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 154.

plurality in kinds of power;²⁵⁰ anonymity;²⁵¹ fear, tradition, interaction between creeds and other sources of power, and substitution of a new creed for an old one;²⁵² political alliance;²⁵³ sensitivity to the needs of others;²⁵⁴ numbers;²⁵⁵ manipulation of symbolic rewards;²⁵⁶ success;²⁵⁷ and a system of ideas or philosophy.²⁵⁸

Common elements: The following elements are assigned to bases of the phenomenon of influence and are also found as elements assigned to bases of the phenomenon of power: the possession of specific resources such as wealth,^{259,260,261,}

250 Edward Christie Banfield, Op. Cit., p. 320.

251 Harold J. Leavitt, Op. Cit., p. 149.

252 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 157.

253 L. Craig Wilson, Op. Cit., p. 337.

254 Harold J. Leavitt, Op. Cit., p. 136.

255 Ibid., p. 149.

256 Amitai Etzioni, Op. Cit., p. 5.

257 Thomas Hobbes, Op. Cit., p. 56.

258 Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 37.

259 George Caspar Homans, Op. Cit., p. 74-75.

260 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 39-49.

261 Ralph B. Kimbrough and Michael Y. Nunnery, Op. Cit., p. 335.

262,263,264,265,266,267,268 prestige and reputation, 269,270,
271,272,273,274,275,276,277,278,279

262 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit.,
p. 245-248.

263 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit.,
p. 83.

264 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 70.

265 W. W. Charters, et al., Perspectives on Educational Administration and the Behavioral Sciences, Eugene, University of Oregon, Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1965, p. 114.

266 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 436.

267 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit.,
p. 83.

268 Herbert A. Simon, Op. Cit., 1957, p. 70.

269 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 32.

270 Ibid., p. 39-49.

271 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit.,
p. 83.

272 Harold J. Leavitt, Op. Cit., p. 136.

273 Russell T. Gregg, Op. Cit., 1957, p. 305.

274 Thomas Hobbes, Op. Cit., p. 56-57.

275 W. W. Charters, et al., Op. Cit., p. 114.

276 R. Jean Hills, Op. Cit., p. 248.

277 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 418.

278 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 26.

279 Thomas Sergiovanni and Fred D. Carver, The New School Executive: A Theory of Administration, New York, Dodd, Mead, 1973, p. 19.

280,281 knowledge, 282,283,284,285,286,287,288,289,290 compe-
tence, skill, and expertise, 291,292,293,294,295,296,297

-
- 280 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 17-18.
- 281 William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 72-73.
- 282 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 39-49.
- 283 Ralph B. Kimbrough and Michael Y. Nunnery, Op. Cit., p. 335.
- 284 W. W. Charters, et al., Op. Cit., p. 114.
- 285 Russell T. Gregg, Op. Cit., 1957, p. 305.
- 286 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit.,
p. 245-248.
- 287 Robert Chin and Kenneth B. Benne, Op. Cit., p. 52.
- 288 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit.,
p. 83.
- 289 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 17-18.
- 290 Warren G. Bennis, Changing Organizations, New
York, McGraw-Hill, 1966, p. 19.
- 291 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 39-49.
- 292 D. Mechanic, Op. Cit., p. 356-361.
- 293 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit.,
p. 83.
- 294 Ralph B. Kimbrough and Michael Y. Nunnery,
Op. Cit., p. 335.
- 295 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit.,
p. 245-248.
- 296 Harold J. Leavitt, Op. Cit., p. 136.
- 297 Abraham Zaleznik, Op. Cit., p. 60.

298,299,300,301,302,303,304,305,306 physical strength, 307,
308,309,310 personality, 311,312,313,314,315,316 social

298 Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach, San Francisco, California, Chandler, 1962, p. 176.

299 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 155-156.

300 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 428-429.

301 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 205-206.

302 Gordon L. Lippitt, Op. Cit., p. 44.

303 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 418.

304 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 363.

305 Warren G. Bennis, Op. Cit., p. 19.

306 Edwin Paul Hollander, Op. Cit., 1964, p. 11.

> 307 George Caspar Homans, Op. Cit., 1974, p. 74-75.

308 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit., p. 245-248.

309 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 36.

310 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 200.

311 L. Craig Wilson, Op. Cit., p. 337.

312 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit., p. 245-248.

313 Harold J. Leavitt, Op. Cit., p. 136.

314 D. Mechanic, Op. Cit., p. 356-361.

315 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 17-18.

316 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 200.

status; 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328
control over resources; 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334,

317 Ralph B. Kimbrough and Michael Y. Nunnery,
Op. Cit., p. 335.

318 Harold J. Leavitt, Op. Cit., p. 136.

319 W. W. Charters, et al., Op. Cit., p. 114.

320 Thomas Hobbes, Op. Cit., p. 57.

321 Alvin Zander, Arthur R. Cohen, and Ezra Stotland,
"Power and the Relations Among Professions", in Dorwin
Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., p. 17.

322 Gerald Zaltman, David H. Florio, and Linda
Sikorski, Op. Cit., p. 73.

323 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 373.

324 Thomas Sergiovanni and Fred D. Carver, Op. Cit.,
p. 19.

325 William Herman Newman and E. Kirby Warren,
Op. Cit., p. 251.

326 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 17-18.

327 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 200.

328 Edwin Paul Hollander, Op. Cit., 1964, p. 26.

329 Richard Newbold Adams, Op. Cit., p. 19.

330 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit.,
p. 76.

331 M. Newcomb, R. H. Turner, and P. E. Converse,
"Leadership Roles in Goal Achievement", in Cecil Austin Gibb,
Ed., Leadership: Selected Readings, Harmondsworth, Eng.,
Penguin, 1979, p. 330-331.

332 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 67-71.

333 W. W. Charters, et al., Op. Cit., p. 114.

334 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 26.

335, 336, 337 control over information; 338, 339, 340, 341, 342
coercion in the form of threats or appeals; 343, 344, 345, 346,
347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352,

335 Dorwin Cartwright, Op. Cit., 1965, p. 12-13.

336 William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 72-73.

337 Gerald Zaltman, David H. Florio, and Linda A.
Dikorski, Op. Cit., p. 73.

338 Andrew M. Pettigrew, Op. Cit., 1973, p. 28.

339 A. M. Pettigrew, "Information as a Power Source",
in Sociology, Vol. 6, 1976, p. 187-204.

340 William Herman Newman and E. Kirby Warren,
Op. Cit., p. 252.

341 Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., 1959, p. 12-13.

342 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 200.

343 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven,
Op. Cit., p. 155-156.

344 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 428-429.

345 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 205-206.

346 Gordon L. Lippitt, Op. Cit., p. 44.

347 Donald M. Wolfe, Op. Cit., p. 101.

348 Gerald Zaltman, David H. Florio, and Linda
Sikorski, Op. Cit., p. 73.

349 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 22.

350 Ibid., p. 116.

351 Robert Dahl, Op. Cit., 1976, p. 48-49.

352 Max Weber, in Stephen J. Knezevich, Op. Cit.,
p. 45.

353, 354, 355, 356, 357 official position or office; 358, 359, 360
361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372 rewards and

-
- 353 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 54-56.
- 354 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 36.
- 355 Robert F. Wilson, Op. Cit., p. 55.
- 356 Edward Christie Banfield, Op. Cit., p. 4-5.
- 357 William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 75-81.
- 358 Ralph B. Kimbrough, Op. Cit., p. 13.
- 359 William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 13.
- 360 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 482.
- 361 T. M. Newcomb, R. H. Turner, and P. E. Converse, Op. Cit., p. 330-331.
- 362 Amitai Etzioni, Op. Cit., p. 89-90.
- 363 Andrew M. Pettigrew, Op. Cit., 1973, p. 29.
- 364 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 39-49.
- 365 D. Mechanic, Op. Cit., p. 356-361.
- 366 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 83.
- 367 Ralph B. Kimbrough and Michael Y. Nunnery, Op. Cit., p. 335.
- 368 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit., p. 245-248.
- 369 Alvin Zander, Arthur R. Cohen, and Ezra Stotland, Op. Cit., p. 17.
- 370 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 26.
- 371 John R. P. French, Jr. and Richard Snyder, "Leadership and Interpersonal Behavior", in Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., p. 118.
- 372 Herbert A. Simon, Op. Cit., 1957, p. 70.

inducements; 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383
beliefs and a system of morals; 384, 385, 386, 390, 391 and the
relationship between two individuals or interpersonal

373 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 155-156.

374 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 428-429.

375 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 205-206.

376 Gordon L. Lippitt, Op. Cit., p. 44.

377 Donald M. Wolfe, Op. Cit., p. 101.

378 Gerald Zaltman, David Florio, and Linda Sikorski, Op. Cit., p. 73.

379 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 54-56.

380 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 36.

381 Robert A. Dahl, Op. Cit., 1976, p. 45.

382 William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 75-81.

383 Edward Christie Banfield, Op. Cit., p. 4-5.

384 Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1956, p. 98.

385 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 145.

386 Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 29.

387 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 29.

388 Stephen J. Bennett, Op. Cit., p. 30.

389 Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, Op. Cit., p. 1.

390 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 17-18.

391 Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, Eds., Op. Cit., p. 226.

transaction.^{392,393,394,395.396,397}

C. Elements assigned to conditions of the phenomena of influence and power.

Specific elements: The following elements are assigned to conditions of the phenomenon of influence and are not found as elements of conditions of the phenomenon of power: a person's perception is important in determining whether he will react to an influence attempt from another person;^{398,399} an individual's motivation;^{400,401,402} the selection of resources constituting a base which are

³⁹² John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 153.

³⁹³ Donald M. Wolfe, Op. Cit., p. 100.

³⁹⁴ Richard M. Emerson, "Power-Dependence Relations", in American Sociological Review, Vol. 27, February 1962, p. 31-40, in James D. Thompson, Organizations in Action, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1967, p. 107.

³⁹⁵ Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, Op. Cit., p. 218-219.

³⁹⁶ Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., p. 15-18.

³⁹⁷ George Levinger, Op. Cit., p. 84.

³⁹⁸ Herbert A. Simon, Op. Cit., 1957, p. 123.

³⁹⁹ Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 104.

⁴⁰⁰ Ibid.

⁴⁰¹ Herbert A. Simon, Op. Cit., p. 123.

⁴⁰² Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, Eds., Op. Cit., p. 225.

appropriate to the social setting under consideration;^{403,}
-404,405 the manipulation of a person's environment, especially in keeping with his needs;^{406,407,408,409} dependence of one person on another;^{410,411} dependence of the influencee on information;^{412,413} institutionalization of moral values and affect;^{414,415} the occurrence of interaction;^{416,417} the perception by others that the influencing agent is

403 Douglas McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1960, p. 31.

404 Dorwin Cartwright, Op. Cit., 1965, p. 5.

405 Robert King Merton, Op. Cit., p. 456.

406 Raymond E. Miles, Theories of Management: Implications for Organizational Behavior and Development, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1975, p. 5.

407 James G. March and Herbert A. Simon, Op. Cit., p. 52.

408 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 169-170.

409 George Levinger, Op. Cit., p. 83.

410 Douglas McGregor, Op. Cit., p. 20.

411 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 54.

412 Ibid., p. 27-31.

413 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 433.

414 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 427.

415 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 355.

416 William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 70.

417 Rensis Likert, Op. Cit., p. 69.

living up to the group's tasks and expectations;^{418,419} operation, by the influencing agent, on the intentions of the object of persuasion and through positive channels;⁴²⁰ location of centers of latent power in the development of educational influence strategies;⁴²¹ devotion from subordinates and close alliance with other executives both at one's own level and above serves to protect and enhance one's sphere of influence;⁴²² the consistency between the advocated premise and the receiver's cognitive state;⁴²³ obtention of agreement that influence exists as a prerequisite to consent;⁴²⁴ the adequacy of the means employed by the influencer to act on the influencee's motivations and expectations;⁴²⁵ the attraction of a person to the influencing agent;⁴²⁶

418 Edwin Paul Hollander, Op. Cit., 1964, p. 26.

419 Ralph M. Stogdill, Op. Cit., p. 230.

420 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 335.

421 Ralph B. Kimbrough and Michael Y. Nunnery, Op. Cit., p. 336.

422 Harold Lazarus and E. Kirby Warren, The Progress of Management, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1968, p. 127.

423 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 122-123.

424 Arthur W. Reeves, Harold C. Melsness, and John E. Cheal, Op. Cit., p. 28.

425 Edward Christie Banfield, Op. Cit., p. 4.

426 Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, Eds., Op. Cit., p. 225.

command over commitments;⁴²⁷ access to skills, knowledge, tools;⁴²⁸ combination of resources by individuals and groups;⁴²⁹ the effectiveness of the communication processes;⁴³⁰ the relation of the influence act to the functional equilibrium of the system on which it impinges;⁴³¹ informing the influencee of the rewards available to satisfy his needs;⁴³² knowledge about the consequences of behavior;⁴³³ increasing the skills of people in an organization;⁴³⁴ the behavior of a person in the use of a base;⁴³⁵ a person's accurate view of reality;⁴³⁶ and the perceived adherence by the influencing agent to the normative behavior of the group.⁴³⁷

427 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 428.

428 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 169-170.

429 Robert A. Dahl, "Equality and Power in American Society", Edward Keynes and David M. Ricci, Political Power, Community and Democracy, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1970, p. 147.

430 Rensis Likert, Op. Cit., p. 55.

431 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 133.

432 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 169-170.

433 Herbert A. Simon, Op. Cit., 1965, p. 77.

434 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 428.

435 Dorwin Cartwright, Op. Cit., 1959, p. 15-18.

436 Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, Eds., Op. Cit., p. 227.

437 Edwin Paul Hollander, Op. Cit., 1964, p. 194.

The following elements are assigned to conditions of the phenomenon of power and are not found as elements of conditions of the phenomenon of influence: the possession of one or more resources;^{438,439,440,441,442} the marginal value the person attaches to the resources being utilized by the power-wielder;^{443,444,445,446,447} resources must be low in relation to demand;^{448,449} the perception by those influenced of the number of positive rewards they think a potential social

438 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 71.

439 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 49.

440 P.M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 22.

441 T.M. Newcomb, R.H. Turner, and P.E. Converse, Op. Cit., p. 330.

442 Willard R. Lane, et al., Op. Cit., p. 202.

443 Gerald Zaltman, David H. Florio, and Linda A. Sikorski, Op. Cit., p. 74.

444 George Caspar Homans, Op. Cit., 1974, p. 74-75.

445 George C. Homans, The Human Group, New York, Harcourt, Brace & Company, 1950, p. 87.

446 William Herman Newman and E. Kirby Warren, Op. Cit., p. 247.

447 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 32.

448 David V.J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 30.

449 George Caspar Homans, Op. Cit., 1974, p. 74-75.

agent can mobilize;^{450,451,452,453,454} the perception by those influenced of the ability of the influencing agent to mediate punishment;^{455,456,457,458,459} integration of the system including unifying of staff and binding of units, individual and collective;^{460,461,462,463,464,465,466,}

450 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 155-156.

451 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 428-429.

452 George Levinger, Op. Cit., p. 84.

453 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 139.

454 Donald M. Wolfe, Op. Cit., p. 101.

455 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 155-156.

456 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 428-429.

457 Ibid., p. 413.

458 George Levinger, Op. Cit., p. 84.

459 Donald Wolfe, Op. Cit., p. 101.

460 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 205.

461 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit., p. 270.

462 Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 63.

463 Harold Lazarus and E. Kirby Warren, Op. Cit., p. 126.

464 Ralph B. Kimbrough, Op. Cit., p. 196.

465 Ibid., p. 215.

466 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 28.

467,468,469 the ability of individuals to command the loyalty of those that they wish to influence;^{470,471,472,473,474} a realistic appraisal by the power-holder of his power relative to that of others;^{475,476,477,478} a more or less accepted system of ideas and morals;^{479,480} the number of available

467 Bertrand Russell, Authority and the Individual, London, George Allen & Unwin, 1949, p. 101.

468 Daniel E. Griffiths, Ed., "Behavioral Science and Educational Administration", in Sixty-Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1964, p. 236.

469 Sidney Rosen, Op. Cit., p. 70.

470 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 23.

471 Herbert Goldhamer and Edward A. Shils, Op. Cit., p. 174.

472 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 207.

473 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 155-156.

474 Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Op. Cit., p. 144.

475 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 18-19.

476 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 110.

477 Alvin Zander, Arthur R. Cohen, and Ezra Stotland, Op. Cit., p. 18.

478 Sidney Rosen, Op. Cit., p. 70.

479 Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 31.

480 Donald J. McCarty and Charles E. Ramsey, The School Managers, Wesport, Connecticut, Greenwood, 1971, p. 56.

alternatives;^{481,482} the degree of threat and fear experienced by an individual;^{483,484,485} a structured institutional framework;^{486,487} the command over and rendering of services others need by the influencing agent establishes their dependence on and obligation to him;⁴⁸⁸ the distribution of resources within power structures by means of which compliance can be enforced;⁴⁸⁹ coming through with the promised reward by the power-holder;⁴⁹⁰ the need for a wide range of implied powers;⁴⁹¹ the maintenance of a threat capability;⁴⁹² a belief in the sanctity of traditions by which the power-holder exercises power and in the legalities of the laws,

481 Willard R. Lane, et al., Op. Cit., p. 202.

482 Andrew M. Pettigrew, Op. Cit., 1973, p. 26.

483 Arthur R. Cohen, Op. Cit., p. 37.

484 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 19.

485 Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, Eds., Op. Cit., p. 225.

486 Robert Presthus, Op. Cit., p. 5.

487 Floyd Hunter, Op. Cit., p. 6.

488 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 118.

489 Andrew M. Pettigrew, Op. Cit., 1973, p. 26.

490 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 30.

491 William H. Roe and Thelbert L. Drake, Op. Cit., p. 52.

492 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 30.

decrees, and directives promulgated by the power-holder;⁴⁹³ an apparent conformity of the influencing agent to the political formula;⁴⁹⁴ the relationship of good will that prevails between the power-holder and the target;⁴⁹⁵ a deep feeling of creed or sentiment by the majority of the population;⁴⁹⁶ some demand for reward;⁴⁹⁷ a generalized capacity to secure compliance along with the use of symbolic means;⁴⁹⁸ a cultural recognition by others of an actor's control of the environment;⁴⁹⁹ the existence of a time lag between the actions of the person exerting power and the response of the respondent;⁵⁰⁰ the existence of some connection between the actor and the respondent;⁵⁰¹ a uniformity which depends upon sentiment and habit;⁵⁰² the making of decisions by a person

493 Herbert Goldhamer and Edward A. Shils, Op. Cit., p. 173.

494 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 126.

495 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 32.

496 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 154.

497 George Caspar Homans, Op. Cit., 1974, p. 74-75.

498 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1974, p. 362.

499 Richard Newbold Adams, Op. Cit., p. 13.

500 Robert A. Dahl, Op. Cit., 1957, p. 204.

501 Ibid.

502 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 150.

which affect the course of action of an enterprise to a greater extent than do decisions of others, and which influence other decisions;⁵⁰³ the right of expulsion and its related financial hardship;⁵⁰⁴ communication about the relevant rewards and punishments and about the specific behavior upon which they depend;⁵⁰⁵ the perception and understanding of the power communication;⁵⁰⁶ the size of the unit governed by the power-holder;⁵⁰⁷ the power-holder remaining indifferent to the benefits that others can offer him in exchange for his benefits;⁵⁰⁸ and a recognition that subdominants as well as dominants operate in the community power structure of the school.⁵⁰⁹

Common elements: The following elements are assigned to conditions of the phenomenon of influence and are also found as elements of the phenomenon of power: control of

503 Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1959, p. 87.

504 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 179-180.

505 Gerald Zaltman, David H. Florio, and Linda Sikorski, Op. Cit., p. 74.

506 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 74.

507 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1949, p. 28.

508 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 21.

509 Charles V. Willie, "New Perspectives in School Community Relations", in Journal of Negro Education, Vol. 37, Summer, 1968, p. 220-226, in William H. Roe and Thelbert L. Drake, Op. Cit., p. 8.

some resources or access to resources which could serve as rewards or sanctions or means to ends being sought;^{510,511, 512,513,514,515,516,518,518} persons having needs that could be satisfied by resources that the influencing agent has to offer;^{519,520,521,522,523,524} the perception by a person that the influencing agent has a legitimate right to prescribe behavior for him, thereby sanctioning the authority of the position and accepting the influencing agent and his

510 Willia, H. Lucio and John D. McNeil, Op. Cit., p. 82.

511 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 26.

512 D. Mechanic, Op. Cit., p. 352.

513 Ibid., p. 355.

514 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 205.

515 Ralph B. Kimbrough and Michael Y. Nunnery, Op. Cit., p. 335.

516 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 170.

517 Dorwin Cartwright, Op. Cit., 1965, p. 1-44.

518 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 79-80.

519 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 122.

520 Dorwin Cartwright, "A Field Theoretical Conception of Power", in Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., p. 204-206.

521 Harold J. Leavitt, Op. Cit., p. 146.

522 Donald M. Wolfe, Op. Cit., p. 101.

523 Harold J. Leavitt, Op. Cit., p. 145.

524 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 77-78.

authority;^{525,526,527,528,529,531,532,533,534} the effective use of resources, that is, on the degree of congruence between the act of influence and goals and cultural norms, etc.;^{535,536,537,538,539,540,541} and the perceived competence

525 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 155-156.

526 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 428-429.

527 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 205.

528 Dorwin Cartwright, "Power: A Neglected Variable in Social Psychology", in Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., p. 5-7.

529 James G. March and Herbert A. Simon, Organizations, New York, Wiley, 1967, p. 90.

530 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 418.

531 Warren G. Bennis, Op. Cit., p. 164.

532 Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, Op. Cit., p. 218.

533 Herbert A. Simon, Op. Cit., 1957, p. 70.

534 John R. P. French, Jr. and Richard Snyder, Op. Cit., p. 147.

535 Ralph B. Kimbrough and Michael Y. Nunnery, Op. Cit., p. 335.

536 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 199.

537 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 120.

538 Dorwin Cartwright, Ed., Op. Cit., 1959, p. 15-18.

539 Jack R. Gibb, "Defense Level and Influence Potential in Small Groups", in Luigi Petrullo and Bernard Bass, Eds., Leadership and Interpersonal Behavior, New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1967, p. 67.

540 David C. McClelland, Op. Cit., p. 261.

541 Herbert A. Simon, Op. Cit., 1965, p. 223.

of the influencing agent by the influencee.^{542,543,544}

D. Elements assigned to purposes of the phenomena of influence and power.

Specific elements: The following elements are assigned to purposes of the phenomenon of influence and are not found as elements of purposes of the phenomenon of power: to shape the attitudes or behavior of others;⁵⁴⁵ to strengthen an individual's power base by increasing his resources;⁵⁴⁶ to augment future influence;⁵⁴⁷ and to achieve some sort of gratification.⁵⁴⁸

The following elements are assigned to purposes of the phenomenon of power and are not found as elements of purposes of the phenomenon of influence: to control people and the decision-making process;^{549,550} to coordinate human

⁵⁴² John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 155-156.

⁵⁴³ Edwin Paul Hollander, Op. Cit., 1964, p. 11.

⁵⁴⁴ Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 123-124.

⁵⁴⁵ Gerald Zaltman, David H. Florio, and Linda A. Sikorski, Op. Cit., p. 225.

⁵⁴⁶ Dorwin Cartwright, Op. Cit., 1965, p. 7.

⁵⁴⁷ Herbert A. Simon, Op. Cit., 1957, p. 70.

⁵⁴⁸ Dorwin Cartwright, Op. Cit., 1965, p. 11.

⁵⁴⁹ Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1959, p. 86.

⁵⁵⁰ Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1956, p. 95.

activity which is important for effective organizations;⁵⁵¹
to enforce laws and decisions;⁵⁵² to acquire authority;⁵⁵³
to obtain and secure the objects of one's desires;⁵⁵⁴ to
perpetuate interests already vested in an organization;⁵⁵⁵
to feel powerful;⁵⁵⁶ and autocratic power aspires to the
ideal of conformity.⁵⁵⁷

Common elements: The following element is assigned
to purposes of the phenomenon of influence and is also found
as an element of the phenomenon of power: to achieve
goals.^{558,559,560,561}

551 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit.,
p. 231.

552 Robert F. Wilson, Op. Cit., p. 55.

553 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit.,
p. 137.

554 Martin Fleisher, Ed., Machiavelli and the Nature
of Political Thought, New York, Atheneum, 1972, p. 134.

555 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 389.

556 David C. McClelland, Op. Cit., p. 17.

557 Benjamin M. Sachs, Op. Cit., p. 75.

558 Sidney Rosen, Op. Cit., p. 70.

559 Robert F. Wilson, Op. Cit., p. 54.

560 Andrew M. Pettigrew, Op. Cit., 1973, p. 265.

561 Russell T. Gregg, Op. Cit., 1957, p. 302.

E. Elements assigned to functions of the phenomena of influence and power.

Specific elements: The following elements are assigned to functions of the phenomenon of influence and are not found as elements of functions of the phenomenon of power: persuasion of others toward performance;^{562,563,564} altering the ability of others to achieve their goals or satisfy their needs;^{565,566} integration of social systems;^{567,568,569} the handling of tensions which arise continually in a dynamic society between the egalitarian and the elitist components;⁵⁷⁰ bringing about organizational change through the peer group;⁵⁷¹ augmenting future

562 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 337.

563 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 346.

564 Arthur W. Reeves, Harold C. Melsness, and John E. Cheal, Op. Cit., p. 178.

565 Douglas McGregor, Op. Cit., p. 20.

566 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 71.

567 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 129.

568 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 434.

569 Edgar H. Schein, Organizational Psychology, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1965, p. 77.

570 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 346.

571 Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, Op. Cit., p. 450.

influence;⁵⁷² affecting the motivation to produce;⁵⁷³ regulation of communication in systems;⁵⁷⁴ mediation;⁵⁷⁵ regulation of the interplay between political support and identification by membership in solidary involvements;⁵⁷⁶ bringing about an allocation of sub-collectivity organizations and their memberships, statuses, roles compatible with the interest of the collectivity and of the units;⁵⁷⁷ and enhancement of the capacity for solidarity of the societal community.⁵⁷⁸

The following elements are assigned to functions of the phenomenon of power and are not found as elements of functions of the phenomenon of influence: the control of others' behavior by an individual or by an organization;⁵⁷⁹

572 Herbert A. Simon, Op. Cit., 1957, p. 70.

573 James G. March and Herbert A. Simon, Op. Cit., p. 82.

574 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 213.

575 Ibid., p. 357.

576 Ibid., p. 213-214.

577 Ibid., p. 358.

578 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 51.

579 Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1959, p. 86.

580,581,582,583,584,585 stabilization of the organization in the face of a changing environment; 586,587 the coordination of activities in the pursuit of a purposeful course of action; 588,589 the provision of services to others; 590,591 an essential aspect to the inauguration, guaranteed continuance, and order of an association; 592 implied powers allow progress, growth and experimentation in an organization by providing a frontier where imaginative and dynamic

580 Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1956, p. 95.

581 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 389.

582 Lanore A. Netzer, et al., Op. Cit., p. 84.

583 Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Op. Cit., p. 142.

584 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 36-37.

585 John Kenneth Galbraith, American Capitalism. The Concept of Countervailing Power, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1956, p. 25.

586 Willard R. Lane, et al., Op. Cit., p. 207.

587 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 343.

588 William Herman Newman and E. Kirby Warren, Op. Cit., p. 245.

589 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 135.

590 Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Op. Cit., p. 142.

591 Benjamin M. Sachs, Op. Cit., p. 75.

592 Robert M. Bierstedt, "An Analysis of Social Power", in American Sociological Review, Vol. 15, December 1950, p. 735.

administration can occur;⁵⁹³ determining to whose demand the organization will yield;⁵⁹⁴ a vital determinant of the nature and quality of the interaction of persons;⁵⁹⁵ the allocation of power and the system of power arrangements have a decisive influence over the kind of adjustment people reach in an organization and over the outcomes and efficiency of such an organization;⁵⁹⁶ organization and recognition of the field of responsibility;⁵⁹⁷ institutions give power in order to secure institutional action in their power;⁵⁹⁸ provision of the bargaining strength of an organization;⁵⁹⁹ the determination of criteria to be used in measuring organizational effectiveness and the means for evaluating such criteria;⁶⁰⁰ the provision of legitimated rights to make and implement

⁵⁹³ William H. Roe and Thelbert L. Drake, Op. Cit., p. 52-53.

⁵⁹⁴ Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Op. Cit., p. 196.

⁵⁹⁵ Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit., p. 229.

⁵⁹⁶ M. Crozier, The Bureaucratic Phenomenon, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1964, p. 147.

⁵⁹⁷ Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 117.

⁵⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 101.

⁵⁹⁹ Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1949, p. 103-104.

⁶⁰⁰ Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit., p. 256.

decisions which are collectively binding;⁶⁰¹ shaping the process in building a school system;⁶⁰² the exercise of power by educational decision-makers serves to change the way people perceive education and to supply them with information and opinion which is in keeping with national policy;⁶⁰³ school authorities utilize and have power to levy taxes, determine the scope of programs, determine curriculum and to establish rules and regulations relating to the operation of schools;⁶⁰⁴ supporting the fundamental order of society and its social organizations;⁶⁰⁵ dominating and controlling the environment thereby allowing societies to survive;⁶⁰⁶ serving the basic needs of society;⁶⁰⁷ serving as the medium with political primacy which can serve to acquire both human services and the demands for collective action;⁶⁰⁸ a capacity

601 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 210.

602 Jay D. Scribner, Ed., Op. Cit., p. 59.

603 William H. Lucio and John D. McNeil, Op. Cit., p. 83.

604 Paul R. Mort and Donald H. Ross, Principles of School Administration: A Synthesis of Basic Concepts, 2nd Ed., New York, McGraw-Hill, 1957, p. 275.

605 Robert M. Bierstedt, Op. Cit., p. 730-736.

606 Richard Newbold Adams, Op. Cit., p. 28.

607 Robert K. Merton, Leonard Broom, and Leonard S. Cottrell, Eds., Sociology Today: Problems and Prospects, New York, Basic Books, under the auspices of the American Sociological Society, 1959, p. 107.

608 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 20.

of affecting the distribution of resources by having an effect on the setting of objectives and on the operation of the political-economic system;⁶⁰⁹ a means of attempting to satisfy one's desire for more;⁶¹⁰ and serving to monopolize needed rewards, and discouraging coalitions.⁶¹¹

Common elements: The following elements are assigned to functions of the phenomenon of influence and are also found as elements of the phenomenon of power: helping to shape the attitudes and/or behavior of influencees;^{612,613} the mobilization of resources, capacities and commitments of units to valued association.^{614,615,616,617,618}

609 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit., p. 251-253.

610 Ibid., p. 241.

611 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 121.

612 Gerald Zaltman, David H. Florio, and Linda A. Sikorski, Op. Cit., p. 225.

613 William Herman Newman and E. Kirby Warren, Op. Cit., p. 642.

614 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 213-214.

615 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 200.

616 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 190.

617 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit., p. 270.

618 Richard Newbold Adams, Op. Cit., p. 121.

F. Elements assigned to limits of the phenomena of influence and power.

Specific elements: The following elements are assigned to limits of the phenomenon of influence and are not found as elements of limits of the phenomenon of power: influence is likely to be contained by subordinates or low-ranking individuals within a system since they are in larger numbers and may see as irrelevant the threats posed by authorities;^{619,620} influence may vary in the amount of restriction it places on the behavior of those subjected to influence and on the degree of bindingness that it creates for them;^{621,622,623} authorities can confine the influence of potential partisans by regulating access to resources, by making rewards or punishments contingent on attempts at influence, and by altering attitudes and desires of potential partisans toward political objects;⁶²⁴ influence is highly restricted with non-face-to-faceness of large formal

⁶¹⁹ Robert King Merton, Op. Cit., p. 465.

⁶²⁰ Harold J. Leavitt, Op. Cit., p. 147.

⁶²¹ William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 81.

⁶²² Arthur W. Reeves, Harold C. Melsness, and John E. Cheal, Op. Cit., p. 33.

⁶²³ Herbert A. Simon, Op. Cit., 1965, p. 222-223.

⁶²⁴ William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 116-117.

organizations by comparison to the greater opportunity for full and complete influence of small work group decision-making;⁶²⁵ the influence exerted by the influencing agent is contained by the resisting force of the person being influenced;⁶²⁶ the maladjustment in a person reduces his capacity for influencing others;⁶²⁷ the degree of influence is restricted by the amount of control a person possesses;⁶²⁸ environmental elements in an organization such as societal needs, available resources, state of knowledge, and sociopolitical values affect the capacity to influence;⁶²⁹ an organization's technology restricts its range of alternatives and the manager is constrained by the structure in which he operates;⁶³⁰ influence on others, especially on students by teachers, must be exercised with scrupulous caution thereby placing a moral limit on the degree of influence to be exercised;⁶³¹ and, differences in the amount of influence

625 Gordon L. Lippitt, Op. Cit., p. 51.

626 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., 151-152.

627 Sidney Rosen, Op. Cit., p. 69-70.

628 Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, Op. Cit., p. 219.

629 Raymond E. Miles, Op. Cit., p. 11.

630 Ibid., p. 13-14.

631 Arthur W. Reeves, Harold C. Melsness, and John E. Cheal, Op. Cit., p. 178.

that persons exercise can be attributed directly to differences in the distribution of political resources, to variations in the efficiency with which individuals use their political resource, and in the extent to which persons use their resources toward political purposes.⁶³²

The following elements are assigned to limits of the phenomenon of power and are not found as elements of limits of the phenomenon of influence: power is confined and directed by policies and actions permissible by a framework of socially sanctioned authority;^{633,634} power is controlled by extraneous facts, indeed decisions are subject to challenge;^{635,636} power is constrained by public opinion;^{637,638} the magnitude of power changes from one system to another, or from region to region;^{639,640} private economic power or

632 Robert A. Dahl, Op. Cit., 1976, p. 37.

633 William Herman Newman and E. Kirby Warren, Op. Cit., p. 246.

634 Floyd Hunter, Op. Cit., p. 7.

635 Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 60.

636 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, in Benjamin Sachs, Op. Cit., p. 61.

637 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 207.

638 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 127.

639 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 153.

640 Donald M. Wolfe, Op. Cit., p. 100.

corporate management is constrained by the countervailing power of those who are subject to it;^{641,642,643} the philosophy of a power system confines the exercise of power;⁶⁴⁴ the means utilized to achieve the collective goals of a power system contain influence;⁶⁴⁵ the conditions of legitimacy restrain the use of power;⁶⁴⁶ conscience and intellectual restraint contain power;⁶⁴⁷ power is ineffective in generating in others feelings of personal obligation and initiative required for many jobs;⁶⁴⁸ a supervisor who resorts to sanctions in relating with his subordinates will create alienation and eventually undermine his authority;⁶⁴⁹ power resting on power is more limited in scope than power resulting from met needs;⁶⁵⁰ the power of a supervisor diminishes

641 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 207.

642 John Kenneth Galbraith, Op. Cit., p. 111.

643 Harold J. Leavitt, Op. Cit., p. 127.

644 Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 88.

645 William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 180.

646 Willard R. Lane, et al., Op. Cit., p. 202.

647 Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 60.

648 William Herman Newman and E. Kirby Warren, Op. Cit., p. 246.

649 Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Op. Cit., p. 142.

650 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 22.

if subordinates can turn to coercion, do without benefits he has to offer, or have access to equally viable alternatives;⁶⁵¹ power based on expertise is fragile and constantly shifting since it rests on the frontier of progress;⁶⁵² power is depleted whenever an individual secures the advantages of superior status and makes stringent demands on others;⁶⁵³ an executive's ability to enforce his will is reduced by counter-powers that companies impose on the use of power;⁶⁵⁴ social exchange checks the abuse of power;⁶⁵⁵ the external power of an administrator is often reduced when authority is viewed as service;⁶⁵⁶ a creed used as a source of power eventually produces weariness and skepticism especially if the great efforts that it may inspire are not very successful;⁶⁵⁷ love of power, as a motive, is confined by timidity which in turn contains the desire for self-direction;⁶⁵⁸ a person's power

651 Ibid.

652 M. Crozier, Op. Cit., p. 165.

653 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 135.

654 William Herman Newman and E. Kirby Warren, Op. Cit., p. 247.

655 Edwin Paul Hollander, Op. Cit., 1978, p. 85.

656 Benjamin M. Sachs, Op. Cit., p. 65.

657 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 155.

658 Ibid., p. 24.

is confined by the amount of perceived power that a person attributes to himself in relation to another;⁶⁵⁹ the power of an individual is extremely limited whereas groups and organizations are organized to be more powerful through collective action and by influencing the magnitude and direction of communications thereby controlling the effectiveness of one person to influence another;^{660,661,662} and no collective category, or class, or group in and of itself can wield or use power.⁶⁶³

Common elements: The following element is assigned to limits of the phenomenon of influence and is also found as an element assigned to limits of the phenomenon of power: the capacity of an individual, a group or an organization to enforce or influence decisions is confined by its environment or the particular circumstances of situation and space within

659 Alvin Zander, Arthur R. Cohen, and Ezra Stotland, Op. Cit., p. 17.

660 George Caspar Homans, Op. Cit., 1974, p. 109.

661 Sidney Rosen, Op. Cit., p. 70.

662 Edgar Morphet, Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller, Op. Cit., p. 190.

663 Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 63.

a system or a subsystem.^{664,665,666,667,668}

G. Elements assigned to causes of the phenomena of influence and power.

Specific elements: The following elements are assigned to causes of the phenomenon of influence and are not found as elements of causes of the phenomenon of power: influence and decisions often originate through the informal group activity of a few leaders prior to formal action by authorities;⁶⁶⁹ influence is produced from the plurality of competing formal interest groups and associations which serves as a medium for effective expression of the people's self-interests;⁶⁷⁰ the behavior of an operative employee can be influenced by establishing in him attitudes, habits, and state of mind which will guide him toward decisions advantageous to the organization and to greater influence;⁶⁷¹

664 Gordon L. Lippitt, Op. Cit., p. 51.

665 Herbert A. Simon, Op. Cit., 1957, p. 8.

666 Robert King Merton, Op. Cit., p. 378.

667 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 207.

668 Raymond E. Miles, Op. Cit., p. 11.

669 Ralph B. Kimbrough, Op. Cit., p. 208.

670 Ibid., p. 13.

671 Herbert A. Simon, Op. Cit., 1965, p. 11.

influence originates from ecological control;⁶⁷² influence results from communication;⁶⁷³ influence originates from highly specific capacities and achievements;⁶⁷⁴ influence comes about from the exercise of influence which places the influencing agent in a favorable position over the influencee.⁶⁷⁵

The following elements are assigned to causes of the phenomenon of power and are not found as elements of causes of the phenomenon of influence: the mobilization and enhancement of power originates with the organization of collective effort as would be seen in processes of leadership;^{676, 677, 678, 679, 680} a person who builds his resources, personal

672 Dorwin Cartwright, Op. Cit., 1965, p. o-44.

673 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 7-15.

674 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 363.

675 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 83.

676 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 223.

677 Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1964, p. 239.

678 Benjamin M. Sachs, Op. Cit., p. 65.

679 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 129.

680 Ibid., p. 211.

and material, is more likely to become powerful;^{681,682,683} power is brought into existence by the coalescence of men, a philosophy and a group capable of organization into institutions;⁶⁸⁴ power evolves from control over rules;⁶⁸⁵ power results from the need to fight against entropy that threatens society with disorder;⁶⁸⁶ power on one side of a market situation creates the need for countervailing power to be exercised from the other side;⁶⁸⁷ the stronger the basis of power, the greater is the capacity to exercise power;⁶⁸⁸ the granting of authority by united consent, and passing of powers to one man gives rise to the greatest powers;⁶⁸⁹ and identification with others enhances the potential and position of power.⁶⁹⁰

681 Dorwin Cartwright, Op. Cit., 1965, p. 7.

682 David C. McClelland, Op. Cit., p. 78.

683 Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 19.

684 Ibid., p. 69.

685 Willard R. Lane, Op. Cit., p. 203.

686 Georges Balandier, Political Anthropology, translated by A. M. Sheridan Smith, New York, Random House, 1970, p. 36.

687 John Kenneth Galbraith, Op. Cit., p. 113.

688 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 165.

689 Thomas Hobbes, Op. Cit., p. 56.

690 Harold D. Hasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 78.

H. Elements assigned to consequences of the phenomena of influence and power.

Specific elements: The following elements are assigned to consequences of the phenomenon of influence and are not found as elements of consequences of the phenomenon of power: participation in acts of influence yield commitment, personal growth, and satisfaction;^{691,692,693} an influence attempt may result in producing an effect exactly opposite to the intent;⁶⁹⁴ whenever an individual succeeds in influencing people, although he considers that it is for their own good, he may be accused of manipulation;⁶⁹⁵ the influencing agent through the use of influence, receives certain commitments which he can then use;⁶⁹⁶ inability to influence is a major liability since the achievement of many goals occurs through influence;⁶⁹⁷ the use of a congruent means of influence increases the strength and stability of an existing orientation, especially if perceived as

691 Gordon L. Lippitt, Op. Cit., p. 78.

692 Warren G. Bennis, Op. Cit., p. 196-198.

693 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 422.

694 Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, Op. Cit., p. 219.

695 David C. McClelland, Op. Cit., p. 255.

696 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 431.

697 Sidney Rosen, Op. Cit., p. 70.

successful;⁶⁹⁸ a person may anticipate the expectations of the influence about the consequences of his behavior and he may act accordingly;⁶⁹⁹ influence which is not readily detected, such as the case of a teacher influencing a student, is easily subject to abuse;⁷⁰⁰ an effect of social influence is seen as an alteration of knowledge and belief about some aspect of the environment, as an alteration of attitudes, motivations, values, feelings toward some aspect of the environment, and alteration of overt behavior toward some aspect of the environment;⁷⁰¹ influence forms coalitions;⁷⁰² with occurrence of influence, ownership or control of resources may be relinquished, if, for example, money is paid for services;⁷⁰³ influence contributes to higher morale, and greater participant commitment in the organization when there is an increase in the total influence of an organization;⁷⁰⁴ the permeability of a group varies inversely with its

698 William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 173.

699 Herbert A. Simon, Op. Cit., 1957, p. 5.

700 Arthur W. Reeves, Harold C. Melsness, and John E. Cheal, Op. Cit., p. 178.

701 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 20.

702 Dorwin Cartwright, Op. Cit., 1965, p. 1-44.

703 Ibid., p. 17.

704 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 442.

influence;⁷⁰⁵ interpersonal influence is an asymmetrical relation between people;⁷⁰⁶ and the exercise of influence by a person does not necessarily alter the other person's influence.⁷⁰⁷

The following elements are assigned to consequences of the phenomenon of power and are not found as elements of consequences of the phenomenon of influence: whenever two kinds of power are emphasized at the same time or with repeated exchanges between men, there is a tendency for equalization or neutralization of power to occur;^{708,709} power results in an uncomfortable psychological position of dependence on a power-holder by the person subjected to his power;^{710,711} managerial use of power stifles initiative, enthusiasm and self-expression;⁷¹² authority is created from acceptance and institutionalization of power;⁷¹³ power allows

705 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 61.

706 Robert King Merton, Op. Cit., p. 464.

707 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 415.

708 George Caspar Homans, Op. Cit., 1974, p. 76.

709 Amitai Etzioni, Op. Cit., p. 6-7.

710 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 116.

711 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit., p. 234.

712 William Herman Newman and E. Kirby Warren, Op. Cit., p. 248.

713 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit., p. 271.

a person to withdraw from an authority figure and to establish his own independence;⁷¹⁴ the mechanization of power suppresses ambiguities;⁷¹⁵ power widens the field of responsibility with a resultant impact on the personality of a man;⁷¹⁶ whenever new power enters a system it increases the amount of power at the top with an increased possibility of forming further levels;⁷¹⁷ when mobilized, power changes through the redistribution of old power and formation of new equilibria;⁷¹⁸ a person in an administrative position of power has access to certain privileges such as information, control of appraisals, channel of promotion;⁷¹⁹ business power yields command over wealth;⁷²⁰ all sources of power yield influence; power creates the need for more power;⁷²² power reduces uncertainty in securing control;⁷²³ power

714 Benjamin M. Sachs, Op. Cit., p. 77.

715 Ibid., p. 69.

716 Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 121.

717 Richard Newbold Adams, Op. Cit., p. 81.

718 Lanore A. Netzer, et al., Op. Cit., p. 84.

719 William G. Scott, Op. Cit., p. 207.

720 Ibid., p. 389.

721 Ralph M. Stogdill, Op. Cit., p. 292.

722 Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1956, p. 100.

723 Edward Christie Banfield, Op. Cit., p. 320.

visions expressed as a revolt against established authority can stir social movements;⁷²⁴ in a relationship, the person with the greatest power gets the least from the exchanges;⁷²⁵ the enjoyment of power gives ascendancy;⁷²⁶ power over opinions tends to result in coalescence, concentration, and eventually a State monopoly;⁷²⁷ expert power is self-defeating and disappears with the end results of the rationalization process that is rules, programs, etc.;⁷²⁸ highly monopolistic and conservative power makes dynamic supervision very difficult;⁷²⁹ and, reciprocal power relationships result in an increased systemic complexity and pluralism, whereas power relationships with low reciprocity give rise to systemic simplicity and elitism.⁷³⁰

Common elements: The following elements are assigned to consequences of the phenomenon of influence and are also found as elements assigned to consequences of the phenomenon

724 David C. McClelland, Op. Cit., p. 170.

725 George Caspar Homans, Op. Cit., 1974; p. 73.

726 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 82.

727 Bertrand Russell, Op. Cit., 1938, p. 143.

728 M. Crozier, Op. Cit., p. 165.

729 Ben M. Harris, Supervisory Behavior in Education, 2nd Ed., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1975, p. 274.

730 Andrew S. McFarland, Op. Cit., p. 22.

of power: influence and power which is coercive, domineering, illegitimate and unfair gives rise to disapproval, frustration of needs, anger, aggression, alienation, retaliation, and resentful acquiescence on the part of those subjected to influence and power and reduction in power on the part of the power-holder;^{731,732,733,734,735,736,737,738,739,740,741} resources consumed in an influence or power transaction could be spent on alternative activity, which has been lost;^{742,743,744}

731 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 22-23.

732 Ibid., p. 135.

733 John R. P. French, Jr. and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 165.

734 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 31.

735 Amitai Etzioni, Op. Cit., p. 15-16.

736 Andrew M. Pettigrew, Op. Cit., 1973, p. 24.

737 Abraham Zaleznik, Op. Cit., p. 53.

738 William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 173.

739 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 31.

740 J. B. Cooper and J. L. McGaugh, "Leadership", in Cecil Austin Gibb, Ed., Op. Cit., p. 249.

741 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 442.

742 William A. Gamson, Op. Cit., p. 83-91.

743 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 31.

744 Ibid.

and, the outcome of power or influence may affect the powerholder's or influencing agent's reputation positively or negatively especially in relation to future transactions.^{745,746}

I. Elements assigned to relations of the phenomena of influence and power.

Specific elements: The following elements are assigned to relations of the phenomenon of influence and are not found as elements assigned to relations of the phenomenon of power: power is the potential for influence and influence is the result of actualized power;^{747,748,749,750} the use of authority in the sense of respect accorded to the authority figure implies influence;^{751,752} influence is a generic term including authority, control and power;^{753,754} the

745 Ibid.

746 Ibid.

747 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 7.

748 Dorwin Cartwright, Op. Cit., 1965, p. 1-44.

749 Gordon L. Lippitt, Op. Cit., p. 51.

750 Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, Op. Cit., p. 220.

751 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 40.

752 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 373.

753 Edward Christie Banfield, Op. Cit., p. 348.

754 Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, Op. Cit., p. 219.

process of influence is one of leadership;^{755,756,757} forms of influence based on power are forms of power to the extent that the scope of the influence is included within that of power;⁷⁵⁸ the medium focal to the societal community is influence and it is interchangeable for power, money, and value commitments;⁷⁵⁹ authority is but one of several forms of social influence or control;⁷⁶⁰ influence over subordinates which is acquired by obligating them does not initially form an established authority over them, it may eventually lead to this;⁷⁶¹ influence is a complex component of leadership;⁷⁶² social influence and communication are inseparable and equivalent aspects of an undifferentiated social process.⁷⁶³

755 Edwin Paul Hollander, Op. Cit., 1978, p. 1.

756 Gerald J. Skibbins, Op. Cit., p. 240.

757 Russell T. Gregg, Op. Cit., 1957, p. 305.

758 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 85.

759 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1977, p. 201.

760 Douglas McGregor, Op. Cit., p. 18.

761 Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Op. Cit., p. 143.

762 George R. Bach, "Scientific Concern for the Human Factor in Industry", in Robert Tannenbaum, Irving R. Weschler, and Fred Massarik, Op. Cit., p. 415.

763 Stephen W. King, Op. Cit., p. 7-15.

The following elements are assigned to relations of the phenomenon of power and are not found as elements of relations of the phenomenon of influence: legitimate power is the same as authority;^{764,765,766,767,768,769,770,771,772,773,774} power is the ability to use force, sanctions or rewards and authority is a legitimate right;^{775,776,777} power and authority are similar concepts, both refer to a

764 Amitai Etzioni, Op. Cit., p. 14.

765 George Caspar Homans, Op. Cit., 1974, p. 91-92.

766 Daniel E. Griffiths, Op. Cit., 1956, p. 120.

767 P. M. Blau, Op. Cit., p. 200.

768 Harold J. Leavitt, Op. Cit., p. 141.

769 Gerald J. Skibbins, Op. Cit., p. 240.

770 Harold J. Leavitt, William R. Dill, and Henry B. Eyring, The Organizational World, Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich, 1973, p. 43.

771 David V. J. Bell, Op. Cit., p. 40.

772 Richard Newbold Adams, Op. Cit., p. 36.

773 Edgar Morphet, Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller, Op. Cit., p. 141.

774 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit., p. 271.

775 Ibid., p. 230.

776 George Caspar Homans, Op. Cit., 1976, p. 276.

777 Willard R. Lane, et al., Op. Cit., p. 201.

relationship which deals with the ability of one to influence or persuade another;^{778,779} leadership and power are regarded as two closely related concepts;^{780,781} authority derived from status settles the terms on which power will be exchanged with influence;⁷⁸² power is seen as the capacity to exert influence;⁷⁸³ power involves control and resistance to it;⁷⁸⁴ power is the capacity to influence behavior, authority is legitimized power;⁷⁸⁵ power rests on legitimate authority;⁷⁸⁶ power is the basis of authority;⁷⁸⁷ the exercise of control and power are often interchanged within a system;⁷⁸⁸ the power to cause an event has little relation to the

778 Donald M. Wolfe, Op. Cit., p. 101.

779 Eugene J. Kolb, Op. Cit., p. 36.

780 David C. McClelland, Op. Cit., p. 254.

781 John R. P. French, Jr. and Richard Snyder, Op. Cit., p. 118.

782 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 373.

783 Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, Op. Cit., p. 220.

784 Edwin Paul Hollander, Op. Cit., 1978, p. 84.

785 Gordon L. Lippitt, Op. Cit., p. 51.

786 Joseph A. Litterer, Op. Cit., p. 413.

787 Herbert G. Hicks and C. Ray Gullett, Op. Cit., p. 231.

788 Richard Newbold Adams, Op. Cit., p. 26.

capacity to control feelings and opinions of men;⁷⁸⁹ power can be exchanged for influence;⁷⁹⁰ and power must be distinguished from influence.⁷⁹¹

Common elements: The following elements are assigned to relations of the phenomenon of influence and are also found as elements assigned to relations of the phenomenon of power: influence is persuasive and power is coercive;⁷⁹²,⁷⁹³,⁷⁹⁴,⁷⁹⁵ the phenomena of influence and power involve a dyadic relationship;⁷⁹⁶,⁷⁹⁷ in a general sense, one can consider power, influence and control as the capacity of one person to do something affecting another which changes the likely pattern of specified future events;⁷⁹⁸,⁷⁹⁹ authority

789 Adolf A. Berle, Op. Cit., p. 67.

790 Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Op. Cit., p. 84.

791 Talcott Parsons, Op. Cit., 1969, p. 46.

792 Robert M. Bierstedt, Op. Cit., p. 731.

793 Don Martindale, Op. Cit., p. 292.

794 Ibid.

795 Robert M. Bierstedt, Op. Cit., p. 731.

796 John R. P. French and Bertram Raven, Op. Cit., p. 150.

797 Ibid.

798 Nelson W. Polsby, Op. Cit., 1963, p. 3.

799 Ibid.

is the most restricted of a set of related concepts, influence includes mostly any interpersonal transaction with a psychological or behavioral effect, control includes successful and intended influence attempts, and power is the potential for influence backed by the means to coerce compliance;^{800,801} and authority and influence are related concepts which are elements of power.^{802,803}

In this first section an interphenomenal intradimensional analysis of influence and power has been presented, that is at the level of each dimension, elements are identified which are 1) specific to each phenomenon under study, and 2) common to both phenomena. Findings from this analysis are presented in the next section.

2. Presentation of Findings Resulting from the Interphenomenal Intradimensional Analysis of Influence and Power.

Findings from the interphenomenal intradimensional analysis of influence and power are presented in this section. At the level of each dimension, elements are presented which are specific to each phenomenon as well as common to

800 Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, Op. Cit., p. 220.

801 Ibid.

802 Floyd Hunter, Op. Cit., p. 164.

803 Ibid.

both phenomena. The findings from this analysis will be presented in the following manner. First, specific elements are identified as those assigned to a dimension of the phenomenon of influence and not found in the corresponding dimension of the phenomenon of power, and those which having been assigned to a dimension of the phenomenon of power are not found in the corresponding dimension of the phenomenon of influence. These are classified within each dimension according to common elements or those mentioned by more than one author, complementary elements or those mentioned by only one author and contradictory elements or those giving rise to divergent views from authors. Second, common elements are identified, these are elements which having been assigned to a dimension of the phenomenon of influence are also found in the corresponding dimension of the phenomenon of power.

A. Constituent elements of essential
definitions of the phenomena
of influence and power.

Specific elements assigned to the phenomenon of influence: Elements in this subsection are assigned to essential definitions of the phenomenon of influence and are not found as essential definitions of the phenomenon of power.

The following elements are mentioned by more than one author: a medium of persuasion; a process which induces a change in the state of another individual or group of

individuals; whenever a behavior is attempted by an influencee to meet an intention of an influencer without any action on the part of the latter or implicit influence.

The following elements are mentioned by only one author: a capacity to have an impact on the events of the organization or the behavior of a person or group; the value position and potential of a person or group; the result of actualized power; the kind of power that changes attitudes; kinetic power; a symbolic medium; an effort to change behavior; a process implicating two or more people; both an alteration of behavior and maintenance of behavior, other than it would have been without an intervention of the influencer; a transferable process from one solidary group-ing to another in a way similar to the transfer of wage income from the employer to the householder; a process consisting in affecting policies of others than the self; ideas or a plan of action sponsored by some and followed by others in preference to alternatives; the resultant force on a system in the life of a person which has its source in an act of the influencer, this resultant force induced by the influencer consists of a force to change the system in the direction desired by the influencer and an opposing resistance initiated by this same act; voluntary acceptance of guidance; leadership; giving another the premises for action, attitudes, habits, etc. leading to organizational goals; a sort of

prediction in the form of advice, encouragement, warning, etc. that given certain actions certain outcomes will occur.

The following elements give rise to divergent views from authors: the likelihood of a give-and-take communication ending with the person who accepts advice potentially influencing the outcome to some minor extent; and control over the premises of decisions, with the decisions of the subordinate being consistent with premises selected for him by his superior.

Specific elements assigned to the phenomenon of power: Elements which follow are assigned to essential definitions of the phenomenon of power and are not found as essential definitions of the phenomenon of influence.

The following elements are mentioned by more than one author: potential for influence; decisions made by the power-holder; an influence relationship; a capacity within a relationship of imposing one's own will even against resistance; the ability to secure the achievement of goals; potential ability to use force; a capacity for action; the exercise of coerciveness; a part of human action; the influence of others to behave in terms of one's own goals and interests.

The following elements are mentioned by only one author: participation in the decisions affecting another; a functional-relational system which is controlled by

institutional patterns, collectivities and roles; a mutual influence between authorities and potential partisans; a declared intent to shift an individual's value position either in the direction of more or less enjoyment depending on the use of promise or threat; a present means which serves to obtain some future apparent good; a force that makes organizations operate; the basis of responsible action; a latent force; authority; influence over thought; the enhancement of others; the ability of a person or group to impose its will on others in a recurrent manner; the cement which holds a society.

The following elements give rise to divergent views on the part of various authors: the relative ability of people to influence each other, that is the dependence or interdependence of one person on another; and the provision of sanctions or rewards.

Common elements assigned to the phenomena of influence and power: The following elements are assigned to essential definitions of the phenomenon of influence and are also found as elements assigned to essential definitions of the phenomenon of power: a behavior causing behavior; and control over the behavior of another person.



B. Constituent elements of the bases
of the phenomena of
influence and power.

Specific elements assigned to the phenomenon of influence: Elements in this subsection are assigned to bases of the phenomenon of influence and are not found as bases of the phenomenon of power.

The following elements are mentioned by more than one author: possession of specific resources such as power, achievements, motivation and self-esteem, access to communication channels, the ability to hire, promote and fire, the ability to allocate corporation money to civic projects, the ability to influence large numbers of voters and the ability to enhance or damage reputation, information; control over specific resources such as controls over gains and costs and physical control over another's body, control over funding and control over legal sanctions, and control over communication; rational persuasion which entails improving logic and/or information of the influencee; the solidarity of a group which gives rise to loyalty and belongingness; friendship; respect; authority; and acceptance of role within an organization.

The following elements are mentioned by only one author: the use of supportive relationships and group methods of decision-making and supervision; the strengthening and inspiring of an audience by a leader; environmental

matters such as laws, governmental regulations, professional organizations, trade unions, and customer reactions; the exercise of influence over another sustains the capacity of the influencer to exercise influence by placing him in a favorable position vis-a-vis the influencee; the adherence of an individual to agreed upon procedures; the command over commitments; the established rules of an organization; temporal features that is the time dimension; control over another; knowledge about the environment; insight into the decision-making process; selection of symbols and words that create a favorable impression; a debt or obligation that an influencer can collect; similarity; membership group; communication; inspiration or appeal to emotions; and norms underlying organic solidarity.

Elements have not been identified as part of bases of the phenomenon of influence which would express contradictory views on the part of authors.

Specific elements assigned to the phenomenon of power: Elements in this subsection are assigned to bases of the phenomenon of power and are not found as elements of bases of the phenomenon of influence.

The following elements are mentioned by more than one author: the possession of resources, such resources being physical force, popularity, charisma, intellectual ability, legal authority, effort and interest, personal ambition,

leadership ability, access to mass media, family ties, leadership in informal groups, friendship ties, knowledge of the political system, and ownership; control over specific resources such as jobs and credits, votes, income, terms of relationship, and economic power such as production and delivery of goods and services; legitimacy, reference, institutions or organizations; persuasion; the needs or values the power act is being directed; and violent force.

The following elements are mentioned by only one author: coalescence of three elements, men, a philosophy, and a group capable of organization into institutions; a system of inequalities that permits influence of lower class by coalitions; the provision of service; the distribution of resources; a leader's association with various collective systems of power, on subsystems, and on his ability to manipulate the larger system; control of the decision-making process; availability of controls over power or accountability; an interaction among 1) the possession or control of resources, 2) the target's needs or values, 3) credibility, and 4) good will and responsiveness; political symbols; implied terms of statutes, rules and regulations; creed; plurality in kinds of power; anonymity; fear, tradition, interaction between creeds and other sources of power, and substitution of a new creed for an old one; political alliance; sensitivity to the needs of others; numbers;

manipulation of symbolic rewards; success; and a system of ideas or philosophy.

Elements have not been identified as part of bases of the phenomenon of power which would express contradictory views by authors.

Common elements assigned to the phenomenon of influence and power: The following elements are assigned to bases of the phenomenon of influence and are also found as elements assigned to bases of the phenomenon of power: the possession of specific resources such as wealth, prestige and reputation, knowledge, competence, skill and expertise, physical strength, personality, social status; control over resources; control over information; coercion in the form of threats or appeals; official position or office; rewards and inducements; beliefs and a system of morals; and the relationship between two individuals or interpersonal transaction.

C. Constituent elements of the conditions of the phenomena of influence and power.

Specific elements assigned to the phenomenon of influence: Elements in this subsection are assigned to conditions of the phenomenon of influence and are not found as conditions of the phenomenon of power.

The following elements are mentioned by more than one author: a person's perception is important in determining whether he will react to an influence attempt from another

person; an individual's motivation; the selection of resources constituting a base which are appropriate to the social setting under consideration; the manipulation of a person's environment especially in keeping with his needs; dependence of one person on another; dependence of the influencee on information; institutionalization of moral values and affect; the occurrence of interaction; the perception by others that the influencing agent is living up to the group's tasks and expectations.

The following elements are mentioned by only one author: operation, by the influencing agent, on the intentions of the object of persuasion and through positive channels; location of centers of latent power in the development of educational influence strategies; devotion from subordinates and close alliance with other executives both at one's own level and above serves to protect and enhance one's sphere of influence; the consistency between the advocated premise and the receiver's cognitive state; obtention of agreement that influence exists as a prerequisite to consent; the adequacy of the means employed by the influencer to act on the influencee's motivations and expectations; the attraction of a person to the influencing agent; command over commitments; access to skills, knowledge, tools; combination of resources by individuals and groups; the effectiveness of the communication processes; the relation of the influence act to

the functional equilibrium of the system on which it impinges: informing the influencee of the rewards available to satisfy his needs; knowledge about the consequences of behavior; increasing the skills of people in an organization; the behavior of a person in the use of a base; a person's accurate view of reality; and the perceived adherence by the influencing agent to the normative behavior of the group.

No element has been identified which constitutes one of the conditions of the phenomenon of influence which gave rise to divergent views among authors.

Specific elements assigned to the phenomenon of power: Elements in this subsection are assigned to conditions of the phenomenon of power and are not found as conditions of the phenomenon of influence.

The following elements are mentioned by more than one author: the possession of one or more resources; the marginal value the person attaches to the resources being utilized by the power wielder; resources must be low in relation to demand; the perception by those influenced of the number of positive rewards they think a potential social agent can mobilize; the perception by those influenced of the ability of the influencing agent to mediate punishment; integration of the system including unifying of staff and binding of units, individual and collective; the ability of individuals to command the loyalty of those that they wish to influence;

a realistic appraisal by the power-holder of his power relative to that of others; a more or less accepted system of ideas and morals; the number of available alternatives; the degree of threat and fear experienced by an individual; a structured institutional framework.

The following elements are mentioned by only one author: the command over and rendering of services others need by the influencing agent establishes their dependence on and obligation to him; the distribution of resources within power structures by means of which compliance can be enforced; coming through with the promised reward by the power-holder; the need for a wide range of implied powers; the maintenance of a threat capability; a belief in the sanctity of traditions by which the power-holder exercises power and in the legalities of the laws, decrees, and directives promulgated by the power-holder; an apparent conformity of the influencing agent to the political formula; the relationship of good will that prevails between the power-holder and the target; a deep feeling of creed or sentiment by the majority of the population; some demand for reward; a generalized capacity to secure compliance along with the use of symbolic means; a cultural recognition by others of an actor's control of the environment; the existence of a time lag between the actions of the person exerting power and the response of the respondent; the existence of some connection between the actor and the

respondent; a uniformity which depends upon sentiment and habit; the making of decisions by a person which affect the course of action of an enterprise to a greater extent than do decisions of others, and which influences other decisions; the right of expulsion and its related financial hardship; communication about the relevant rewards and punishments and about the specific behavior upon which they depend; the perception and understanding of the power communication; the size of the unit governed by the power-holder; the power-holder remaining indifferent to the benefits that others can offer him in exchange for his benefits; and a recognition that subdominants as well as dominants operate in the community power structure of the school.

Elements have not been identified as parts of conditions of the phenomenon of power which give rise to divergent views among authors.

Common elements assigned to the phenomenon of influence and power: The following elements are assigned to conditions of the phenomenon of influence and are also found as elements assigned to conditions of the phenomenon of power: control of some resources which could serve as rewards or sanctions or ends to means being sought; persons having needs that could be satisfied by resources that the influencing agent has to offer; the perception by a person that the influencing agent has a legitimate right to prescribe behavior

for him, thereby sanctioning the authority of the position and accepting the influencing agent and his authority; the effective use of resources, that is, on the degree of congruence between the act of influence and goals and cultural norms, etc.; and the perceived competence of the influencing agent by the influencee.

D. Constituent elements of purposes
of the phenomena of
influence and power.

Specific elements assigned to the phenomenon of influence: Elements in this subsection are assigned to purposes of the phenomenon of influence and are not found as purposes of the phenomenon of power.

No element has been identified which constitutes one of the purposes of the phenomenon of influence and which is mentioned by more than one author.

The following elements are mentioned by only one author: to shape the attitudes or behavior of others; to strengthen an individual's power base by increasing his resources; to augment future influence; and to achieve some sort of gratification.

No element has been identified which constitutes one of the purposes of the phenomenon of influence which gave rise to divergent views among authors.

Specific elements assigned to the phenomenon of power: Elements in this subsection are assigned to purposes of the phenomenon of power and are not found as purposes of the phenomenon of influence.

The following element is mentioned by more than one author: to control people and the decision-making process.

The following elements are mentioned by only one author: to coordinate human activity which is important for effective organizations; to enforce laws and decisions; to acquire authority; to obtain and secure the objects of one's desires; to perpetuate interests already vested in an organization; to feel powerful; and autocratic power aspires to the ideal of conformity.

No element has been identified which constitutes one of the purposes of the phenomenon of power which gave rise to divergent views among authors.

Common elements assigned to the phenomena of influence and power: The following element is assigned to purposes of the phenomenon of influence and is also found as an element of the phenomenon of power: to achieve goals.

E. Constituent elements of functions of the phenomena of influence and power.

Specific elements assigned to the phenomenon of influence: Elements in this subsection are assigned to functions of the phenomenon of influence and are not found as

elements of functions of the phenomenon of power.

The following elements are mentioned by more than one author: persuasion of others toward performance; altering the ability of others to achieve their goals or satisfy their needs; integration of social system.

The following elements are mentioned by only one author: the handling of tensions which arise continually in a dynamic society between the egalitarian and the elitist components; bringing about organizational change through the peer group; augmenting future influence; affecting the motivation to produce; regulation of communication in systems; mediation; regulation of the interplay between political support and identification by membership in solidary involvements; bringing about an allocation of sub-collectivity organizations and their memberships, statuses, roles compatible with the interest of the collectivity and of the units; and enhancement of the capacity for solidarity of the societal community.

No element has been identified which constitutes one of the functions of the phenomenon of influence which gave rise to divergent views among authors.

Specific elements assigned to the phenomenon of power: Elements in this subsection are assigned to functions of the phenomenon of power and are not found as functions of the phenomenon of influence.

The following elements are mentioned by more than one author: the control of others' behavior by an individual or by an organization; stabilization of the organization in the face of a changing environment; the coordination of activities in the pursuit of a purposeful course of action; and the provision of services to others.

The following elements are mentioned by only one author: an essential aspect to the inauguration, guaranteed continuance, and order of an association; implied powers allow progress, growth and experimentation in an organization by providing a frontier where imaginative and dynamic administration can occur; determining to whose demand the organization will yield; a vital determinant of the nature and quality of the interaction of persons; the allocation of power and the system of power arrangements have a decisive influence over the kind of adjustment people reach in an organization and over the outcomes and efficiency of such an organization; organization and recognition of the field of responsibility; institutions give power in order to secure institutional action in their power; provision of the bargaining strength of an organization; the determination of criteria to be used in measuring organizational effectiveness and the means for evaluating such criteria; the provision of legitimated rights to make and implement decisions which are collectively binding; shaping the process is building a school

system; the exercise of power by educational decision-makers serves to change the way people perceive education and to supply them with information and opinion which is in keeping with national policy; school authorities utilize and have power to levy taxes, determine the scope of programs, determine curriculum and to establish rules and regulations relating to the operation of schools; supporting the fundamental order of society and its social organizations; dominating and controlling the environment thereby allowing societies to survive; serving the basic needs of society; serving as the medium with political primacy which can serve to acquire both human services and the demands for collective action; a capacity of affecting the distribution of resources by having an effect on the setting of objectives and on the operation of the political-economic system; a means of attempting to satisfy one's desire for more; and serving to monopolize needed rewards, and discouraging coalitions.

No element has been identified which constitutes one of the functions of the phenomenon of power which gave rise to divergent views among authors.

Common elements assigned to the phenomena of influence and power: helping to shape the attitudes and/or behavior of influencees; and the mobilization of resources, capacities and commitments of units to valued association.

F. Constituent elements of limits of the phenomena of influence and power.

Specific elements assigned to the phenomenon of influence: Elements in this subsection are assigned to limits of the phenomenon of influence and are not found as part of limits of the phenomenon of power.

The following elements are mentioned by more than one author: influence is likely to be contained by subordinates or low-ranking individuals within a system since they are in larger numbers and may see as irrelevant the threats posed by authorities; and influence may vary in the amount of restriction it places on the behavior of those subjected to influence and on the degree of bindingness that it creates for them.

The following elements are mentioned by only one author: authorities can confine the influence of potential partisans by regulating access to resources, by making rewards or punishments contingent on attempts at influence, and by altering attitudes and desires of potential partisans toward political objects; influence is highly restricted with non-face-to-faceness of large formal organizations by comparison to the greater opportunity for full and complete influence of small work group decision-making; the influence exerted by the influencing agent is contained by the resisting force of the person being influenced; the maladjustment in a person

reduces his capacity for influencing others; the degree of influence is restricted by the amount of control a person possesses; environmental elements in an organization such as societal needs, available resources, state of knowledge, and socio-political values affect the capacity to influence; an organization's technology restricts its range of alternatives and the manager is constrained by the structure in which he operates; influence on others, especially on students by teachers, must be exercised with scrupulous caution thereby placing a moral limit on the degree of influence to be exercised; and, differences in the amount of influence that persons exercise can be attributed directly to differences in the distribution of political resources, to variations in the efficiency with which individuals use their political resource, and in the extent to which persons use their resources toward political purposes.

No element has been identified which constitutes one of the limits of the phenomenon of influence which gave rise to divergent views among authors.

Specific elements assigned to the phenomenon of power: Elements in this subsection are assigned to limits of the phenomenon of power and are not found as part of limits of the phenomenon of influence.

The following elements are mentioned by more than one author: power is confined and directed by policies and

actions permissible by a framework of socially sanctioned authority; power is controlled by extraneous facts, indeed decisions are subject to challenge; power is constrained by public opinion; the magnitude of power changes from one system to another, or from region to region; private economic power or corporate management is constrained by the countervailing power of those who are subject to it.

The following elements are mentioned by only one author: the philosophy of a power system confines the exercise of power; the means utilized to achieve the collective goals of a power system contain influence; the conditions of legitimacy restrain the use of power; conscience and intellectual restraint contain power; power is ineffective in generating in others feelings of personal obligation and initiative required for many jobs; a supervisor who resorts to sanctions in relating with his subordinates will create alienation and eventually undermine his authority; power resting on power is more limited in scope than power resulting from met needs; the power of a supervisor diminishes if subordinates can turn to coercion, do without benefits he has to offer, or have access to equally viable alternatives; power based on expertise is fragile and constantly shifting since it rests on the frontier of progress; power is depleted ~~whenever~~ an individual secures the advantages of superior status and makes stringent demands on others; an executive's

ability to enforce his will is reduced by counter-powers that companies impose on the use of power; social exchange checks the abuse of power; the external power of an administrator is often reduced when authority is viewed as service; a creed used as a source of power eventually produces weariness and skepticism especially if the great efforts that it may inspire are not very successful; love of power, as a motive, is confined by timidity which in turn contains the desire for self-direction; a person's power is confined by the amount of perceived power that a person attributes to himself in relation to another.

Various authors have expressed divergent opinions regarding the following element which constitutes a limit of the phenomenon of power: the relative power of an individual and of a collectivity.

Common elements assigned to the phenomena of influence and power: The following element is assigned to limits of the phenomenon of influence and is also found as an element assigned to limits of the phenomenon of power: the capacity of an individual, a group or an organization to enforce or influence decisions is confined by its environment or the particular circumstances of situation and space within a system or a subsystem.

G. Constituent elements of causes of the phenomena of influence and power.

Specific elements assigned to the phenomenon of influence: Elements in this subsection are assigned to causes of the phenomenon of influence and are not found as part of causes of the phenomenon of power.

No element has been identified as mentioned by more than one author while being assigned to causes of the phenomenon of influence.

The following elements are mentioned by only one author: influence and decisions often originate through the informal group activity of a few leaders prior to formal action by authorities; influence is produced from the plurality of competing formal interest groups and associations which serves as a medium for effective expression of the people's self-interests; the behavior of an operative employee can be influenced by establishing in him attitudes, habits, and state of mind which will guide him toward decisions advantageous to the organization and to greater influence; influence originates from ecological control; influence results from communication; influence originates from highly specific capacities and achievements; influence comes about from the exercise of influence which places the influencing agent in a favorable position over the influencee.

No element has been identified which constitutes one of the causes of the phenomenon of influence which gave rise to divergent opinions among authors.

Specific elements assigned to the phenomenon of power: Elements in this subsection are assigned to causes of the phenomenon of power and are not found as causes of the phenomenon of influence.

The following elements are mentioned by more than one author: the mobilization and enhancement of power originates with the organization of collective effort as would be seen in processes of leadership; and a person who builds his resources, personal and material, is more likely to become powerful.

The following elements are mentioned by only one author: power is brought into existence by the coalescence of men, a philosophy and a group capable of organization into institutions; power evolves from control over rules; power results from the need to fight ~~against entropy~~ that threatens society with disorder; power on one side of a market situation creates the need for countervailing power to be exercised from the other side; the strongest the basis of power, the greater is the capacity to exercise power; the granting of authority by united consent, and passing of powers to one man gives rise to the greatest powers; and identification with others enhances the potential and position of power.

No element has been identified which constitutes one of the causes of the phenomenon of power which gave rise to divergent opinions among authors.

Common elements assigned to the phenomena of influence and power: No element has been identified which having been assigned to causes of the phenomenon of influence was equally assigned to causes of the phenomenon of power.

H. Constituent elements of consequences of the phenomena of influence and power..

Specific elements assigned to the phenomenon of influence: Elements in this subsection are assigned to consequences of the phenomenon of influence and are not found as part of consequences of the phenomenon of power.

The following element is mentioned by more than one author: participation in acts of influence yields commitment, personal growth, and satisfaction.

The following elements are mentioned by only one author: an influence attempt may result in producing an effect exactly opposite to the intent; whenever an individual succeeds in influencing people, although he considers that it is for their own good, he may be accused of manipulation; the influencing agent through the use of influence, receives certain commitments which he can then use; inability to influence is a major liability since the achievement of many goals occurs through influence; the use of a congruent means

of influence increases the strength and stability of an existing orientation, especially if perceived as successful; a person may anticipate the expectations of the influence about the consequences of his behavior and he may act accordingly; influence which is not readily detected, such as the case of a teacher influencing a student, is easily subject to abuse; an effect of social influence is seen as an alteration of knowledge and belief about some aspect of the environment, as an alteration of attitudes, motivations, values, feelings toward some aspect of the environment, and alteration of overt behavior toward some aspect of the environment; influence forms coalitions; with occurrence of influence, ownership or control of resources may be relinquished, if, for example, money is paid for services; influence contributes to higher morale, and greater participant commitment in the organization when there is an increase in the total influence of an organization; the permeability of a group varies inversely with its influence.

Various authors have expressed divergent opinions regarding the following element which constitutes a consequence of the phenomenon of influence: the symmetry or asymmetry in relations between people.

Specific elements assigned to the phenomenon of power: Elements in this subsection are assigned to consequences of the phenomenon of power and are not found as part of

consequences of the phenomenon of influence.

The following elements are mentioned by more than one author: whenever two kinds of power are emphasized at the same time or with repeated exchanges between men, there is a tendency for equalization or neutralization of power to occur; power results in an uncomfortable psychological position of dependence on a power-holder by the person subjected to his power.

The following elements are mentioned by only one author: managerial use of power stifles initiative, enthusiasm and self-expression; authority is created from acceptance and institutionalization of power; power allows a person to withdraw from an authority figure and to establish his own independence; the mechanization of power suppresses ambiguities; power widens the field of responsibility with a resultant impact on the personality of a man; whenever new power enters a system it increases the amount of power at the top with an increased possibility of forming further levels; when mobilized, power changes through the redistribution of old power and formation of new equilibria; a person in an administrative position of power has access to certain privileges such as information, control of appraisals, channel of promotion; business power yields command over wealth; all sources of power yield influence; power creates the need for more power; power reduces uncertainty in securing control;

power visions expressed as a revolt against established authority can stir social movements; in a relationship, the person with the greatest power gets the least from the exchanges; the enjoyment of power gives ascendancy; power over opinions tends to result in coalescence, concentration, and eventually a State monopoly; expert power is self-defeating and disappears with the end results of the rationalization process that is rules, programs, etc.; highly monopolistic and conservative power makes dynamic supervision very difficult; and, reciprocal power relationships result in an increased systemic complexity and pluralism, whereas power relationships with low reciprocity give rise to systemic simplicity and elitism.

Various authors have expressed divergent opinions regarding the following element which constitutes a consequence of the phenomenon of power: the exercise of power results in ambivalence, suspicion and mistrust or alternatively in increased liking of the powerful members by those members with less power.

Common elements assigned to the phenomena of influence and power: Elements in this subsection are assigned to consequences of the phenomenon of influence and are also found as elements assigned to consequences of the phenomenon of power: influence and power which is coercive, domineering, illegitimate and unfair gives rise to disapproval, frustration



of needs, anger, aggression, alienation, retaliation, and resentful acquiescence on the part of those subjected to influence and power and reduction in power on the part of the power-holder; resources consumed in an influence or power transaction could be spent on alternative activity, which has been lost; and, the outcome of power or influence may affect the power-holder's or influencing agent's reputation positively or negatively especially in relation to future transactions.

I. Constituent elements of relations of the phenomena of influence and power.

Specific elements assigned to the phenomenon of influence: Elements in this subsection are assigned to relations of the phenomenon of influence and are not found as part of relations of the phenomenon of power.

The following elements are mentioned by more than one author: power is the potential for influence and influence is the result of actualized power; the use of authority in the sense of respect accorded to the authority figure implies influence; influence is a generic term including authority, control and power; the process of influence is one of leadership.

The following elements are mentioned by only one author: forms of influence based on power are forms of power to the extent that the scope of the influence is included

within that of power; the medium focal to the societal community is influence and it is interchangeable for power, money, and value commitments; authority is but one of several forms of social influence or control; influence over subordinates which is acquired by obligating them does not initially form an established authority over them, it may eventually lead to this; influence is a complex component of leadership; social influence and communication are inseparable and equivalent aspects of an undifferentiated social process.

No element has been identified which constitutes one of the relations of the phenomenon of influence which gave rise to divergent views among authors.

Specific elements assigned to the phenomenon of power: Elements in this subsection are assigned to relations of the phenomenon of power and are not found as part of relations of the phenomenon of influence.

The following elements are mentioned by more than one author: legitimate power is the same as authority; power is the ability to use force, sanctions or rewards and authority is a legitimate right; power and authority are similar concepts, both refer to a relationship which deals with the ability of one to influence or persuade another; leadership and power are regarded as two closely related concepts.

The following elements are mentioned by only one author: authority derived from status settles the terms on

which power will be exchanged with influence; power is seen as the capacity to exert influence; power involves control and resistance to it; power is the capacity to influence behavior, authority is legitimized power.

Various authors have expressed divergent opinions regarding the following elements which constitute relations of the phenomenon of power; power as resting on authority or alternatively as a basis of authority; the interchangeability or noninterchangeability of the exercise of controls and of power; and the exchangeability or distinctiveness of power and influence.

Common elements assigned to the phenomena of influence and power: The following elements are assigned to relations of the phenomenon of influence and are also found as elements assigned to relations of the phenomenon of power: influence is persuasive and power is coercive; the phenomena of influence and power involve a dyadic relationship; in a general sense, one can consider power, influence and control as the capacity of one person to do something affecting another which changes the likely pattern of specified future events; authority is the most restricted of a set of related concepts, influence includes mostly any interpersonal transaction with a psychological or behavioral effect, control includes successful and intended influence attempts, and power is the potential for influence backed by the means to coerce

compliance; and authority and influence are related concepts which are elements of power.

Findings from the interphenomenal intradimensional analysis of influence and power have been presented in this section. The next brief section will contain an interpretation of these findings.

3. Interpretation of findings.

All dimensions studied as part of the interphenomenal intradimensional analysis of influence and power contained elements assigned by authors which were specific to each phenomenon, and all dimensions with one exception contained elements which were common to both phenomena.

This chapter contained an interphenomenal intradimensional analysis of influence and power. Chapter V, which follows, will consist of a synoptic view of essential findings from the analyses contained in chapters II, III, and IV.

CHAPTER V

ESSENTIAL FINDINGS FROM THE ANALYSES OF THE PHENOMENA OF INFLUENCE AND POWER: A SYNOPTIC VIEW

This chapter contains a synoptic view of the essential findings arising from the intraphenomenal intradimensional, intraphenomenal interdimensional, and interphenomenal intradimensional analyses presented in the three previous chapters. It serves to identify, within the limits of a descriptive, comparative and exploratory analysis, those elements which could be utilized in the development of a differential theory of influence and power.

Based on results from writings found in chapters II, III and IV, it seems therefore necessary to note that from a descriptive, comparative and exploratory angle the common elements arising from the intraphenomenal intradimensional analysis of each phenomenon, the specific elements arising from the intraphenomenal interdimensional analysis of each phenomenon and the specific elements arising from the interphenomenal intradimensional analysis of these phenomena should be important in the elaboration of a differential theory of influence and of power.

In considering elements listed in the synoptic view, the gradation toward an increased degree of specificity should be noted. It should, therefore, be recognized that

Common elements arising from the intraphenomenal intradimensional analysis are important since they are mentioned by more than one author, but that specific elements arising from the intraphenomenal interdimensional analysis and especially those arising from the interphenomenal intradimensional analysis have greater importance, due to their increased degree of adherence to each dimension of each phenomenon and to each phenomenon.

The following synoptic view lists for each phenomenon respectively: 1) common elements arising from the intraphenomenal intradimensional analysis that is those elements assigned to a dimension of each phenomenon and which are mentioned by more than one author; 2) specific elements arising from the intraphenomenal interdimensional analysis of each phenomenon that is those elements assigned to a dimension of each phenomenon, mentioned by more than one author and which are not found in another dimension of the same phenomenon; and 3) specific elements arising from the interphenomenal intradimensional analysis of these phenomena, that is those elements found in a dimension of one of these phenomena and not found in the corresponding dimension of the other phenomena, and in addition these elements are not assigned to another dimension of the same phenomenon and are mentioned by more than one author.

Synoptic View
Essential Findings from Analyses of Influence and Power

I. Intraphenomenal intradimensional analysis - Common elements that is those assigned to the dimensions of each phenomenon and which are mentioned by more than one author.

1. Phenomenon of influence:

A. Essential definitions:

- . social causation, that is, a behavior causing behavior, and a behavior producing an effect in behavior, psychological state or any other condition;
- . control over the behavior of another person or persons;
- . a medium of persuasion;
- . a process which induces a change in the state of another individual or group of individuals; and
- . whenever a behavior is attempted by an influencee to meet an intention of an influencer without any action on the part of the latter or implicit influence.

B. Bases:

- . the possession of resources such as wealth, power, status, prestige and reputation, competence, achievements, knowledge, personality, physical strength and well-being, motivation and self-esteem, access to communication channels, ability to promote, hire and fire, the ability to allocate corporation money to civic projects, the ability to influence large numbers of voters, and the ability to enhance or damage reputation;
- . the control of resources such as control over gains and costs, physical control over another's body, control over funding, legal sanctions, and communication;

- . inducements;
- . sanctions or constraints in the form of threats or appeals;
- . the possession and control of information;
- . customs, beliefs and values;
- . interpersonal transactions;
- . rational persuasion which entails improving logic and/or information of the influencee;
- . the solidarity of a group which gives rise to loyalty and belongingness;
- . friendship;
- . the legitimate authority of a position;
- . respect;
- . authority; and
- . acceptance of role within an organization.

C. Conditions:

- . acceptance of the influencing agent and his authority by those subjected to the influencing act;
- . the perceived competence of the influencing agent by the influencee;
- . a person's perception in determining whether he will react to an influence attempt from another person;
- . an influencee's motivation;
- . the consonance between the act of influence and its apparent purpose and group goals;
- . resources constituting a base which are appropriate to the social setting under consideration;
- . the manipulation of a person's environment especially in keeping with his needs;

- . dependence of one person on another;
- . dependence of the influencee on information;
- . institutionalization of moral values and effects;
- . interaction, or interpersonal transaction;
- . control over resources, primarily rewards;
- . the needs of the influencee; and
- . the perception by others that the influencing agent is living up to the group's tasks and expectations.

D. Purposes:

No element has been identified which constitutes one of the purposes of the phenomenon of influence and which is mentioned by more than one author.

E. Functions:

- . to persuade others toward performance;
- . to alter the ability of others to achieve their needs; and
- . a medium capable of integration of social systems.

F. Limits:

- . the particular circumstances of situation and space within a system or subsystem;
- . the subordinates or low-ranking individuals within a system may see as irrelevant the threats posed by authorities due to their larger numbers; and
- . there is a varying amount of restriction that influence places on the behavior of those subjected to it and on the degree of bindingness that it creates for them.

G. Causes:

No element has been identified which constitutes one of the causes of the phenomenon of influence and which is mentioned by more than one author.

H. Consequences:

- . participation in acts of influence yields commitment, personal growth, and satisfaction;
- . hostility, alienation, and resentful acquiescence may happen in those subjected to coercive and domineering influence; and
- . resources consumed in an influence transaction could be spent on alternative activity, which has been lost.

I. Relations:

- . influence is persuasive while power is coercive;
- . power is potential for influence and influence is the result of actualized power;
- . authority in the sense of respect accorded to the authority figure implies influence;
- . influence is a generic term which includes authority, control, and power; and
- . the process of influence is one of leadership.

2. Phenomenon of power

A. Essential definitions:

- . the potential for influence;
- . the ability to control others and events;
- . more specifically, the ability to control the reward and punishment system, rewards, processes that are part of the meaningful environment of a person, and the potential to permit or to withhold gratification of a need;
- . the capacity of the power-holder to make decisions;
- . participation in the decisions affecting another;
- . an influence relationship between people;
- . a capacity within a relationship of imposing one's own will even against resistance;

- . social causation, that is, the capacity of a person to change the behavior of another;
- . the ability to secure the achievement of goals;
- . the potential ability to use force;
- . a capacity for action;
- . the exercise of coerciveness;
- . a part of human action; and
- . influencing others to behave in terms of one's own goals and interests.

B. Bases:

- . the possession of resources;
- . possession of resources that a person can use in order to affect others such as wealth, prestige and reputation, knowledge, competence, skill and expertise, physical strength, physical force, personality, popularity, charisma, intellectual ability, legal authority, effort and interest, personal ambition, leadership ability, access to mass media, family ties, leadership in informal groups, friendship ties, knowledge of the political system, and ownership;
- . control over resources generally and more specifically control over jobs, credit, votes, income, terms of relationship, information, and economic power such as production and delivery of goods and services;
- . the exercise of coercion;
- . rewards;
- . legitimacy;
- . an official position or office;
- . institutions or organizations;
- . beliefs and a system of morals;

- . a system of ideas or philosophy;
- . a capacity for persuasion;
- . the relationship between two individuals;
- . the needs or values of the person to whom a power act is being directed; and
- . violent force.

C. Conditions:

- . the possession of one or more resources;
- . control of some resources or access to resources which could serve as sanction or means to ends being sought;
- . a person's needs that could be satisfied by resources that the influencing agent has to offer;
- . the marginal value the person attaches to the resources being utilized by the power-holder;
- . resources must be low in relation to demand;
- . the perception of those being influenced of the number of rewards that an influencing agent can mobilize;
- . the perception by those influenced of the ability of the influencing agent to mediate punishment;
- . a person's perception that the influencing agent has a legitimate right to prescribe behavior for him thereby sanctioning the authority of the position;
- . integration of the system including unifying of staff, and binding of units, individual and collective;
- . the ability of individuals to command the loyalty of those that they wish to influence;
- . a realistic appraisal by the power-holder of his power relative to that of others;

- . a more or less accepted system of ideas and morals;
- . the number of alternatives available;
- . a structured institutional framework; and
- . the effective use of resources, that is, on the degree of congruence with goals, cultural norms, etc.

D. Purposes:

- . to keep individuals and organizations moving toward their respective goals; and
- . to control people and the decision-making process.

E. Functions:

- . control of the behavior of ~~others~~ by an individual or by an organization;
- . stabilization of the organization in the face of a changing environment;
- . the coordination of activities in the pursuit of a purposeful course of action;
- . the capacity to provide services to others; and
- . the capacity to mobilize resources and capacities, it can be seen as the energy of the organization.

F. Limits:

- . the capacity of a group to enforce or influence decisions is constrained by its environment;
- . power is confined and directed by policies and actions permissible by a framework of socially sanctioned authority;
- . power is controlled by extraneous facts, indeed decisions are subject to challenge;
- . power is constrained by public opinion;

- . the magnitude of power changes from one system to another, or from region to region; and
- . private economic power or corporate management is constrained by the countervailing power of those who are subject to it.

G. Causes:

- . the mobilization and enhancement of power as originating with the organization of collective effort; and
- . the building of a person's resources, personal and material, is likely to generate power.

H. Consequences:

- . illegitimate, coercive and unfair exercise of power gives rise to disapproval, frustration of needs, anger, aggression, hostility, retaliation, and reduction in power on the part of the power-holder;
- . whenever two kinds of power are emphasized at the same time or with repeated exchanges between men, there is a tendency for equalization or neutralization of power to occur; and
- . power results in an uncomfortable psychological position of dependence on a power-holder by the person subjected to his power.

I. Relations:

- . legitimate power is the same as authority;
- . power is the ability to use force, sanctions of rewards while authority is a legitimate right;
- . both power and authority refer to a relationship which deals with the ability of one to influence or persuade another;
- . power is coercive while influence is persuasive; and
- . leadership and power are regarded as two closely related concepts.

II. Intraphenomenal interdimensional analysis - Elements specific to each dimension within each phenomenon and mentioned by more than one author.

1. Phenomenon of influence.

A. Essential definitions:

- . social causation, that is, a behavior causing behavior, and a behavior producing an effect in behavior, psychological state or any other condition;
- . control over the behavior of another person or persons;
- . a process which induces a change in the state of another individual or group of individuals; and
- . whenever a behavior is attempted by an influencee to meet an intention of an influencer without any action on the part of the latter or implicit influence.

B. Bases:

- . the possession of resources such as wealth, power, status, prestige and reputation, competence, achievements, knowledge, personality, physical strength and well-being, motivation and self-esteem, access to communication channels, ability to promote, hire and fire, the ability to allocate corporation money to civic projects, the ability to influence large numbers of voters, and the ability to enhance or damage reputation;
- . inducements;
- . sanctions or constraints in the form of threats or appeals;
- . the possession and control of information;
- . customs, beliefs and values;
- . the solidarity of a group which gives rise to loyalty and belongingness;
- . friendship;

- . the legitimate authority of a position;
- . respect;
- . authority; and
- . acceptance of role within an organization.

C. Conditions:

- . acceptance of the influencing agent and his authority by those subjected to the influencing act;
- . the perceived competence of the influencing agent by the influencee;
- . a person's perception in determining whether he will react to an influence attempt from another person;
- . an influencee's motivation;
- . the consonance between the act of influence and its apparent purpose and group goals;
- . resources constituting a base which are appropriate to the social setting under consideration;
- . the manipulation of a person's environment especially in keeping with his needs;
- . dependence of one person on another;
- . dependence of the influencee on information;
- . institutionalization of moral values and affect;
- . the needs of the influencee; and
- . the perception by others that the influencing agent is living up to the group's tasks and expectations.

D. Purposes:

No element has been identified which constitutes one of the purposes of the phenomenon of influence and which is mentioned by more than one author.

E. Functions:

- . to alter the ability of others to achieve their goals or satisfy their needs; and
- . a medium capable of integration of social systems.

F. Limits:

- . the particular circumstances of situation and space within a system or subsystem;
- . the subordinates or low-ranking individuals within a system may see as irrelevant the threats posed by authorities due to their larger numbers; and
- . there is a varying amount of restriction that influence places on the behavior of those subjected to it and on the degree of bindingness that it creates for them.

G. Causes:

No element has been identified which constitutes one of the causes of the phenomenon of influence and which is mentioned by more than one author.

H. Consequences:

- . participation in acts of influence yields commitment, personal growth and satisfaction;
- . hostility, alienation and resentful acquiescence may happen in those subjected to coercive and domineering influence; and
- . resources consumed in an influence transaction could be spent on alternative activity, which has been lost.

I. Relations:

- . power is potential for influence and influence is the result of actualized power;
- . authority in the sense of respect accorded to the authority figure implies influence;

- . influence is a generic term which includes authority, control and power; and
- . the process of influence is one of leadership.

2. Phenomenon of power:

A. Essential definitions:

- . the potential for influence;
- . the ability to control the reward and punishment system, rewards, processes that are part of the meaningful environment of a person, and the potential to permit or to withhold gratification of a need;
- . the capability of the power-holder to make decisions;
- . participation in the decisions affecting another;
- . a capacity within a relationship of imposing one's own will even against resistance;
- . social causation, that is, the capacity of a person to change the behavior of another;
- . the potential ability to use force;
- . a capacity for action;
- . a part of human action; and
- . influencing others to behave in terms of one's own goals and interests.

B. Bases:

- . the possession of resources that a person can use in order to affect others such as wealth, prestige and reputation, knowledge, competence, skill and expertise, physical strength, physical force, personality, popularity, charisma, intellectual ability, legal authority, effort and interest, personal ambition, leadership ability, access to media, family ties, leadership in informal groups, friendship ties, knowledge of the political system, and ownership;

- . rewards;
- . an official position or office;
- . a system of ideas or a philosophy;
- . the needs or values of the person to whom a power act is being directed; and-
- . violent force.

C. Conditions:

- . a person's needs that could be satisfied by resources that the influencing agent has to offer;
- . the marginal value the person attaches to the resources being utilized by the power-holder;
- . resources must be low in relation to demand;
- . the perception of those being influenced of the number of rewards that an influencing agent can mobilize;
- . the perception by those influenced of the ability of the influencing agent to mediate punishment;
- . the ability of individuals to command the loyalty of those whom they wish to influence;
- . a realistic appraisal by the power-holder of his power relative to that of others;
- . the available number of alternatives; and
- . the effective use of resources, that is, the degree of congruence with goals, cultural norms, etc.

D. Purposes:

All elements originally identified as common elements to this dimension are equally part of another dimension.

E. Functions:

- . stabilization of the organization in the face of a changing environment;
- . the capacity to provide services to others; and
- . the capacity to mobilize resources and capacities, it can be seen as the energy of the organization.

F. Limits:

- . the capacity of a group to enforce or influence decisions is constrained by its environment;
- . power is confined and directed by policies and actions permissible by a framework of socially sanctioned authority;
- . power is controlled by extraneous facts, indeed decisions are subject to challenge;
- . power is constrained by public opinion;
- . the magnitude of power changes from one system to another, or from region to region; and
- . private economic power or corporate management is constrained by the countervailing power of those who are subject to it.

G. Causes:

- . the building of a person's resources, personal and material, is likely to generate power.

H. Consequences:

- . illegitimate, coercive and unfair exercise of power gives rise to disapproval, frustration of needs, anger, aggression, hostility, retaliation, and reduction in power on the part of the power-holder;
- . whenever two kinds of power are emphasized at the same time or with repeated exchanges between men, there is a tendency for equalization or neutralization of power to occur; and

- . power results in an uncomfortable psychological position of dependence on a power-holder by the person subjected to his power.

I. Relations:

- . legitimate power is the same as authority;
- . power is the ability to use force, sanctions or rewards while authority is a legitimate right; and
- . leadership and power are regarded as two closely related concepts.

III. Interphenomenal intradimensional analysis - Elements specific to each phenomenon, mentioned by more than one author and not found in another dimension of the same phenomenon.

1. Phenomenon of influence:

A. Essential definitions:

- . a process which induces a change in the state of another individual or group of individuals; and
- . whenever a behavior is attempted by an influencee to meet an intention of an influencer without any action on the part of the latter or implicit influence.

B. Bases:

- . the possession of resources such as power, achievements, well-being, motivation and self-esteem, access to communication channels, ability to promote, hire and fire, the ability to allocate corporation money to civic projects, the ability to influence large numbers of voters, and the ability to enhance or damage reputation;
- . the solidarity of a group which gives rise to loyalty and belongingness;
- . friendship;
- . respect;
- . authority; and

- . acceptance of role within an organization.

C. Conditions:

- . a person's perception in determining whether he will react to an influence attempt from another person;
- . an influencee's motivation;
- . resources constituting a base which are appropriate to the social setting under consideration;
- . the manipulation of a person's environment especially in keeping with his needs;
- . dependence of the influencee on information;
- . institutionalization of moral values and effects; and
- . the perception by others that the influencing agent is living up to the group's tasks and expectations.

D. Purposes:

No element has been identified which constitutes one of the purposes of the phenomenon of influence and which is mentioned by more than one author.

E. Functions:

- . to alter the ability of others to achieve their goals or satisfy their needs; and
- . a medium capable of integration of social systems.

F. Limits:

- . the subordinates or low-ranking individuals within a system may see as irrelevant the threats posed by authorities due to their larger numbers; and
- . there is a varying amount of restriction that influence places on the behavior of those subjected to it and on the degree of bindingness that it creates for them.

G. Causes:

No element has been identified which constitutes one of the causes of the phenomenon of influence and which is mentioned by more than one author.

H. Consequences:

- . participation in acts of influence yields commitment, personal growth and satisfaction.

I. Relations:

- . power is potential for influence and influence is actualized power;
- . authority in the sense of respect accorded to the authority figure implies influence;
- . influence is a generic term which includes authority, control and power; and
- . the process of influence is one of leadership.

2. Phenomenon of power:

A. Essential definitions:

- . the potential for influence;
- . the ability to control the reward and punishment system, rewards, processes that are part of the meaningful environment of a person, and the potential to permit or to withhold gratification of a need;
- . the capability of the power-holder to make decisions;
- . participation in the decisions affecting another;
- . a capacity within a relationship of imposing one's own will even against resistance;
- . the potential ability to use force;
- . a capacity for action;
- . a part of human action; and

- . influencing others to behave in terms of one's own goals and interests.

B. Bases:

- . the possession of resources that a person can use in order to affect others such as physical force, popularity, charisma, intellectual ability, legal authority; effort and interest, personal ambition, leadership ability, access to media, family ties, leadership in informal groups, friendship ties, knowledge of the political system, and ownership;
- . a system of ideas or a philosophy;
- . the needs or values of the person to whom a power act is being directed; and
- . violent force.

C. Conditions:

- . the marginal value the person attaches to the resources being utilized by the power-holder;
- . resources must be low in relation to demand;
- . the perception of those being influenced of the number of rewards that an influencing agent can mobilize;
- . the perception by those influenced of the ability of the influencing agent to mediate punishment;
- . the ability of individuals to command the loyalty of those that they wish to influence; and
- . a realistic appraisal by the power-holder of his power relative to that of others.

D. Purposes:

In the intraphenomenal interdimensional analysis, there were no elements specific to this dimension.

E. Functions:

- . stabilization of the organization in the face of a changing environment; and

A SYNOPTIC VIEW

200

- . the capacity to provide services to others.

F. Limits:

- . power is confined and directed by policies and actions permissible by a framework of socially sanctioned authority;
- . power is controlled by extraneous facts, indeed decisions are subject to challenge;
- . power is constrained by public opinion;
- . the magnitude of power changes from one system to another, or from region to region; and
- . private economic power or corporate management is constrained by the countervailing power of those who are subject to it.

G. Causes:

- . the building of a person's resources, personal and material, is likely to generate power.

H. Consequences:

- . whenever two kinds of power are emphasized at the same time or with repeated exchanges between men, there is a tendency for equalization or neutralization of power to occur; and
- . power results in an uncomfortable psychological position of dependence on a power-holder by the person subjected to his power.

I. Relations:

- . legitimate power is the same as authority;
- . power is the ability to use force, sanctions or rewards while authority is a legitimate right; and
- . leadership and power are regarded as two closely related concepts.

A synoptic view of the essential findings arising from the intraphenomenal intradimensional, intraphenomenal interdimensional and interphenomenal intradimensional analyses of the phenomena of influence and power has been presented in this chapter.. The summary and conclusions of this study follow.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study was conducted with the purpose of attempting to clarify the state of confusion surrounding the use of influence and power in the field of educational administration, and to provide basic information which could serve as a basis to the development of a differential theory of influence and power. Based on authors studied, there was an attempt to identify elements comprising each dimension of each phenomenon, to identify elements specific to each phenomenon and those common to both phenomena. This was accomplished by undertaking intraphenomenal intradimensional and intraphenomenal interdimensional analyses of each phenomenon and an interphenomenal intradimensional analysis of both phenomena.

The methodology utilized is based on a theoretical framework facilitating the analysis of the phenomena under study by: 1) organizing the constituent elements according to nine perceptual dimensions; 2) utilizing a comparative method of systematic analysis of elements within each dimension according to the commonality, complementarity or divergence of elements; 3) and utilizing an operational process in order to determine elements common and specific to corresponding dimensions of influence and power.

From this study, the following statements can be made: most of the perceptual dimensions studied of the

phenomena of influence and power contained elements mentioned by more than one author; all of the perceptual dimensions studied of the phenomena of influence and power contained elements mentioned by one author; most of the perceptual dimensions of the phenomena of influence and power studied contained elements which had also been assigned to at least another dimension of the same phenomenon; there were very few perceptual dimensions of the phenomena of influence and power which gave rise to contradictory views from authors; all the corresponding dimensions of the phenomena of influence and power contained elements specific to one phenomenon or the other; and only one dimension did not have elements common to a corresponding dimension of these phenomena.

The large number of elements each mentioned by one author only, the minimal contradiction among authors, and the extensive number of elements assigned to the phenomenon of power by comparison to the lower number assigned to the phenomenon of influence are findings worthy of note.

In scrutinizing the findings from the interphenomenal intradimensional analyses that is those elements specific to each phenomenon, mentioned by more than one author and not found in another dimension of the same phenomenon, certain salient features come to the attention of the reader. The following observations highlight these main features: medium of persuasion does not appear as an element specific to

essential definitions of influence, although a close link exists in the literature between persuasion and influence; the absence of authority as a basis of power even at the level of common elements raises questions since it would seem that authority is fundamental to both influence and power yet it is only found as a basis of the former; the perceived competence of the influencing agent is not identified as an element specific to conditions of influence yet it seems rather central to this phenomenon; specific elements that are part of bases of influence appear to be of a higher order than specific elements comprising bases of power, to illustrate this point some of the bases of influence are respect, group solidarity, authority while in contrast some of the bases of power are violent force, personal ambition, popularity, charisma. Further, it can also be stated that there is a tendency for a large number of authors to utilize influence as a generic term which includes other phenomena such as power.

On the basis of authors studied, it is evident that operational definitions of influence and power do not seem to have received much attention. Findings from this study could be useful in the development of operational definitions of these two phenomena.

Four related phenomena frequently encountered in writings of authors studied are influence, power, authority,

and control. A future study could focus on a study of their relation and uniqueness.

In reviewing authors studied, four areas recurred regularly as potential additional dimensions. These were: the weight or the degree to which policies are affected; the domain or the number of persons being affected; the scope or the set of matters or systems over which an individual has influence or power; and forms or types of influence or power. Future users of the methodology utilized in this study could consider adding these four dimensions in order to present a more thorough analysis.

Because this study has been limited to a descriptive, comparative and exploratory approach, it is difficult to know whether points of commonality, complementarity and divergence would be sustained given a philosophical interpretation of findings.

In considering the results of this study, it should be noted that, within the limits of a descriptive, comparative and exploratory study, common elements arising from the intraphenomenal intradimensional analysis of each phenomenon, the specific elements arising from the intraphenomenal interdimensional analysis of each phenomenon, and the specific elements arising from the interphenomenal intradimensional analysis of these phenomena could serve as the basis of a differential theory of influence and power. It would also

seem that common elements arising from the intraphenomenal intradimensional analysis have a certain degree of importance because they are mentioned by more than one author, but that specific elements arising from the intraphenomenal interdimensional analysis and especially those arising from the interphenomenal intradimensional analysis are probably more relevant in the development of such a differential theory of influence and power. Those involved in behavioral and administrative science studies should equally keep these elements under consideration in their work.

By identifying the constituent elements of the phenomena of influence and power and those elements which are common to both phenomena and specific to each phenomenon, this study should bring some degree of clarity in the state of confusion surrounding the use of these phenomena.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Major Works Annotated.

Bell, David V. J., Power, Influence and Authority, New York, University Press, 1975, xii-131 p.

Author discusses the bases of influence and power. Influence, authority and power are introduced at micro and macro level and their relationship is presented.

Berle, Adolf A., Power, New York, Harcourt, Brace & World, 1969, xv-603 p.

Author postulates and discusses five laws of power, he then applies these laws to an elaborate discussion of economic, political and international power.

Blau, P. M., Exchange and Power in Social Life, New York, Wiley, 1964, xxiii-352 p.

This text is an analysis of the social processes that govern the relations between individuals and groups. The author uses concepts of exchange, reciprocity, imbalance and power to analyze social life from the simplest interpersonal relations between individuals to the complex relations existing among large collectivities. The differentiation of power and legitimization of organizing authority is also discussed.

Cartwright, Dorwin, Ed., Studies in Social Power, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan, 1959, ix-225 p.

From this book of reading various aspects of power are presented, from its bases, to its relation with other phenomena such as authority and leadership, to development of perception in social power relations. There is a distinctive thread throughout this book whereby power is seen as the ability to influence or control some aspect of another person.

Gamson, William A., Power and Discontent, Homewood, Illinois, The Dorsey Press, 1968, xi-208 p.

By presenting material around a series of hypotheses supported by the literature, author discusses the nature, basis, means, degree, cost, and scope of influence. He uses potential partisans and authorities as a medium to discuss influence.

King, Stephen W., Communication and Social Influence, Don Mills, Ontario, Addison-Wesley, 1975, x-169 p.

Author treats social influence from a process point of view and proposes a model of social influence which includes psychological, sociological, situational, biological and cultural factors. This model includes two kinds of

influence processes, a normative and informational. In addition, author presents definition, sources, effects, types and related concepts of social influence.

Kolb, Eugene J., A Framework for Political Analysis, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, 1978, xiii-338 p.

Some basic concepts about politics, government, and conflict are discussed along with the nature and role of power.

Lasswell, Harold D. and Abraham Kaplan, Power and Society, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1969, xxiv-295 p.

Authors present a framework for communicating postulates, hypotheses and findings of political science and apply this framework to various dimensions of influence and power. From this text a large number of elements have been retained for the current study.

Parsons, Talcott, Politics and Social Structure, New York, The Free Press, 1969, xvii-557 p.

This text provides substantial and abundant information on nature, bases, conditions, and dynamics of influence and power.

-----, Social Systems and the Evolution of Action Theory, New York, The Free Press, 1977, x-420 p.

Author discusses influence and power in the context of a functional analysis of societies including social interaction, social systems and social structure.

Russell, Bertrand, Power: A New Social Analysis, New York, Norton, 1938, 315 p.

Various kinds of power are presented along with a description of the exercise of power, its various forms and the problem of regulating this phenomenon.

Scott, William G., Organization Theory A Behavior Analysis for Management, Illinois, Richard D. Irwin, 1967, xii-442 p.

Influence is presented as part of processes such as status, role, communication, decision-making and balance.

2. Other Authors Consulted.

Adams, Richard Newbold, Energy and Structure, Austin, University of Texas Press, 1975, xviii-353 p.

Banfield, Edward Christie, Political Influence, New York, Free Press, 1965, vi-354 p.

Blau, Peter M. and W. Richard Scott, Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach, San Francisco, California, Chandler, 1962, x-312 p.

Dahl, Robert A., Modern Political Analysis, 3rd Ed., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1976, xii-156 p.

Etzioni, Amitai, A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations, New York, The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961, xx-366 p.

Galbraith, John Kenneth, American Capitalism. The Concept of Countervailing Power, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1956, xi-208 p.

Gibb, Cecil Austin, Ed., Leadership: Selected Readings, Harmondsworth, Eng., Penguin, 1979, 439 p.

Griffiths, Daniel E., Human Relations in School Administration, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1956, xii-458 p.

-----, Administrative Theory, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959, viii-123 p.

Hick, Herbert G. and C. Ray Gullett, Organizations: Theory and Behavior, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1975, xvii-446 p.

Hollander, Edwin Paul, Leadership Dynamics: A Practical Guide to Effective Relationships, New York, Free Press, 1978, xii-212 p.

Homans, George Caspar, Social Behavior Its Elementary Forms, New York, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1974, xi-386 p.

Hunter, Floyd, Community Power Structure, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1953, xiv-297 p.

Katz, Daniel and Robert L. Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organizations, New York, Wiley, 1966, vii-498 p.

Kimbrough, Ralph B., Political Power and Educational Decision-Making, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1964, ix-307 p.

----- and Michael Y. Nunnery, Educational Administration: An Introduction, New York, Macmillan, 1976, viii-504 p.

Lane, Willard R., et al., Foundations of Educational Administration: A Behavioral Analysis, New York, Macmillan, 1967, x-433 p.

Leavitt, Harold J., Managerial Psychology, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1972, viii-366 p.

Lippitt, Gordon L., Organizational Renewal: Achieving Viability in a Changing World, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969, xii-321 p.

Litterer, Joseph A., The Analysis of Organizations, New York, Wiley, 1973, vii-757 p.

Lucio, William H. and John D. McNeil, Supervision: A Synthesis of Thought and Action, 2nd Edition, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1969, xi-329 p.

March, James G., Ed., Handbook of Organizations, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1965, xvi-1247 p.

----- and Herbert A. Simon, Organizations, New York, Wiley, 1967, xi-262 p.

Martindale, Don, Institutions, Organizations, and Mass Society, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1966, xvi-576 p.

McClelland, David C., Power. The Inner Experience, New York, Irvington, 1975, xiv-427 p.

McFarland, Andrew S., Power and Leadership in Pluralist Systems, Stanford, California, Stanford University Press, 1969, xiii-273 p.

Mechanic, D., "Sources of Power of Lower Participants in Complex Organizations", in Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 7, 1962, p. 349-364.

Merton, Robert King, Social Theory and Social Structure, Toronto, Collier-Macmillan, 1968, xxiii-702 p.

Newman, William Herman and E. Kirby Warren, The Process of Management: Concepts, Behavior, and Practice, 4th Ed., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1977, xv-670 p.

Pettigrew, Andrew M., The Politics of Organizational Decision-Making, U.S.A., Harper & Row, 1973, xvii-302 p.

Polsby, Nelson W., Community Power and Political Theory, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1963, xiv-144 p.

Presthus, Robert, Men at the Top: A Study in Community Power, New York, Oxford University Press, 1964, x-485 p.

Reeves, Arthur W., Harold C. Melsness, and John E. Cheal, Educational Administration: The Role of the Teacher, Toronto, Macmillan, 1962, xxi-277 p.

Roe, William H. and Thelbert L. Drake, The Principals, New York, Macmillan, 1974, vii-337 p.

Russell, Bertrand, Authority and the Individual, London, George Allen & Unwin, 1949, 125 p.

Sachs, Benjamin M., Educational Administration: A Behavioral Approach, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1966, xiii-412 p.

Simon, Herbert A., Models of Man, New York, Wiley, 1957, xiv-287 p.

Skibbins, Gerald J., Organizational Evolution: A Program for Managing Radical Change, New York, AMACOM, 1974, xvi-267 p.

Stogdill, Ralph M., Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research, New York, Macmillan, 1974, viii-613 p.

Wilson, L. Craig, School Leadership Today: Strategies for the Educator, Boston, Allyn & Bacon, 1978, xiv-346 p.

Wilson, Robert F., Educational Administration, Columbus, Ohio, Charles E. Merrill, 1966, xxi-853 p.

Zaleznik, Abraham, "Power and Politics in Organizational Life", in Harvard Business Review, May-June, 1970, p. 47-60.

Zaltman, Gerald, David H. Florio, and Linda A. Sikorski, Dynamic Educational Change: Models, Strategies, Tactics, and Management, New York, Free Press, 1977, xvi-264 p.

APPENDIX 1

VALIDATION REVIEW PANEL

VALIDATION REVIEW PANEL

Katharine B. Cooke

Ph.D., 1965, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.
Major: Sociology (Social change theory and
community studies).

Director,
Research Branch,
Indian and Northern Affairs,
Government of Canada,
10 Wellington Street,
Hull, Quebec.

Dany Daniels

Ph.D., 1963, University of Alberta,
Major: Educational Administration.

Senior Policy Advisor, Education,
Policy Research and Evaluation,
Indian and Northern Affairs,
Government of Canada,
10 Wellington Street,
Hull, Quebec.

Robert C. Lyle

Ph.D., 1974, University of Ottawa,
Major: Measurement and Experimentation in Education.

Director of Planning,
Algonquin College,
1385 Woodroffe Avenue,
Ottawa, Ontario.

APPENDIX 2

ABSTRACT OF

A Comparative Study of Influence and Power
in Educational Administration

ABSTRACT OF

A Comparative Study of Influence and Power
in Educational Administration¹

By undertaking a comparative analysis of authors in the field of educational administration, an attempt was made to identify elements specific to influence and power and those common to both phenomena.

Authors for this study were selected on the basis of a review of educational administration literature. The analytical approach utilized in this study was based on the methodology developed by Poirier² for his doctoral thesis.

This methodology consisted of a theoretical framework allowing for the analysis of influence and power according to nine perceptual dimensions; a comparative method of analysis consisting of a description of elements attributed by authors to the phenomenon under study, interpretation of these elements and their juxtaposition; and an operational approach to analysis of constituent elements of dimensions comprising each phenomenon according to their commonality, complementarity and divergence.

1 Huguette Labelle, Doctoral Thesis, presented to the Faculty of Education of the University of Ottawa, Ottawa, 1979, viii-302 p.

2 Pierre Poirier, Une étude des phénomènes de l'autorité et du leadership en administration scolaire, unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Presented to the Faculty of Education of the University of Ottawa, Ontario, 1973, v-371 p.

In concluding the author has indicated the potential use of the essential findings of this study as a basis for the development of a differential theory of influence and power. Requirements for additional studies of related phenomena have also been identified.