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ABSTRACT

POWER MOTIVATION AND POWER STYLE IN
HIGHER EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION

by

Nancy Lewis Garland

The problem of this study was to determine if a relationship exists between selected personal characteristics of higher education administrators and their perceived levels of power motivation and power style.

The techniques of ex post facto research were used in this study. The Power Management Inventory developed by Jay Hall and James Hawker was selected as the appropriate instrument for use in this study. The Power Management Inventory was designed to provide a comparison between one's espoused theory (power motivation) and one's theory in action (power style). A personal data sheet was used to obtain information concerning the personal characteristics of the administrators.

The statistical analysis of the data for hypotheses 1 through 24 was intended to determine significant differences in the power motivation types and power style scores of the administrators based on a comparison with selected personal characteristics of those administrators.

The differences showing significance in the study warranted the following conclusions:

1. The power motivation of administrators can be directly related to the ages of the administrators.

2. The power style of administrators can be directly related to the ages of administrators.

3. The power motivation of administrators can be directly related to the method by which they were selected for their positions.

4. The power style of administrators can be directly related to the method by which they were selected to their positions.

5. The power style of administrators can be directly related to the number of years of service in their positions.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

In the entire lexicon of social concepts none is more troublesome than the concept of power. We may say about it in general only what St. Augustine said about time, that we all know perfectly well what it is—until someone asks us.¹

Perhaps no other concept in the field of human relations is as pervasive as that of "power." Power has many political and manipulative aspects. More basic to human existence, however, is the overwhelming truth that power is a fact of life.

Human beings have always been fascinated by power. They have reason to be; power has long played a prominent role in discourse concerning human behavior. Machiavelli instructed Lorenzo Di Medici in the art of seizing and securing power.² James Madison and his colleagues sought to develop a system of government that would limit and disperse power. Marx argued that political power inevitably accrues to the economically dominant class.³

The massive impact of power on human existence is apparent in the statement that power is "nothing less than an objective quality of all

reality, a quality inherent in all that exists by virtue of the mere fact that it does exist. Power is an inescapable aspect of reality itself.\textsuperscript{4}

The Problem

The Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine if a relationship exists between selected personal characteristics of higher education administrators and their perceived levels of power motivation and power style.

Significance of the Study

Contemporary philosophers, theorists and lay persons are devoting considerable writing and research effort to the study of power. The need for a thorough understanding of the dynamics and psychology of power is, perhaps, greater today than at any other period in human existence.

The more mechanical and complicated our world is, the more we need the simplicity of power to guide us and protect us. It's the one gift that allows us to remain human in an inhuman world—for "the love of power is the love of ourselves."\textsuperscript{5}

Conventional wisdom would teach that, living in a mass society, safety should lie in following the herd. Humans are not, however, herding animals; safety lies in the ability to act and to survive alone. An understanding of the herd is a useful skill, to occasionally hide in


a herd is a useful deception, but "man cannot join it without sacrificing his essential nature."^6

The process of administration is, in many respects, an exercise in the use of power. Power is fundamental to every organization. Joseph Bower commented that as organizations become more complex, managers increasingly need power to influence the people upon whom they depend.\footnote{Korda, p. 305.} Administrative tasks such as goal setting, formulation of objectives, performance appraisal, reprimands, and evaluation all involve the exercise of power. It is also conceivable that personal characteristics of administrators substantially impact the positive and negative aspects of their power dynamics. An investigation of these factors is essential so that administrators, and those they manage, may more fully understand the interpersonal influence and dramatic role that power plays in organizational leadership.

**Assumptions**

The following assumptions were considered relevant to this study:

1. There are some characteristics of administrators that set them apart from other administrators on the basis of their power profiles.

2. Comparisons and contrasts can be examined between the personal characteristics and the power profiles of administrators.

Limitations of the Study

The following limitations were relevant to this study:

1. The study was limited to an intact group of ninety-four academic administrators representing ninety-six administrative positions at East Tennessee State University.

2. The study was further limited to (a) one Vice President for Academic Affairs; (b) one Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs; (c) one Assistant to the Vice President for Academic Affairs; (d) three Coordinators; (e) twenty-one Directors; (f) nine Deans; (g) twelve Assistant and Associate Deans; and (h) forty-eight Chairpersons.

3. Responses were limited to a personal data sheet and the Power Management Inventory (see Appendices E and F).

4. A return of 50 percent of the respondents would be necessary for data analysis.

Definition of Terms

Administrator

An administrator is responsible for maintaining proper functioning of the university.

Affiliation Motive (AM)

The tendency to value being liked and warmly received by others, to nurture and give support to others and to reassure and make others comfortable, even when these are done at one's own expense or to the detriment of one's other personal aspirations.  

---

Personalized Power Motive (PP)

The tendency to value and desire power for purposes of personal aggrandizement and control, indicating a need to be the center of attention, generally in control of interpersonal situations, and to prevail in most encounters with others.9

Power

The human capacity to act effectively to influence and lead other humans so as to realize a worthwhile action and its driving purpose. Power, in its purest sense, is as ethical a concept as action.10

Power Management Inventory

The Power Management Inventory is a validated instrument designed to assess a manager's characteristic management of influence dynamics, how a given manager prefers to handle situations calling for the exercise of power and authority.11

Power Motivation

For the purposes of this study, power motivation involved the designation of three power orientations: (1) the tendency to value and desire power for purposes of personal aggrandizement and control;


(2) the tendency to value and desire power for purposes of serving and benefiting the common welfare; and (3) the tendency to value being liked and warmly regarded by other people.\textsuperscript{12}

\textbf{Power Style}

For the purposes of this study, power style reflected a person's typical mode of responding when dealing with others in a managerial or leadership role.\textsuperscript{13}

\textit{S/he}

Denotes she and/or he.

\textbf{Socialized Power Motive (SP)}

The tendency to value and desire power for purposes of serving and benefiting the common welfare, indicating a personal need to have impact on cultures and systems and to be an influence for widespread enhancement.\textsuperscript{14}

\textbf{Hypotheses}

$H_1$ There will be a significant difference between the power motivation types of male administrators and the power motivation types of female administrators.

\textsuperscript{12} Hawker and Hall, \textit{The Power Management Inventory}, p. 2.

\textsuperscript{13} Hawker and Hall, \textit{The Power Management Inventory}, p. 2.

\textsuperscript{14} Hawker and Hall, "The Development and Validation," p. 2.
$H_2$ There will be a significant difference between the power style scores of male administrators and the power style scores of female administrators.

$H_3$ There will be a significant difference between the power motivation types of taller administrators and the power motivation types of shorter administrators.

$H_4$ There will be a significant difference between the power style scores of taller administrators and the power style scores of shorter administrators.

$H_5$ There will be a significant difference between the power motivation types of older administrators and the power motivation types of younger administrators.

$H_6$ There will be a significant difference between the power style scores of older administrators and the power style scores of younger administrators.

$H_7$ There will be a significant difference between the power motivation types of Vice Presidents/Associate or Assistant Vice Presidents, Deans and Departmental Chairpersons and the power motivation types of Directors, Coordinators and other administrators.

$H_8$ There will be a significant difference between the power style scores of Vice Presidents/Associate or Assistant Vice Presidents, Deans and Departmental Chairpersons and the power style scores of Directors, Coordinators and other administrators.

$H_9$ There will be a significant difference between the power motivation types of administrators selected by members of their Colleges/Schools/Departments or search committees and the power motivation types of
administrators selected by direct appointment by their superiors.

$H_{10}$ There will be a significant difference between the power style scores of administrators selected by members of their Colleges/Schools/Departments or search committees and the power style scores of administrators selected by direct appointment by their superiors.

$H_{11}$ There will be a significant difference in the power motivation types of administrators whose positions were advertised outside their Colleges/Schools/Departments and the power motivation types of administrators whose positions were not advertised outside their Colleges/Schools/Departments.

$H_{12}$ There will be a significant difference in the power style scores of administrators whose positions were advertised outside their Colleges/Schools/Departments and the power style scores of administrators whose positions were not advertised outside their Colleges/Schools/Departments.

$H_{13}$ There will be a significant difference in the power motivation types of administrators who have served in their current positions for a longer length of time and the power motivation types of administrators who have served in their current positions for a shorter length of time.

$H_{14}$ There will be a significant difference in the power style scores of administrators who have served in their current positions for a longer length of time and the power style scores of administrators who have served in their current positions for a shorter length of time.

$H_{15}$ There will be a significant difference in the power motivation types of administrators who have been employed for a longer length of time at their current institutions and the power motivation types of
ad
dministrators who have been employed at their current institutions for
a shorter length of time.

$H_{16}$ There will be a significant difference in the power style
scores of administrators who have been employed for a longer period of
time at their current institutions and the power style scores of
administrators who have been employed at their current institutions for
a shorter length of time.

$H_{17}$ There will be a significant difference in the power motivation
types of administrators who select one color as their favorite and the
power motivation types of administrators who select other colors as
their favorite.

$H_{18}$ There will be a significant difference in the power style
scores of administrators who select one color as their favorite and the
power style scores of administrators who select other colors as their
favorite.

$H_{19}$ There will be a significant difference in the power motivation
types of administrators who select one color as their least favorite
and the power motivation types of administrators who select other colors as
their least favorite.

$H_{20}$ There will be a significant difference in the power style
scores of administrators who select one color as their least favorite
and the power style scores of administrators who select other colors as
their least favorite.

$H_{21}$ There will be a significant difference in the power motivation
types of administrators who select one position for their office
furnishings and the power motivation types of administrators who select other positions for their office furnishings.

H22 There will be a significant difference in the power style scores of administrators who select one position for their office furnishings and the power style scores of administrators who select other positions for their office furnishings.

H23 There will be a significant difference in the power motivation types of administrators whose offices are located on the middle level of their buildings and the power motivation types of administrators whose offices are located on the other levels of the buildings.

H24 There will be a significant difference in the power style scores of administrators whose offices are located on the middle level of their buildings and the power style scores of administrators whose offices are located on the other levels of the buildings.

**Procedures**

The following procedures were followed in conducting the study:

1. A review of related literature was conducted.
2. A validated instrument was selected.
3. A telephone call was made to a representative of Telemetrics International of The Woodlands, Texas, requesting permission to use the Power Management Inventory.
4. A 1983-84 listing of academic administrators was obtained from the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
5. One hundred ten copies of the Power Management Inventory were purchased at fifty cents a copy.
6. A demographic data sheet was prepared and validated.

7. A letter was written and mailed along with the instrument and data sheet explaining the purpose and soliciting administrators' responses.

8. Two weeks later a follow-up letter was written to those administrators who had not responded.

9. When at least 50 percent of the responses were collected and one month had elapsed, the data were analyzed and recorded in tables.

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 includes the introduction, the statement of the problem, significance of the study, the hypotheses, the limitations, the assumptions, the definition of terms, the procedure, and the organization of the study.

Chapter 2 contains a review of relevant literature.

Chapter 3 contains a description of the methods and procedures used in the study.

Chapter 4 contains a presentation and analysis of the data.

Chapter 5 contains a summary of the study, with conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER TWO

Review of Relevant Literature

Introduction

A review of the literature was conducted to identify relevant research essential to an investigation of power in higher education administration.

In the portion of the literature review dealing with the historical perspective of power, the derivation of the word "power" is discussed; the religious significance of power is examined, and the writings of historical leaders are reviewed.

Definitions and terminology of power are discussed including the views of educators, social scientists and political scientists. Distinctions are drawn between the terms power, authority, influence and persuasion.

A section of the literature review outlines the various theories, concepts and classifications of power. This is followed by a review of selected research studies on power in higher education, with an investigation of the personality and environmental characteristics most conducive to power.

In order to identify pertinent studies and information on power in higher education administration, bibliographies, periodicals and references to major works were reviewed. In addition, an Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) search was conducted through the facilities of East Tennessee State University.
Historical Perspective of Power

The English word "power" derives from the Old Latin root "potere" which means "to be able." Power has held the fascination of human beings since their inception. It is through this concept of power that British associationist philosophers argued that we form our ideas of power from observations of our own abilities.

Throughout history, human myth and religion have been saturated with concern for power. The Judaeo-Christian God is all powerful. "The voice of the Lord is powerful; the voice of the Lord is full of majesty." "And he that overcometh, and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations." The term "power" is referred to 186 times throughout the King James Version of the Old and New Testaments.

In the ancient Chinese Book of Changes, the I Ching, there was considerable concern about power. The book included discussions on the taming power of the small, the taming power of the great, the power of the light, and the power of the dark. In the climax of the Hindu epic, the Bhagavad Gita, the hero faced a decision between exercising and not exercising power in the war against his kindred. He was advised that he

2 Winter, p. 4.
3 Psalms, 29:4.
must exert power, but that he should "so act as not to be attached to the outcome of his actions; he must feel neither success nor failure, no joy nor sorrow, whatever the outcome of his actions."\(^7\)

Plato argued that man's potentially unbounded lust for power is a "demonic flaw" that can corrupt and destroy him. He encouraged that power seeking be tempered, either by humility arising from classical moderation and restraint or by both avoiding the desire to rule and at the same time looking after the needs of the ruled.\(^8\) Plato made the following comment concerning the role of power in human affairs:

> When a master passion is enthroned in absolute dominion over every part of the soul, feasting and revelling with courtesans and all such delights will become the order of the day . . . he will look out for any man of property whom he can rob by fraud or violence . . . when the numbers of such criminals and their hangers-on increase and they become aware of their strength, then it is they who, helped by the folly of the common people, create the despot out of that one among their number whose soul is itself under the most tyrannical despotism.\(^9\)

Niccolo Machiavelli concluded, throughout his writings, that man's nature and the origins of human society can be explained by man's strivings for power. He instructed Lorenzo Di Medici that "men must either be caressed or else annihilated; they will revenge themselves for small injuries, but cannot do so for great ones; the injury therefore that we do to a man must be such that we need not fear his vengeance."\(^10\)


\(^9\) Plato, p. 174.

He further instructed the Prince to follow the example of the Romans, who consider not only present but also future discords and likewise guard against them. A disease, at the beginning, may be simple to cure but difficult to recognize. In time, when left untreated, the disease becomes easy to recognize and difficult to cure. Machiavelli further stated:

Thus it happens in matters of state; for knowing afar off (which it is only given to a prudent man to do) the evils that are brewing, they are easily cured. But when, for want of such knowledge, they are allowed to grow so that every one can recognize them, there is no longer any remedy to be found.

Historically, humans have by nature belonged to a violent species. A review of the past reveals long successions of war with only brief periods of peace. Bertrand Russell wrote that some of the ablest leaders known to history arose in revolutionary situations. Cromwell, Napoleon, and Lenin each dominated their respective countries and secured the service of men who were not by nature submissive.

Russell saw power as "the fundamental concept in social science, in the same sense in which Energy is a fundamental concept in physics." He stated that "men like power so long as they believe in their own competence to handle the business in question, but when they know themselves incompetent they prefer to follow a leader." He further

11 Machiavelli, p. 39.  
12 Machiavelli, p. 39.  
14 Russell, pp. 15-16.  
stated that this "impulse of submission," which is just as real and just as common as the impulse of command, has its roots in fear. 16

Definitions of Power

Robert Dahl wrote that "the first and most salient fact one needs to know about power is that neither in ordinary language nor in political science is there agreement on terms and definitions." 17 David Winter commented that the word "power" has acquired many different and often conflicting definitions. Therefore, using "power" as a superficial explanation, may in the end explain nothing. Differing definitions do not, however, negate the importance of power as a concept in modern social science. 18

Definitions of "power" vary widely in terms of simplicity and quality. Kenneth B. Clark defined power as "nothing less than an objective quality of all reality, a quality inherent in all that exists by virtue of the mere fact that it does exist. Power is an inescapable aspect of reality itself." 19 A definition of power this all-inclusive and comprehensive is practically valueless for systematic research. On the other hand, Bertrand Russell defined power as a quantitative concept very simple in design: "given two men with similar desires, if one achieves all the desires that the other achieves, and also others, he

18 Winter, p. 2.
has more power (e.g. 'A' has more power than 'B', if 'A' achieves many intended effects and 'B' only a few)."\(^{20}\)

C. Wright Mills offered an inclusive yet understandable definition of power which stated, "power has to do with whatever decisions men make about the arrangements under which they live, and about the events which make up the history of their times."\(^{21}\) Mills further commented that we do not know the limits of such power. It is hoped that limits do exist. This does not remove the fact, however, that much power today is successfully employed without the sanction of reasons or the conscience of the obedient.\(^{22}\)

Floyd Hunter expressed very similar views to those held by Mills in this definition of power: "the ability of some men to move other men, goods, and services toward socially allowed objectives, or conversely to stop such movements when it seems undesirable at a given point or time."\(^{23}\) Hunter stressed, in his writings, that few men in a given power situation see any operation as a whole, nor can an individual ever be fully aware of all other individuals and factors that may guide his own power structure.\(^{24}\)

In the study of physics, power is "any form of energy or force

\(^{20}\) Russell, p. 17.


\(^{22}\) Mills, p. 23.


\(^{24}\) Hunter, p. 136.
available for work or applied to produce motion or pressure. Kenneth Clark stated that the concept of power in the social sciences can be viewed as essentially the same, namely "the force or energy required to bring about, to sustain, or to prevent social, political or economic change." In the most fundamental sense, power in the social sciences, as in physics, must be perceivable and demonstrable.

Hans Morgenthau presented a definition with reference to social power, in his writings concerning political power:

Political power is a psychological relation between those who exercise it and those over whom it is exercised. It gives the former control over certain actions of the latter through the impact which the former exerts on the latter's mind. This impact derives from one of three sources: the expectation of benefits, the fear of disadvantages, the respect or love for men or institutions. It may be exerted through orders, threats, the authority or charisma of a man or of an office, or a combination of any of these.

Kenneth Clark wrote five premises derived from the vast number of definitions of power. These premises may be used in the analysis of these definitions, and are stated as follows:

1. Power is amoral. It can be used for good or evil, but in itself cannot determine value. It may be rational, irrational, constructive, or destructive in its consequences.

2. Power may manifest itself in varying degrees of intensity on a continuum from pseudo power of mere verbalization, or claims of a power that does not in fact prevail in the face of conflict and cannot effect change in the desired direction; through latent power which demonstrates itself only when challenged and to the minimal extent required to meet or contain the challenge; through active power which is usually overt, understood, sustained and

---

25 Clark, p. 75.

26 Clark, p. 75.

27 Clark, p. 75.

institutionalized; to coercive power which involves the
enforcement of the desires of the holders of power in the
face of overt, persistent and intense challenges.

3. Power can be seen as operating in terms of a
"law of the economy of power." The power holders do not
expend any greater degree of power than that which is
required to deal with the degree of challenge that
confronts them.

4. The conditions of passive or active resistance
determines the degree of power exerted in any given
situations. Power can be expressed through: persuasion,
argumentation, negotiation, bargaining, institutional
controls, restraints, sanctions, or privileges.

5. The forms, the manifestation, and the intensity
of the social power exerted vary according to the nature
of the threat; or according to the stability, the security
or the psychological health and strength of the holders
of power.29

Terminology of Power

Varieties of terms are often associated with, or substituted for
the word "power." A distinction among these terms may be considered
for research purposes and for a basic general understanding of the
concept of power. Three terms are frequently used synonymously with the
word "power" in formal writings and research: authority, influence and
persuasion. Although other terms are often substituted for power, these
three words are perhaps used with the most regularity. Therefore, these
terms are defined, compared and contrasted to the term "power."

Power and Authority

Herbert Simon defined authority as "the power to make decisions
which guide the actions of another."30 Chester Barnard spoke of

29 Clark, pp. 77-79.

30 Herbert A. Simon, Administrative Behavior, 2nd ed. (New York:
authority as "another name for the willingness and capacity of individuals to submit to the necessities of cooperative systems." 31 Stephen Knezevich discussed both power and authority as means of obtaining social control. Knezevich noted subtle distinction between power and authority. He stated that power was "a form of raw energy that enabled a person to carry out his own will despite the protestations of others." 32 Power, therefore, was based on involuntary compliance. Authority, on the other hand, was voluntarily obeyed. 33 Francis Griffith distinguished three types of authority. Charismatic authority is the influence exerted by an individual through his/her personality. Traditional authority is based on age and experience. Legalistic or administrative authority is based on law. 34

A delineation between the terms power and authority was evident from a personal discussion with Douglas Mitchell. Mitchell explained that the word authority derived from the Latin root "auctor." This Latin root refers to a creator, originator, or promoter, much like the word "author" which is derived from the same root. 35 The ancient Greeks

33 Knezevich, p. 45.
did not have a word for authority, but used a word which literally meant "out of the substance." By contrast, the Greek word for power is "dunamis" from which the English words "dynamic" and "dynamite" were derived. Mitchell, therefore, stated that "power" clearly refers to the "ability to make things happen," whereas "authority" is an expression of the "inner character" of the person, and reflects the basis of his or her actions rather than his or her force of strength.36

Power and Influence

James Fisher referred to "power" and "influence" as being synonymous. Fisher stated that "influence" was simply the more socially acceptable term.37 Robert Dahl stated that power is often defined as a special case of influence involving severe losses for noncompliance. Exactly what constitutes a "severe" loss or deprivation is somewhat arbitrary.38 He commented, however, that "one man's influence is another man's power."39

Hans Morgenthau drew a distinction between influence and power with the following example. The Secretary of State has influence over the President, but no power. He cannot impose his will. He can persuade, but not compel, the President to act in a given manner. The President, in contrast, has power. He can impose his will by virtue of the authority of his office, the promise of benefits and the threat of disadvantage.40

38 Dahl, p. 32. 39 Dahl, p. 15.
40 Morgenthau, p. 29.
Power and Persuasion

Persuasion, like authority, is a form of voluntary compliance. The persuasive person has no formal or legitimate position in the hierarchy. Persuasion can be utilized when subordinates accept the legitimacy of a superordinate's authority. "It is compliance without consideration of personal wants (power) or the position of the other person (authority)."

Theories, Concepts and Classifications of Power

Robert Dahl stated that "the concept of power is as ancient and ubiquitous as any that social science can boast." Despite the current level of interest in the topic of power, it is yet to occupy a central theme in the social sciences as envisioned by Dahl and other scientists and philosophers. Perhaps one reason for this phenomenon is the number of varied theories, conceptualizations and classifications of power, each of which differs in emphasis and scope. The relationship of these differing views to each other is also often unclear.

One example of the resulting confusion was found in various discussions of the works of John French and Bertram Raven. Throughout the literature their delineation of five types of power is referred to

41 Knezevich, p. 45.
43 Knezevich, p. 45.
as: a theory of power, a taxonomy of power, bases of power, types of power, classifications of power and concepts of power. Although these discrepancies do not reduce the importance of their work, they serve as a reminder of the differing views of power throughout the social sciences. Key theories, concepts and classifications of power will be discussed in this section.

French and Raven defined five bases for social power: reward power, based on the perception of a wielder of power as having control over rewards; coercive power, based on expectations of punishment for failure to conform to stated expectations; expert power, based on the extent of knowledge or perceived knowledge possessed by a group or individual; legitimate power, based on an accepted principle that an individual has a legitimate right to prescribe certain behaviors for another individual; and referent power based on an identification with a wielder of power, expressed by the linkage of behavior, beliefs, perceptions and/or values with those subject to the power. 45

In a discussion of these bases of power, Roy Martin commented on French and Raven's belief that all social change resulting from human intervention could be attributed to the operation of one or more of these forms of power. Martin concluded that "the most influential persons are those who have more than one source of power at their disposal." 46


Amitai Etzioni introduced the concept of the effects of the exercise of power as one way of classifying types of authority. He classified types of power in his trichotomy of power, which included coercive, utilitarian and normative power. 47

William Pollard and Terence Mitchell outlined four key theories of social power. Of the theories discussed by Pollard and Mitchell, field theory and exchange theory are considered process theories, and the political science theory and decision theory are considered outcome theories. 48

The field theory is based on the premise that behavior is seen as a function of needs or tensions, conceptualized as force vectors. 'A' can have power over 'B' without bringing about a behavioral change since 'B's actual behavior is a function of forces induced by other actors and the impersonal environment, in addition to forces created by 'A'. Thus 'A' can have power by overcoming the resistance to him/her. To have control, however, s/he must overcome not only resistance forces but all the opposition forces as well. 49

The exchange theory is based on an economic-like analysis of the interaction between actors. The exchange theorists view this interaction in terms of the rewards and costs the actors mediate for each other, and

49 Pollard and Mitchell, p. 434.
on the exchange aspect of the mutual dispensation of rewards and punishments or costs. The general assumption is that individuals behave so as to maximize the difference between the rewards and costs they experience.\(^{50}\)

The political science theory is based on the premise that the power of an actor can be examined in terms of the effects s/he has on the decisions or choices of other actors. The power of 'A' can be determined by the extent to which 'A' can get 'B' to do something 'B' would not otherwise do. The power of 'A' over 'B' is a function of the difference between the probability of 'B' performing a given behavior after 'A' has made some intervention and the probability of 'B' performing this behavior without 'A's' intervention.\(^{51}\)

The decision theory is based on the idea that the behavior of men is guided by the desire to obtain pleasure and avoid pain. This theory is based on the outcomes of two specific types of decisions: riskless and risky. A riskless decision occurs when an actor knows exactly what the outcomes of the various courses of action will be. The actor must then select the course of action with the largest overall utility. In contrast, a risky decision occurs when the actor must make a decision where the occurrence of certain outcomes as a consequence of the courses of action is a matter of probability.\(^{52}\)

Herbert Goldhamer and Edward A. Shils distinguished three major forms of power in terms of the type of influence brought to bear upon

\(^{50}\) Pollard and Mitchell, p. 434.

\(^{51}\) Pollard and Mitchell, p. 436.

\(^{52}\) Pollard and Mitchell, p. 437.
the subordinate individual. Force is exercised when the power-holder influences behavior by a physical manipulation of the subordinated individual through methods such as assault or confinement. Domination occurs when the power-holder influences behavior by making explicit to others what he wants them to do, through such methods as command or request. Manipulation is exercised where the power-holder influences the behavior of others without making explicit the behavior which he thereby wants them to perform. Manipulation may occur by utilization of symbols or performing acts. Propaganda is a major form of manipulation. 53

Paul Secord and Carl W. Backman stated that the amount of power that an individual may exert in a given situation is directly related to three interdependent properties: resources, dependencies and alternatives. 54

A resource is a property or conditional state of an individual which enables him to modify the rewards and costs experienced by another person. These properties or conditional states may include a possession, an attribute of appearance or personality, a job position or a certain way of behaving. The value of such a resource is primarily determined by the dependency of the other person on him/her. The value of a resource also varies situationally, with some situations creating temporary dependencies. The potentialities for influence in a relationship between two persons are dependent on more than just the characteristics of each person and the

53 Herbert Goldhamer and Edward A. Shils, "Type of Power and Status," The American Journal of Sociology, 45 (September 1939), 171-72.

situation. Power is a function of the availability of alternative
sources of reward and alternative means of reducing costs. 55

David McClelland classified power into two dimensions: (1) whether
the source of power is outside or inside the self; and (2) whether the
object of power is the self or someone or something outside the self.
McClelland felt these dimensions could be divided into four modalities
and stressed the fact that an individual could stay in any one stage for
a lifetime or progress/regress through the stages. 56

Stage I is referred to as "it strengthens me." The first way an
infant has to feel strong is to incorporate strength from another. Later
in life the "Stage I" person continues to draw strength from others such
as friends, family or an admired leader. 57

Stage II is referred to as "I strengthen myself." A child learns
that he can be powerful simply by saying "No." The mother urges the
child to defecate at a particular time. By learning to control defecation,
the child has a major opportunity to learn self-assertiveness and self-
control. The child learns that the mother cannot control his/her
thoughts. Eventually, by extension, the adult who employs this modality
of feeling powerful may accumulate possessions envisioned as part of
self, such as sports cars, rifles, or credit cards. 58

Stage III is referred to as "I have impact on others." If

57 McClelland, p. 13. 58 McClelland, p. 15.
consideration is returned to the growing child, soon after s/he learns s/he can feel powerful by controlling or building up himself/herself, s/he also learns to feel power by controlling others. As the child grows older, simple methods of environmental control give way to more subtle techniques such as persuasion, bargaining and maneuvering, in order to control the behavior of others. 59

Helping behavior also belongs in Stage III. One way of looking at giving is to perceive that for help to be given, help must be received. In accepting a gift, or help, the receiver can be perceived as acknowledging that s/he is weaker. From this viewpoint the receiver acknowledges that s/he is weaker to the extent that s/he accepts help from the giver. 60

McClelland commented that persons who either are or want to be educators regularly feel a stronger need to have power. The field of education is regarded as a "help giving" profession. This finding, therefore, suggests that persons with high power motivation are attracted to the teaching profession because it gives them the opportunity to feel strong by helping others. 61

Stage IV is referred to as "it moves me to do my duty." When the little boy recognizes that he cannot defeat his father, he incorporates the father's image and tries to be like him. Power based on this type of collective authority carries far more dangerous potential than power based on the authority of one individual. McClelland felt that what a person would not do on his own behalf, he will do if he perceives it as his duty to the higher authority. 62

59 McClelland, p. 18. 60 McClelland, p. 18.
Power, Personality and Environmental Characteristics

David C. McClelland and David H. Burnham studied five hundred successful managers and their less successful colleagues in sales, research, product development and operations divisions of twenty-five major organizations. Their major conclusion was that "a good manager is not one who needs personal success or who is people-oriented, but one who likes power." McClelland and Burnham found that the desire to have impact, to be strong and influential, was essential to good management. They termed this concept "power motivation" and concluded from their research that 70 percent of the managers tested were higher in power motivation than non-management personnel.

The better managers, as judged by the morale of those working for them, tended to be even higher in power motivation. The single most important determining factor of high morale was whether the manager's power motivation was higher than his/her need to be liked. Seventy-three percent of those perceived as being the better managers had a stronger need for power than a need to be liked. The need to be liked was termed the "affiliation motive."

McClelland and Burnham stated from their study that, above all:

---
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The good manager's power motivation is not oriented toward personal aggrandizement but toward the institution which he or she serves. The better managers are high in power motivation and low in affiliation motivation. They care about institutional power and use it to stimulate their employees to be more productive.67

Jay Hall and James Hawker summarized the findings of McClelland and Burnham by stating that good management may be said to require an appreciation of and desire for having impact, being strong and influential. Moreover, this need must be greater than either the need for personal achievement or the need to be liked by others.68 McClelland stated that one's desire for impact, strength or influence may take a form oriented primarily toward the achievement of personal gain and aggrandizement or by the need to influence others' behavior for the common good.69 In the first instance, the need for power is essentially self-serving, colored by unresolved achievement needs. In the second example, the person's power motivation is labeled "socialized," with power as an instrument to be used for the common good on behalf of the whole organization.70

Many other factors have been examined in current literature as having an impact on personal power. Michael Korda commented that it is probably easier for males to achieve power.71 Korda stated that the main

67 McClelland and Burnham, p. 103.
reason women find it difficult to achieve power is not so much that males put obstacles in their way, but rather that power is thought of as essentially male. This distinction may originate from the fact that "the authentic voice of power" is thought of as that of a man. The President of the United States has always been a man; most judges are men, and even in schools where teachers are women, the majority of principals are men. Korda further commented that women may have a distinct advantage over men; men are seldom inclined to see women as rivals.

Jane Mayo-Chamberlain conducted dissertation research on women's experience with power. Her theoretical paper concluded that human beings experience three kinds of power: transformation, communication and instrumental. These kinds of power involve an interrelationship between feminine and masculine principles:

1. Transformation—the capacity to move forward full potential through the nurturing and imaginative action of the feminine principle, and the clarifying effect of the masculine principle;
2. Communication—the capacity to achieve consensus through the relating and receptive action of the feminine principle, and the discriminating action of the masculine principle; and
3. Instrumental—capacity to gain prespecified goals through the adaptive and persistent action of the feminine principle and the insightful action of the masculine principle.

---
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Another characteristic associated with personal power is height. Julius Fast spoke of "dominance through height" as a truism which works from animal kingdom to man. Among wolves, studies indicate that the pack leader asserts his dominance by wrestling a yearling or subordinate wolf to the ground and standing over him. 76

Humans have a tradition of abasement before a king, idols or altars. Bowing, in general, is a statement of inferiority by height. The body language message is "You are higher than I am, therefore, you are dominant." 77

History supports the concept that powerful individuals were often above average in height. Of the forty presidents of the United States of America, only two were below average height. James Madison was five feet and four inches tall, and Martin Van Buren was five feet and six inches in height. 78

The age of an individual may influence his/her personal power in a given situation. David Brown interviewed fifty-two chief executive officers from universities across the United States. He posed a question concerning the length of time that an executive officer could remain effective in a university position. Of those responding in numbers, the average length of time was four to ten years. 79

The following comments

77 Fast, p. 40.
were made by the executive officers:

1. The implication here is that the more change a person is responsible for, the shorter his term may be, unless he is able to be a very astute politician, and even then his days are numbered;

2. As long as they feel there is a challenge to be met, they can be effective; and

3. Effective leadership requires a long-term commitment to an institution... a truly effective administrator establishes himself over a long period of time. Furthermore, he really is not fully accepted until the institution has weathered some bad times under his leadership.\(^\text{80}\)

James S. Larson conducted dissertation research on the effects of temperament, age and administrative setting on leadership style. Larson identified two types of leadership style:

1. Discipline— the use of punishment rather than tact in response to errors; and

2. Decision centralization— to centralize without employee input or advice in decision making.\(^\text{81}\)

The findings of the study suggested that among non-college administrators discipline was used more often, while college administrators tended to use decision centralization. It was reasoned that college administrators use less discipline because authority and accountability in college administration are less clearly defined than in non-college settings.\(^\text{82}\)

The results of this study further suggested that decision centralization and discipline are negatively related. When one style is used, there is a tendency not to use the other as a leadership style.\(^\text{83}\)

---
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Bertrand Russell stated that power is mainly dependent on organizations. Purely psychological power, such as that of Plato or Galileo, may exist without any corresponding social institution. Most power, however, is not important unless it is propagated by a church, a political party, or some analogous social organism. 84

James A. Burkhart, Samuel Krislov and Raymond L. Lee wrote of the philosophies of Martin Luther King, Jr. King was an example of a charismatic leader, emerging as the spokesman of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and the civil rights movement. 85 His sanction for leadership among the black population and his dedication to their cause were expressed in his letter from the Birmingham City Jail. Burkhart, Krislov and Lee referred to this letter as "an eloquent demonstration of why he emerged as the spokesman of the civil rights movement." 86 The charismatic leadership style and power of King were expressed in the following comment from that letter:

I would not hesitate to say that it is unfortunate that so-called demonstrations are taking place in Birmingham at this time, but I would say in more emphatic terms that it is even more unfortunate that the white power structure of this city left the Negro community with no other alternative. 87

Russell defined an organization as "a set of people who are combined

84 Russell, Power, a New Social Analysis, p. 107.
87 Martin Luther King, Jr., "Letter from Birmingham City Jail," The New Leader, 24 June 1963, p. 3.
in virtue of activities directed to common ends." He further stated that every organization, whatever its character or purpose, involves some redistribution of power. Competition for power may be viewed either between organizations or between individuals for leadership within an organization.

In a study concerning sources of power in complex organizations, David Mechanic concluded that within organizations, the distribution of power is closely if not perfectly correlated with the prestige of position. Mechanic stated that, generally, persons occupying high-ranking positions within organizations have more power than those holding low-ranking positions.

The study further indicated that lower participants recognized the right of higher-ranking participants to exercise power and yielded without difficulty to demands they regarded as legitimate. Moreover, a clear correlation was noted between the prestige of positions and the extent to which the position offered access to information, persons and instrumentalities. Mechanic, therefore, stated that "power is closely related to dependence." He concluded that within organizations one makes others dependent on himself/herself by controlling:

1. Information—knowledge of the organization, persons, norms, procedures and techniques;
2. Persons—anyone within or outside the organization

---
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upon whom the organization is in some way dependent; and
3. Instrumentalities—any aspect of the physical plant of the organization or its resources; such as equipment, machines or money.93

In dissertation research conducted by Margaret Sughrue Carlson, female administrators were examined to determine the relationship between organizational factors and perceived power. Using an interview technique, Carlson reached the following conclusions:

1. Systemic factors (role expectations, and organizational structure and process) were more fundamental than positional variables (professional responsibility) in accounting for power in an academic setting;
2. Empowerment of female administrators was linked to the historical and contextual equity patterns of the educational institution;
3. Leadership roles are rooted in academic preparation and expertise rather than administrative skills and competencies; and
4. Perceived power increased with formal authority.94

Charles Clevenger studied the patterned distribution of power in colleges and universities. By specifying a college's social structure, Clevenger hypothesized that the characteristics of an institution's more elusive power distribution pattern could be determined. The findings of his research indicated that power in colleges and universities tends to be system-relevant rather than related to the property or personal attribute of an individual actor. He concluded that power, as a phenomenon distinct from authority, control or influence is much

93 Mechanic, p. 352.

The research of Edward Gross and Paul Grambsch closely paralleled the findings of Clevenger. Gross and Grambsch stated, in a study for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, that it is widely assumed that power holders have a causal impact on their environments, in the sense that they affect or even determine goals and the manner of their attainment. They concluded, however, that the causal direction may be the reverse. It is more likely that universities with certain types of goal structures attract certain kinds of persons into positions of high influence. Instead of assuming that power holders cause goals, it is more likely that goals "cause" certain kinds of power structures to emerge.\footnote{Edward Gross and Paul V. Grambsch, \textit{Changes in University Organization 1964-1971} (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974), p. 120.}

In contrast to these findings, the results of dissertation research conducted by John Thomas Polito indicated that greed is the dominant motive for powerful individuals. Individuals are equally likely to make decisions which benefit themselves and impose costs on others, whether they act jointly or singly.\footnote{John Thomas Polito, "Motives of the Powerful and the Powerless," \textit{Dissertation Abstracts International}, 43 (December 1982), 2083A.}

In selecting individuals to serve in given positions, research by French and Raven explored the hypothesis that in an interdependent situation, an election process would serve to grant an individual a legitimate right to a position. Two work situations were created, both
interdependent and identical with the exception that in one case the individual was elected and in the other the individual assumed the position by appointment. The hypothesis as stated above was substantially supported.98

Barry Richman and Richard Farmer enumerated sources of organizational power. Some of these sources relate to group characteristics, while some are individualistic. These sources of power include

1. Formal authority to decide and act;
2. Authority to enforce various policies, procedures, rules and methods;
3. Expertise, skill and knowledge relating to specific kinds of decisions;
4. Perceived as a significant information source;
5. Manipulative ability and political power source;
6. Referent power or influence by association;
7. Fair, open-minded and trustworthy;
8. Willingness to spend time; and
9. Persistence.99

Personal space and the arrangement of office furnishings hold an interest in the study of power in organizations. Robert Sommer reported research which indicated that spatial arrangement is a function of group task, the degree of relationship of individuals, personalities of the individuals, and the amount and kind of available space. This resulting arrangement, in turn, affects communication, friendship, and status differentiation between individuals.100


Michael Korda began his discussion of spatial arrangement with a discussion of power circles. In a power circle, as in any office arrangement, a desk is the position of control. In a circular arrangement, the order of power will follow in a clockwise fashion from the position of control. The person to the left of the position of control will be the second most powerful, with the person to the right being the least powerful.

Julius Fast discussed a manager's manipulation of the spatial arrangement of office furnishings. Fast stated that a desk can act as a barrier. By arranging the office so that the visiting worker sits on one side of the desk with the manager sitting on the other, the manager automatically proclaims himself/herself the leader. S/he exaggerates the distance between them.

Korda, also, made an observation concerning office windows. He stated that the desk should be placed directly in front of a window. In this position, others within the power circle will be forced to look into the glare of the sun in order to view the individual in the position of control. This produces a halo effect and, thus, a stronger image of power.

Korda discussed power areas within buildings. His writings indicated that the power area (or floor) of an organization will be a

---
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well protected area. It will not allow for the easiest access from possible intruders, either above or below. Korda further indicated that power tends to communicate itself from corner to corner in an X-shaped pattern. The closer an office is to the center of a floor, less power is indicated.

The psychology of color is an area of interest as it relates to the concept of power. Faber Birren pointed out certain basic facts about human likes and dislikes for color. Basically, he stated that a well adjusted individual will like color in general and warm colors in particular.

In the well-known Rorschach's color test, an emotionally responsive person will react quite freely to color in general. An emotionally inhibited person may be shocked or embarrassed by the intrusion of color into his/her inner life. The rigid, emotionally indifferent type may remain unaffected.

Leslie Kane discussed the psychology behind several of the most common colors. Kane stated that in any given society, particular colors affect individuals within that society in the same distinct manner.

The color red is a brilliant, intense color which may be termed "the exciter." Mental associations with red include "hot," fire and
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blood, Tests conducted at UCLA showed the psychological reactions of people to rooms of different colors. It was discovered that blood pressures, respiration rate, heart beat, muscle activity, eyeblinks and brain waves all increased when a person was in a red room. Thus, the color red has come to be associated with "danger."110

Kane stated that blue was a color of sober tranquility and serenity. It "paints" mental images of sky and water. Tests at the University of Alberta, in Edmonton, Canada, showed that blue surroundings can have an intense calming effect on behaviorally disturbed children. This calming effect can even be true if the child is blind. When the blind child's eyes are opened so that color can strike the retina, the effects can be the same as if the child were sighted. Kane concluded that this strongly suggests that "color has a direct biochemical pathway to the brain."111

The color green is the "masquerader." Some people believe green to be quieting, refreshing, peaceful and nascent. Others are irritated by the color, equating it to disease, terror, guilt and envy. Kane stated that authorities insist that it is only when one shade of green is present that the negative impressions will result. She stated that nothing is more tranquil than a walk in the forest, since a forest contains a countless number of green shades, hues and tones.112

Korda devoted considerable conversation to the idea of using color to achieve personal power. He reported that currently there are "executive color consultants" who will analyze a businessperson's
character and appearance to find the color most conducive to his/her personal power. The consultant will arrive at a "basic power color" and then proceed to advise clients on office decoration, shirts, ties, socks, cars and even their home decor.113

According to Korda, blue is considered the most powerful color. Yellow is often thought to be frivolous and weak; beige and tan are too neutral to convey power; red is frightening and brown depressing. White, however, gives a sense of space and freedom. Korda stated that the most powerful color combination is blue (for power), white (for freedom), and a touch of red (for a hint of aggression).114

Summary

The literature reviewed in this chapter dealt primarily with the history, definition, terminology, theories, concepts and classifications of power. Particular emphasis was placed on an examination of personality and environmental characteristics which have relevance to a study of power in higher education. The topics were reviewed in accordance with the framework determined as relevant to the study.

Following an introductory statement, the key elements of power were reviewed. The historical evaluation of power indicated a seeming human obsession with power, which has existed throughout the ages. This obsession was noted throughout the writings of the great philosophers, as well as simply by the actions of humans as members of a notably violent species.
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The ambiguity, throughout literature, concerning the definition and acceptable terminology of power was examined. Definitions from various disciplines were reviewed. Terminology often associated with or substituted for the term "power" were discussed. The major thrust of these sections was toward an enlightened awareness of the fundamental views of key educators, social scientists and political scientists concerning the concept of power.

The literature review concerning theories, concepts and classifications of power included an examination of field, exchange, political science and decision theories. Various concepts and classifications of power were examined as they relate to the interdependent properties of resources, dependencies and alternatives. Four stages of ego development were discussed and compared to the concept of power.

A variety of personality and environmental characteristics were defined in terms of their possible impact on personal power. These characteristics included sex; height; age; the impact of formal organizations, specifically institutions of higher education; spatial arrangement of office furnishings and office locations; and color psychology. Personalized and socialized power motives were discussed; and the lack of desire to power, or affiliation, was defined.

Authors and research studies cited in the review of literature indicated a basic human desire to power. This desire to power, or power motivation, was perceived as potentially manifesting itself through many personal, physical and/or environmental characteristics.
Chapter 3 contains the research design, selection of the sample, procedures followed in collecting the data, and a summary of the statistical analysis of the data.

Research Design

The techniques of ex post facto research were used in this study. These techniques are concerned with discovering possible causes for a particular behavior pattern by "comparing subjects in whom the pattern is present with similar subjects in whom it is absent or present to a lesser degree."\(^1\) Fred N. Kerlinger defined ex post facto research as follows:

Ex post facto research is systematic empirical inquiry in which the scientist does not have direct control of independent variables because their manifestations have already occurred or because they are inherently not manipulatable. Inferences about relations among variables are made, without direct intervention, from concomitant variation of independent and dependent variables.\(^2\)

Ex post facto research is widely used in the behavioral sciences. This method will continue to be used in education.


since it is impossible, impracticable, or unthinkable to manipulate such variables as aptitude, intelligence, personality traits, and some variables that might present unacceptable threat to human beings.3

It is important, however, that the limitations of ex post facto research be recognized

1. The independent variables cannot be manipulated;
2. Subjects cannot be randomly assigned to treatment groups; and
3. Causes are often multiple rather than single.4

Despite these possible limitations in the use of ex post facto research, this method is useful for identifying possible causes of observed variations in behavior. This, in turn, can be valuable in giving direction to later experimental studies, which are more likely to produce clear-cut results.5

Selection of the Sample

The purpose of this study was to determine if relationships exist between selected characteristics of higher education administrators and their perceived power motivation and power style. The academic administrators at East Tennessee State University were chosen as being a representative group for evaluation. This selection was considered to be manageable.

A listing of current academic administrators was secured from the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs (see Appendix B).

---
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The research sample included one Vice President for Academic Affairs, one Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, one Assistant to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, nine Deans, twelve Associate/Assistant Deans, twenty-one Directors, three Coordinators, and forty-eight Chairpersons. This research sample comprised an intact group of academic administrators at East Tennessee State University.

Contact was made with the President of East Tennessee State University. An explanation of the study was given, and permission to conduct the study was requested. A letter with written permission was received from the President (see Appendix A).

The Instrument

The Power Management Inventory developed by Jay Hall and James Hawker was selected as the appropriate instrument for use in this study (see Appendix E). Contact was made with a representative of Teleometrics International of The Woodlands, Texas, to arrange for the purchase of the instrument (see Appendix C). The purchase of 110 copies of the instrument was arranged.

The Power Management Inventory was designed to measure power motivation and power style. The instrument was, therefore, developed with two parts.

Part I of the Power Management Inventory, concerned with power motivation, was designed to suggest one of three types of power orientations: Personalized Power (PP), Socialized Power (SP), and Affiliative Motive (AM). A total of twenty item stems were developed along with appropriate response items representing the three power orientations.
The items were arranged so that each stem appeared in a forced choice format with pairs of responses reflecting the three categories of response. Each item stem appeared three times, resulting in a total of sixty items. For every item the respondent was asked to distribute five points between two response alternatives. As a result, the respondent could distribute 300 points among the three response styles.

The alternative responses were labeled A, B and C to represent the PP, SP, and AM orientations, respectively. The results yielded three scores which were defined by James Hawker and Jay Hall as follows:

Type A (Personalized Power Motive): The tendency to value and desire power for purposes of personal aggrandizement and control. High A scores indicate a personal need to be the center of attention, generally in control of interpersonal situations, and to prevail in most encounters with others.

Type B (Socialized Power Motive): The tendency to value and desire power for purposes of serving and benefiting the common welfare. High B scores indicate a personal need to have impact on cultures and systems and to be an influence for widespread enhancement.

Type C (Affiliative Motive): The tendency to value being liked and warmly regarded by other people. High C scores indicate a personal need to be of service, to nurture and give support to others, and to reassure and make others comfortable—even when these are done at one's own expense or to the detriment of one's other personal aspirations.

Part II of the Power Management Inventory, concerned with power style, was designed to reflect a person's typical mode of responding when dealing with others in a managerial or leadership role. Ten items were constructed to reflect aspects of the manager's job. Each item was presented with an eleven-point scale. The respondent was
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instructed to make an "X" at the appropriate spot on the continuum to indicate how s/he would handle a given situation. Scores were summed and divided by one hundred to yield a Power Style Index (PSI). The two sections of the Power Management Inventory were designed to provide a comparison between one's espoused theory (power motivation) and one's theory in action (power style).  

Information concerning the internal consistency and validity of the Power Management Inventory was supplied with the instrument. To determine the internal consistency, coefficient alpha was computed for each of the three power types in Part I and for the ten items comprising Part II of the Power Management Inventory. The PP, SP and AM types were shown to have internal consistency reliabilities of .77, .67 and .74 respectively, yielding an average internal consistency reliability of .73 across the three types. 8 Part II of the Power Management Inventory yielded a coefficient of .66. 9 Taken together, these data indicated that the Power Management Inventory is acceptably reliable as a measuring instrument. 10

The construct validity of the instrument was evaluated by comparing scores on the Power Management Inventory with the motivational scales measured by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. A significant correlation was noted between the two instruments. 11 A second approach, utilizing discriminant function analysis, attempted to separate the three

7 Hawker and Hall, p. 2. 8 Hawker and Hall, p. 4.
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types of power motivation into a "pure" form, which indicated a high
degree of separation among the three power motivation orientations.\textsuperscript{12}

It was concluded that the \textit{Power Management Inventory} is valid and consis-
tent with the underlying principles of power motivation and is
sufficiently reliable for training and research purposes.\textsuperscript{13}

\textbf{Data Collection}

Once approval to pursue this study was granted by the Advanced
Graduate Committee and the President of East Tennessee State University,
each participant included in the intact group of academic administrators
was mailed a questionnaire, a personal data sheet, and an Informed
Consent Form. A cover letter explaining the purpose of the study,
assuring anonymity and soliciting personal responses was included (see
Appendix G).

Two self-addressed envelopes were included with the survey
instruments. The respondents were asked to sign and return the Informed
Consent Form in one envelope and the questionnaire and personal data
sheet in the second envelope. The cover letter explained to all survey
participants that their names were not to be placed on the questionnaire
or personal data sheet.

Two weeks after the initial contact with the respondents, a follow-
up letter was mailed to those who had not responded (see Appendix H).
When 50 percent of the questionnaires were returned and one month had
elapsed, the data were recorded on coding forms, keypunched, and submitted

\textsuperscript{12} Hawker and Hall, p. 4. \textsuperscript{13} Hawker and Hall, p. 4.
to East Tennessee State University Computer Center for statistical analysis.

Data Analysis

The declarative format for each hypothesis was stated in Chapter 1. For purposes of statistical analysis, the null format for each hypothesis was tested. The null hypotheses stated that no difference existed between the variables studied. The non-parametric statistic chi square was used to determine where significant differences existed in the hypotheses where parametric assumptions could not be met. A t-test for independent data was used to determine if two means were significantly different in those hypotheses in which parametric assumptions could be met.

Summary

The research methodology and procedures were presented in this chapter. The instrument chosen for the study was the Power Management Inventory developed and validated by Jay Hall and James Hawker.

An intact group of academic administrators at East Tennessee State University was selected as the population for this study. When a minimum of 50 percent return of the questionnaires was received, the data were analyzed using chi square and the t-test for independent data.
CHAPTER FOUR

Presentation and Analysis of Data

Introduction

The results and findings obtained from the data gathered in this study are presented in this chapter. The hypotheses tested with these data are set forth in Chapter 1. These hypotheses were tested to determine relationships and differences between selected personal characteristics of higher education administrators and their perceived levels of power motivation and power style among members of a selected group at East Tennessee State University.

Procedures for the statistical treatment of the data were outlined in Chapter 3. Further explanation and clarification of these procedures will be necessary throughout this chapter.

The non-parametric statistic chi square was used to determine where significant differences existed for Hypotheses 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21 and 23. A t-test for independent data was used to determine where significant differences existed for Hypotheses 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22 and 24. The .05 level of significance was established for accepting or rejecting the hypotheses of this study. For purposes of clarity and ease of understanding, those hypotheses analyzed with the statistic chi square were reported first, followed by those hypotheses analyzed with a t-test for independent data.
Hypotheses Analyzed
Using Chi Square

The chi square statistic was selected for analyzing hypotheses 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21 and 23, because parametric assumptions could not be met.

The chi square test applies only to discrete data, counted rather than measured values. The test is a test of independence, the idea that one variable is not affected by, or related to another variable. The chi square is not a measure of the degree of relationship. It is merely used to estimate the likelihood that some factor other than chance (sampling error) accounts for the apparent relationship.¹

The chi square test requires that the expected frequency in each cell not be too small. It was, therefore, necessary to combine cells in order to meet this requirement. Stanley Siegel suggested that when N > 40, chi square corrected for continuity should be used.² The statistical software package utilized for the analysis of this data calculates Yates's corrected chi square.

Cells were combined into a 2 X 2 format for all the hypotheses tested with the statistic chi square. In each case, the power motivation types were collapsed in the same manner utilizing the interpretation rationale of the publishers Jay Hall and James Hawker. In their discussion of the instrument, Hall and Hawker stated that both the

personalized power motive and the socialized power motive were tendencies to value and desire power. Both the socialized and personalized power motives "indicate a strong desire for impact, strength and influence as a manager." Conversely, if the affiliation motive was identified, an aversion to power is indicated. Therefore, types A and B (personalized and socialized power motives) were combined into cell one. Type C constituted cell two. This format was utilized for all the hypotheses tested with the statistic chi square.

**Null Hypothesis 1**

Null Hypothesis 1 is as follows: there will be no significant difference between the power motivation types of male administrators and the power motivation types of female administrators. The power motivation type determined in Part I of the *Power Management Inventory* and question 1 of the Personal Data Sheet were utilized for this analysis. The results of the analysis are listed in Table 1, page 54.

A comparison was made between the power motivation types of male and female administrators. From the results, it was concluded that of 50 male administrators surveyed, 21, or 42 percent of the males sampled, had a tendency to value and desire power. By comparison, 6 of the 14 female administrators, or 42.9 percent of the females sampled, had a

---


5 Hawker and Hall, "Interpreting Your Scores," p. 2.
tendency to value and desire power. Of the 64 administrators surveyed, 27, both male and female, had a tendency to value and desire power, representing 42.2 percent of the study population.

Table 1
Comparison Between the Power Motivation Types of Male and Female Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power and Affiliation Types</th>
<th>Male Administrators</th>
<th>Female Administrators</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 0.0$  df = 1  significance = 1.0000

It was further concluded from the data that 29 of the 50 male administrators surveyed, or 58 percent of the sample, were identified as having an aversion to power, which was classified as the affiliation type. Eight of the 14 female administrators, or 51.1 percent of the females sampled, were classified as the affiliation type indicating an aversion to power. Of the 64 male and female administrators surveyed, 37 were classified as the affiliation type. This group represented 57.8 percent of the study population.

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the power motivation types of male and female administrators. With a chi square analysis of 0.0 and a level of significance at 1.0000, it was concluded that no significant difference existed. Therefore, the
null hypothesis that there would be no significant difference failed to be rejected.

**Null Hypothesis 3**

Null Hypothesis 3 is as follows: there will be no significant difference between the power motivation types of taller administrators and the power motivation types of shorter administrators. The power motivation type determined in Part I of the Power Management Inventory and question 2 of the Personal Data Sheet were utilized for this analysis. The results of the analysis are listed in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power and Affiliation Type</th>
<th>5'5&quot; or under</th>
<th>5'6&quot; or over</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = .49119 \quad \text{df} = 1 \quad \text{significance} = .4834 \]

A comparison was made between the power motivation types of taller and shorter administrators. In order to conform to a 2 x x chi square table, the data were collapsed into two response categories: (a) 5'5" or under; and (b) 5'6" or over. For the purposes of data analysis, heights 5'5" or under were considered below average height for both males and females. Heights 5'6" or over were considered above average height for both males and females.
From the results, it was concluded that of 63 administrators responding, 11, or 17.5 percent of the populations sampled, were classified as below average height. Of this 17.5 percent, 3 administrators, or 4.8 percent of the total sample, had a tendency to value and desire power. By comparison, 8 administrators, or 12.7 percent of the total sample, below average in height were classified as the affiliation type.

It was further concluded from the data that 52 administrators, or 82.5 percent of the population sampled, were classified as above average height. Of this 82.5 percent, 23 administrators, or 36.5 percent of the total sample, had a tendency to value and desire power. By comparison, 29 administrators, or 46.0 percent of the total sample, above average in height were classified as the affiliation type.

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the power motivation types of taller and shorter administrators. With a chi square analysis of .49119 and a level of significance at .4834, it was concluded that no significant difference existed. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there would be no significant difference failed to be rejected.

Null Hypothesis 5

Null Hypothesis 5 is as follows: there will be no significant difference between the power motivation types of older administrators and the power motivation types of younger administrators. The power motivation type determined in Part I of the Power Management Inventory and question 3 of the Personal Data Sheet were utilized for this analysis. The results of the analysis are listed in Table 3, page 57.
Table 3
Comparison Between the Power Motivation Types of Older and Younger Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power and Affiliation Type</th>
<th>50 years or under</th>
<th>51 years or older</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 3.72613 \quad df = 1 \quad \text{significance} = .0500 \]

A comparison was made between the power motivation types of older and younger administrators. In order to conform to a 2 x 2 chi square table, the data were collapsed into two response categories: (a) 50 years and younger; and (b) 51 years and older.

From the results, it was concluded that of 64 administrators surveyed, 45, or 70.3 percent of the population sampled, were classified as younger administrators. Of this 70.3 percent, 15 administrators, or 23.4 percent of the total sample, had a tendency to value and desire power. By comparison, 30 administrators, or 46.9 percent of the total sample, who were younger administrators, were classified as the affiliation type.

It was further concluded from the data that 19 administrators, or 29.7 percent of the population sampled, were classified as older administrators. Of this 29.7 percent, 12 administrators, or 18.8 percent of the total sample, had a tendency to value and desire power. By comparison, 7 administrators, or 10.9 percent of the total sample, which were older administrators, were classified as the affiliation type.
It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the power motivation types of older and younger administrators. With a chi square analysis of 3.72613 and a level of significance of .0500, it was concluded that a significant difference existed. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there would be no significant difference was rejected.

Null Hypothesis 7

Null Hypothesis 7 is as follows: there will be no significant difference between the power motivation types of Vice Presidents/Associate or Assistant Vice Presidents, Deans and Departmental Chairpersons and the power motivation types of Directors, Coordinators and other administrators. The power motivation type determined in Part I of the Power Management Inventory and question 4 of the Personal Data Sheet were utilized for this analysis. The results of the analysis are listed in Table 4, page 59.

A comparison was made between the power motivation types of administrators in various administrative positions. In order to conform to a 2 X 2 chi square table, the data were collapsed into two response categories: (a) Vice Presidents/Associate or Assistant Vice Presidents, Deans and Departmental Chairpersons; and (b) Director, Coordinators and other administrators.

From the results, it was concluded that of 64 administrators surveyed, 41, or 64.1 percent of the population samples, were classified as Vice President/Associate or Assistant Vice President, Dean or
Departmental Chairperson. Of this 64.1 percent, 14 administrators, or 21.9 percent of the total sample, had a tendency to value and desire power. By comparison, 27 administrators, or 42.2 percent of the total sample, who were Vice Presidents/Associate or Assistant Vice Presidents, Deans or Departmental Chairpersons, were classified as the affiliation type.

Table 4

Comparison Between the Power Motivation Types of Vice Presidents/Associate or Assistant Vice Presidents, Deans and Departmental Chairpersons; and Directors, Coordinators and Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power and Affiliation Type</th>
<th>Vice Presidents/Associate or Assistant Vice Presidents, Deans and Departmental Chairpersons</th>
<th>Directors, Coordinators, Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 2.17675 \quad df = 1 \quad \text{significance} = .1401 \]

It was further concluded from the data that 23 administrators, or 35.9 percent of the population sampled, were classified as Directors, Coordinators or other administrators. Of this 35.9 percent, 13 administrators, or 20.3 percent of the total sample, had a tendency to value and desire power. By comparison, 10 administrators, or 15.6 percent of the total sample, who were Directors, Coordinators or other administrators, were classified as the affiliation type.
It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the power motivation types of administrators in various administrative positions. With a chi square analysis of 2.17675 and a level of significance at .1401, it was concluded that no significant difference existed. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there would be no significant difference failed to be rejected.

**Null Hypothesis 9**

Null Hypothesis 9 is as follows: there will be no significant difference between the power motivation types of administrators selected by members of their Colleges/Schools/Departments or search committees and the power motivation types of administrators selected by direct appointment by their superiors. The power motivation type determined in Part I of the Power Management Inventory and question 5 of the Personal Data Sheet were utilized for this analysis. The results of the analysis are listed in Table 5, page 61.

A comparison was made between the power motivation types of administrators selected for their positions by various groups and those administrators selected by direct appointment by a superior. In order to conform to a 2 x 2 chi square table, the data were collapsed into two response categories: (a) administrators selected by members of their Colleges/Schools/Departments or search committees; and (b) administrators selected by direct appointment by their superiors.

From the results, it was concluded that of 64 administrators surveyed, 39, or 60.9 percent of the population sampled, were classified as being selected for their position by members of their Colleges/Schools/
Departments or search committees. Of this 60.9 percent, 12 administrators, or 18.9 percent of the total sample, had a tendency to value and desire power. By comparison, 27 administrators, or 42.2 percent of the total sample, who were selected by members of their Colleges/Schools/Departments or search committees, were classified as the affiliation type.

Table 5
Comparison Between the Power Motivation Types of Administrators Group Selected and Directly Appointed to Current Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power and Affiliation Type</th>
<th>College/School/Department or Search Committee</th>
<th>Direct Appointment by Superior</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\chi^2 = 4.20582 \quad df = 1 \quad \text{significance} = .0403
\]

It was further concluded from the data that 25 administrators, or 39.1 percent of the population sampled, were classified as being selected for their positions by direct appointment by their superiors. Of this 39.1 percent, 15 administrators, or 23.4 percent of the total sample, had a tendency to value and desire power. By comparison, 10 administrators, or 15.6 percent of the total sample, who were selected by direct appointment by their superior, were classified as the affiliation type.

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the power motivation types of administrators selected for their
positions by various groups and those administrators selected by direct
appointment by a superior. With a chi square analysis of 4.20582 and a
level of significance at .0403, it was concluded that a significant
difference existed. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there would be
no significant difference was rejected.

Null Hypothesis II

Null Hypothesis II is as follows: there will be no significant
difference in the power motivation types of administrators whose positions
were advertised outside their Colleges/Schools/Departments and the power
motivation types of administrators whose positions were not advertised
outside their Colleges/Schools/Departments. The power motivation type
determined in Part I of the Power Management Inventory and question 6
of the Personal Data Sheet were utilized for this analysis. The results
of the analysis are listed in Table 6.

Table 6

Comparison Between the Power Motivation Types of
Administrators Whose Positions Were Advertised
and Were Not Advertised Outside College/
School/Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power and Affiliation Type</th>
<th>Advertised Outside College/School/Department</th>
<th>Not Advertised Outside College/School/Department</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 0.0 \quad df = 1 \quad$ significance $= 1.0000$
A comparison was made between the power motivation types of administrators whose positions were advertised outside their Colleges/Schools/Departments and those administrators whose positions were not advertised outside their Colleges/Schools/Departments. From the results, it was concluded that of the 62 administrators responding, 34, or 54.8 percent of the population sampled, were classified as having positions which were advertised outside their Colleges/Schools/Departments. Of this 54.8 percent, 15 administrators, or 24.2 percent of the total sample, had a tendency to value and desire power. By comparison, 19 administrators, or 30.6 percent of the total sample, whose positions were advertised outside their Colleges/Schools/Departments, were classified as the affiliation type.

It was further concluded from the data that 28 administrators, or 45.2 percent of the population sampled, were classified as having positions which were not advertised outside their Colleges/Schools/Departments. Of this 45.2 percent, 12 administrators, or 19.4 percent of the total sample, had a tendency to value and desire power. By comparison, 16 administrators, or 25.8 percent of the total sample, whose positions were not advertised outside their Colleges/Schools/Departments, were classified as the affiliation type.

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the power motivation types of administrators whose positions were advertised outside their Colleges/Schools/Departments and those administrators whose positions were not advertised outside their Colleges/Schools/Departments. With a chi square analysis of 0.0 and a level of significance at 1.0000, it was concluded that no significant difference existed.
Therefore, the null hypothesis that there would be no significant difference failed to be rejected.

Null Hypothesis 13

Null Hypothesis 13 is as follows: there will be no significant difference in the power motivation types of administrators who have served in their current positions for a longer length of time and the power motivation types of administrators who have served in their current positions for a shorter length of time. The power motivation type determined in Part I of the Power Management Inventory and question 7 of the Personal Data Sheet were utilized for this analysis. The results of the analysis are listed in Table 7.

Table 7

Comparison Between the Power Motivation Types of Administrators Serving Longer and Shorter Lengths of Time in Current Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power and Affiliation Type</th>
<th>5 years or less</th>
<th>6 years or more</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = .37912 \quad df = 1 \quad \text{significance} = .5381 \]

A comparison was made between the power motivation types of administrators who have served longer and shorter lengths of time in their current position. In order to conform to a 2 x 2 chi square table,
the data were collapsed into two response categories: (a) five years or less; and (b) six years or more.

From the results, it was concluded that of the 64 administrators surveyed, 46, or 71.9 percent of the population sampled, were classified as having served in their current positions for five years or less. Of this 71.9 percent, 21 administrators, or 32.8 percent of the total sample, had a tendency to value and desire power. By comparison, 25 administrators, or 39.1 percent of the total sample, who had served in their current positions five years or less, were classified as the affiliation type.

It was further concluded from the data that 18 administrators, or 28.1 percent of the population sampled, were classified as having served in their current positions for six years or more. Of this 28.1 percent, 6 administrators, or 9.4 percent of the total sample, had a tendency to value and desire power. By comparison, 12 administrators, or 18.8 percent of the total sample, who had served in their current positions six years or more, were classified as the affiliation type.

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the power motivation types of administrators who have served longer and shorter lengths of time in their current positions. With a chi square analysis of .37912 and a level of significance at .5381, it was concluded that no significant difference existed. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there would be no significant difference failed to be rejected.

Null Hypothesis 15

Null Hypothesis 15 is as follows: there will be no significant
difference in the power motivation types of administrators who have been employed for a longer length of time at the current institution and the power motivation types of administrators who have been employed at the current institution for a shorter length of time. The power motivation type determined in Part I of the Power Management Inventory and question 8 of the Personal Data Sheet were utilized for this analysis. The results of the analysis are listed in Table 8.

Table 8

Comparison Between the Power Motivation Types of Administrators Employed Longer and Shorter Lengths of Time at the Current Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power and Affiliation Type</th>
<th>10 years or less</th>
<th>11 years or more</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 1.88348 \quad df = 1 \quad \text{significance} = .1699 \]

A comparison was made between the power motivation types of administrators who have been employed longer and shorter lengths of time at the current institution. In order to conform to a 2 x 2 chi square table, the data were collapsed into two response categories: (a) ten years or less; and (b) eleven years or more.

From the results, it was concluded that of the 64 administrators surveyed, 40, or 62.5 percent of the population sampled, were classified as having been employed at the current institution for ten years or less.
Of this 62.5 percent, 20 administrators, or 31.3 percent of the total sample, had a tendency to value and desire power. By comparison, 20 administrators, or 31.3 percent of the total sample, who had been employed at the current institution ten years or less, were classified as the affiliation type.

It was further concluded from the data that 24 administrators, or 37.5 percent of the population sampled, were classified as having been employed at the current institution for eleven years or more. Of this 37.5 percent, 7 administrators, or 10.9 percent of the total sample, had a tendency to value and desire power. By comparison, 17 administrators, or 26.6 percent of the total sample, who had been employed at the current institution for eleven years or more, were classified as the affiliation type.

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the power motivation types of administrators who have been employed longer and shorter lengths of time at the current institution. With a chi square analysis of 1.88348 and a level of significance at .1699, it was concluded that no significant difference existed. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there would be no significant difference failed to be rejected.

Null Hypothesis 17

Null Hypothesis 17 is as follows: there will be no significant difference in the power motivation types of administrators who select one color as their favorite and the power motivation types of administrators who select other colors as their favorites. The power motivation
type determined in Part I of the Power Management Inventory and question 9 of the Personal Data Sheet were utilized for this analysis. The results of the analysis are listed in Table 9.

Table 9
Comparison Between the Power Motivation Types of Administrators Selecting Blue and Selecting Other Colors as Favorite Colors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power and Affiliation Type</th>
<th>Other Colors</th>
<th>Blue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 0.0 \quad df = 1 \quad \text{significance} = 1.0000 \]

A comparison was made between the power motivation types of administrators who selected blue as their favorite color and administrators who selected other colors as their favorite. In order to conform to a 2 X 2 chi square table, the data were collapsed into two response categories: (a) other colors; and (b) blue.

From the results, it was concluded that of 64 administrators surveyed, 21, or 32.8 percent of the population sampled, selected colors other than blue as their favorite color. Of the 32.8 percent, 9 administrators, or 14.1 percent of the total sample, had a tendency to value and desire power. By comparison, 12 administrators, or 18.8 percent of the total sample, who selected colors other than blue as being their favorite color, were classified as the affiliation type.
It was further concluded from the data that 43 administrators, or 67.2 percent of the population sampled, selected blue as their favorite color. Of this 67.2 percent, 18 administrators, or 28.1 percent of the total sample, had a tendency to value and desire power. By comparison, 25 administrators, or 39.1 percent of the total sample, who selected blue as their favorite color, were classified as the affiliation type.

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the power motivation types of administrators who selected blue as their favorite color and administrators who selected other colors as their favorite. With a chi square analysis of 0.0 and a level of significance at 1.0000, it was concluded that no significant difference existed. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there would be no significant difference failed to be rejected.

Null Hypothesis 19

Null Hypothesis 19 is as follows: there will be no significant difference in the power motivation types of administrators who select one color as their least favorite and the power motivation types of administrators who select other colors as their least favorite. The power motivation type determined in Part I of the Power Management Inventory and question 10 of the Personal Data Sheet were utilized for this analysis. The results of the analysis are listed in Table 10, page 70.

A comparison was made between the power motivation types of administrators who selected blue as their least favorite color and administrators who selected other colors as their least favorite. In order to conform
to a 2 X 2 chi square table, the data were collapsed into two response categories: (a) other colors; and (b) blue.

Table 10

Comparison Between the Power Motivation Types of Administrators Selecting Blue and Selecting Other Colors as Least Favorite Colors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power and Affiliation Type</th>
<th>Other Colors</th>
<th>Blue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 0.02542 \quad df = 1 \quad \text{significance} = 0.8733 \]

From the results, it was concluded that of 64 administrators surveyed, 63, or 98.4 percent of the population sampled, selected colors other than blue as their least favorite color. Of the 98.4 percent, 26 administrators, or 40.6 percent of the total sample, had a tendency to value and desire power. By comparison, 37 administrators, or 57.8 percent of the total sample, who selected colors other than blue as their least favorite color, were classified as the affiliative type.

It was further concluded from the data that 1 administrator, or 1.6 percent of the population sampled, selected blue as his/her least favorite color. This administrator was classified as having a tendency to value and desire power. No administrators classified as the affiliation type selected blue as their least favorite color.

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference
between the power motivation types of administrators who selected blue as their least favorite color and administrators who selected other colors as their least favorite. With a chi square analysis of .02542 and a level of significance at .8733, it was concluded that no significant difference existed. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there would be no significant difference failed to be rejected.

Null Hypothesis 21

Null Hypothesis 21 is as follows: there will be no significant difference in the power motivation types of administrators who select one position for their office furnishings and the power motivation types of administrators who select other positions for their office furnishings. The power motivation type determined in Part I of the Power Management Inventory and question 11 of the Personal Data Sheet were utilized for this analysis. The results of the analysis are listed in Table 11.

Table 11

Comparison Between the Power Motivation Types of Administrators Placing Desk in front of Window and in Other Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power and Affiliation Type</th>
<th>Desk in Front of Window</th>
<th>Desk in Other Positions</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 0.01901 \quad \text{df} = 1 \quad \text{significance} = 0.8903 \]
A comparison was made between the power motivation types of administrators who selected one position for their office furnishings and those administrators who selected other positions for their office furnishings. In order to conform to a 2 x 2 chi square table, the data were collapsed into two response categories: (a) desk in front of window; and (b) desk in another location.

From the results, it was concluded that of 49 administrators responding, 14, or 28.6 percent of the population sampled, had located their desk in front of a window. Of the 28.6 percent, 5 administrators, or 10.2 percent of the total sample, had a tendency to value and desire power. By comparison, 9 administrators, or 18.4 percent of the total sample, who located their desk in front of a window, were classified as the affiliation type. Fifteen administrators who had no windows in their offices were not included in this analysis.

It was further concluded from the data that 35 administrators, or 71.4 percent of the population sampled, placed their desks in other locations. Of this 71.4 percent, 15 administrators, or 30.6 percent of the total sample, had a tendency to value and desire power. By comparison, 20 administrators, or 40.8 percent of the total sample, who placed their desks in other locations, were classified as the affiliation type.

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the power motivation types of administrators who selected one position for their office furnishings and those administrators who selected other positions for their office furnishings. With a chi square analysis of .01901, and a level of significance at .8903, it was concluded
that no significant difference existed. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there would be no significant difference failed to be rejected.

Null Hypothesis 23

Null Hypothesis 23 is as follows: there will be no significant difference in the power motivation types of administrators whose offices are located on the middle level of their buildings and the power motivation types of administrators whose offices are located on the other levels of the buildings. The power motivation type determined in Part I of the Power Management Inventory and questions 12 and 13 of the Personal Data Sheet were utilized for this analysis. The results of the analysis are listed in Table 12.

Table 12
Comparison Between the Power Motivation Types of Administrators with Offices on Middle Levels and Other Levels of Buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power and Affiliation Type</th>
<th>Office on Middle Level</th>
<th>Office on Other Level</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = 0.0 \quad df = 1 \quad \text{significance} = 1.0000\]

A comparison was made between the power motivation types of administrators whose offices are located on the middle level of their buildings and the administrators whose offices are located on other levels of the buildings. In order to conform to a 2 X 2 chi square table, the data were collapsed into two response categories: (a) office
location on the middle level of the building; and (b) office location on other levels of the building.

From the results, it was concluded that of 58 administrators responding, 19, or 32.8 percent of the population sampled, had offices located on the middle level of their buildings. Of the 32.8 percent, 8 administrators, or 13.8 percent of the total sample, had a tendency to value and desire power. By comparison, 11 administrators, or 19.0 percent of the total sample, whose offices were located on the middle level of their buildings, were classified as the affiliation type.

It was further concluded from the data that 39 administrators, or 67.2 percent of the population sampled, had offices located on other levels of the buildings. Of the 67.2 percent, 16 administrators, or 27.6 percent of the total sample, had a tendency to value and desire power. By comparison, 23 administrators, or 39.7 percent of the total sample, who had offices located on other levels of their buildings, were classified as the affiliation type.

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the power motivation types of administrators whose offices are located on the middle level of their buildings and the administrators whose offices are located on other levels of the buildings. With a chi square analysis of 0.0 and a level of significance at 1,0000, it was concluded that no significant difference existed. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there would be no significant difference failed to be rejected.
Null Hypothesis 2

Null Hypothesis 2 is as follows: there will be no significant difference between the power style scores of male administrators and the power style scores of female administrators. The power style score determined in Part II of the Power Management Inventory and question 1 of the Personal Data Sheet were utilized for this analysis. The results of the analysis are listed in Table 13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N, Mean Score, t-score, Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score Administrators by Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males (N=50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference was tested between the power style scores of male and female administrators. When 50 male and 14 female administrators were compared on the basis of their power style scores, the mean score for male administrators was 0.6108 compared to a mean score of 0.5936 for the female administrators. The t-score was 0.60 with a significance level of 0.554, which was not a significant difference. A t-score of 2.000 was necessary with an N of 64 to establish a significant difference at the .05 level.
It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the power style scores of male and female administrators. With a t-score of 0.60 and a level of significance at 0.554, the null hypothesis that there would be no significant difference failed to be rejected.

Null Hypothesis 4

Null Hypothesis 4 is as follows: there will be no significant difference between the power style scores of taller administrators and the power style scores of shorter administrators. The power style scores determined in Part II of the Power Management Inventory and question 2 of the Personal Data Sheet were utilized for this analysis. The results of the analysis are listed in Table 14.

Table 14

Comparison Between Power Style Scores of Taller and Shorter Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Score Administrators by Height</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5'5&quot; or under (N=11)</td>
<td>0.5955</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5'6&quot; or over (N=57)</td>
<td>0.6062</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.733</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference was tested between the power style scores of taller and shorter administrators. The data were collapsed into two response categories: (a) 5'5" and under; and (b) 5'6" and over, for purposes of statistical analysis with a t-test for independent data. Heights of
5'5" and under were considered below average height for both male and female administrators. Heights of 5'6" and over were considered above average height for both male and female administrators. When 11 shorter and 52 taller administrators were compared on the basis of their power style scores, the mean score for shorter administrators was 0.5955, compared to a mean score of 0.6062 for taller administrators. The t-score was -0.34 with a significance level of 0.733, which was not a significant difference. A t-score of 2.000 was necessary with an N of 63 to establish a significant difference at the .05 level.

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the power style scores of taller and shorter administrators. With a t-score of -0.34 and a level of significance at 0.733, the null hypothesis that there would be no significant difference failed to be rejected.

**Null Hypothesis 6**

Null Hypothesis 6 is as follows: there will be no significant difference between the power style scores of older administrators and the power style scores of younger administrators. The power style scores determined in Part II of the Power Management Inventory and question 3 of the Personal Data Sheet were utilized for this analysis. The results of the analysis are listed in Table 15, page 78.

The difference was tested between the power style scores of older and younger administrators. The data were collapsed into two response categories: (a) 50 years or younger; and (b) 51 years or older, for purposes of statistical analysis with a t-test for independent data.
When 45 younger and 19 older administrators were compared on the basis of their power style scores, the mean score for younger administrators was 0.5911, compared to a mean score of 0.6447 for older administrators. The t-score was -2.11 with a significance level of 0.038, which was a significant difference. A t-score of 2.000 was necessary with an N of 64 to establish a significant difference at the .05 level.

Table 15

Comparison Between the Power Style Scores of Older and Younger Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N, Mean Score, t-score, Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score Administrators by Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 years or younger (N=45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 years or older (N=79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the power style scores of older and younger administrators. With a t-score of -2.11 and a level of significance at 0.038, the null hypothesis that there would be no significant difference was rejected.

Null Hypothesis 8

Null Hypothesis 8 is as follows: there will be no significant difference in the power style scores of Vice Presidents/Associate or Assistant Vice Presidents, Deans and Departmental Chairpersons and the power style scores of Directors, Coordinators and other administrators.
The power style score determined in Part II of the Power Management Inventory and question 4 of the Personal Data Sheet were utilized for this analysis. The results of the analysis are listed in Table 16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N, Mean Score, t-score, Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score Administrators by Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Presidents/Associate and Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors, Coordinators and Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Presidents, Deans and Departmental Chairpersons (N=41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors, Coordinators and Others (N=23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference was tested between the power style scores of administrators in various administrative positions. The data were collapsed into two response categories: (a) Vice Presidents/Associate and Assistant Vice Presidents, Deans and Departmental Chairpersons; and (b) Directors, Coordinators and other administrators, for purposes of statistical analysis with a t-test for independent data. When 41 Vice Presidents/Associate and Assistant Vice Presidents, Deans and Departmental Chairpersons were compared with 19 Directors, Coordinators and other administrators on the basis of their power style scores, the mean score for the first group was 0.5946, compared with a mean score of 0.6291 for
the second group. The t-score was -1.40 with a significance level of 0.166, which was not a significant difference. A t-score of 2.000 was necessary with an N of 64 to establish a significant difference at the .05 level.

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the power style scores of administrators in various administrative positions. With a t-score of -1.40 and a level of significance at 0.166, the null hypothesis that there would be no significant difference failed to be rejected.

**Null Hypothesis 10**

Null Hypothesis 10 is as follows: there will be no significant difference between the power style scores of administrators selected by members of their Colleges/Schools/Departments or search committees and the power style scores of administrators selected by direct appointment by their superior. The power style score determined in Part II of the Power Management Inventory and question 5 of the Personal Data Sheet were utilized for this analysis. The results of the analysis are listed in Table 17, page 81.

The difference was tested between the power style scores of administrators selected for their positions by various groups and those administrators selected by direct appointment by a superior. The data were collapsed into two response categories: (a) Colleges/Schools/Departments or search committee; and (b) direct appointment by superior, for purposes of statistical analysis with a t-test for independent data. When 39 administrators classified as being selected for their positions by
members of their Colleges/Schools/Departments or search committee, were compared on the basis of their power style scores, with 25 administrators classified as being selected for their position by direct appointment by their superior, the mean score for the first group was 0.100, compared with a mean score of 0.079 for the second group. The t-score was -2.17 with a significance level of 0.034, which was a significant difference. A t-score of 2.000 was necessary with an N of 64 to establish a significant difference at the .05 level.

Table 17
Comparison Between the Power Style Scores of Administrators Group Selected and Directly Appointed to Current Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Method of Selection of Administrators</td>
<td>College/School Department Search Committee (N=39)</td>
<td>Direct Appointment by Superior (N=25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/School Department Search Committee (N=39)</td>
<td>0.5869</td>
<td>0.6384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the power style scores of administrators selected by various groups and those administrators selected by direct appointment by a superior. With a t-score of -2.17 and a level of significance at 0.034, the null hypothesis that there would be no significant difference was rejected.
Null Hypothesis 12

Null Hypothesis 12 is as follows: there will be no significant difference between the power style scores of administrators whose positions were advertised outside their Colleges/Schools/Departments and the power style scores of administrators whose positions were not advertised outside their Colleges/Schools/Departments. The power style score determined in Part II of the Power Management Inventory and question 6 of the Personal Data Sheet were utilized for this analysis. The results of the analysis are listed in Table 18.

Table 18

Comparison Between the Power Style Scores of Administrators Whose Positions Were Advertised and Were Not Advertised Outside College/School/Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N, Mean Score, t-score, Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score Administrative Position Advertisement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertised Outside College/School/Department (N=34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Advertised Outside College/School/Department (N=28)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference was tested between the power style scores of administrators whose positions were advertised outside their Colleges/Schools/Departments and those administrators whose positions were not advertised outside their Colleges/Schools/Departments of the 62 administrators responding to this question, 34 responded that their positions
had been advertised outside their Colleges/Schools/Departments, compared to 28 administrators whose positions had not been advertised outside their Colleges/Schools/Departments. The mean score for the first group was 0.6068, compared with a mean score of 0.6071 for the second group. From the 62 responses, a comparison was made on the basis of the administrators' power style scores. The t-score was -0.02 with a significance level of 0.988, which was not a significant difference. A t-score of 2.000 was necessary with an N of 62 to establish a significant difference at the .05 level.

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the power style scores of administrators whose positions were advertised outside their Colleges/Schools/Departments and those administrators whose positions were not advertised outside their Colleges/Schools/Departments. With a t-score of -0.02 and a level of significance at 0.988, the null hypothesis that there would be no significant difference failed to be rejected.

Null Hypothesis 14

Null Hypothesis 14 is as follows: there will be no significant difference between the power style scores of administrators who have served in their current positions for a longer length of time and the power style scores of administrators who have served in their current positions for a shorter length of time. The power style score determined in Part II of the Power Management Inventory and question 7 of the Personal Data Sheet were utilized for this analysis. The results of the analysis are listed in Table 19, page 84.
Table 19

Comparison of Power Style Scores of Administrators Serving Longer and Shorter Lengths of Time in Current Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N, Mean Score, t-score, Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator's Length of Service in Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years or less (N=46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 years or more (N=18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference was tested between the power style scores of administrators who have served longer and shorter lengths of time in their current positions. The data were collapsed into two response categories: (a) five years or less; and (b) six years or more, for purposes of statistical analysis with a t-test for independent data. When 46 administrators who had served in their current position for five years or less were compared on the basis of their power style scores with 18 administrators who had served in their current position for six years or more, the mean score for the first group was 0.6220, compared to a mean score of 0.5689 for the second group. The t-score was 2.06 with a significance level of 0.044, which was a significant difference. A t-score of 2.000 was necessary with an N of 64 to establish a significant difference at the .05 level.

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the power style scores of administrators who have served longer...
and shorter lengths of time in their current positions. With a t-score of 2.06 and a level of significance at 0.044, the null hypothesis that there would be no significant difference was rejected.

Null Hypothesis 16

Null Hypothesis 16 is stated as follows: there will be no significant difference in the power style scores of administrators who have been employed for a longer length of time at the current institution and the power style scores of administrators who have been employed at the current institution for a shorter length of time. The power style score determined in Part II of the Power Management Inventory and question 8 of the Personal Data Sheet were utilized for this analysis. The results of the analysis are listed in Table 20.

Table 20

Comparison Between the Power Style Scores of Administrators Employed Longer and Shorter Lengths of Time at the Current Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Score Administrators Employment at Institution</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 years or less (N=40)</td>
<td>0.6165</td>
<td>0.5912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years or more (N=24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference was tested between the power style scores of administrators who have been employed longer and shorter lengths of time
at the current institution. The data were collapsed into two response
categories: (a) ten years or less; and (b) eleven years or more, for
purposes of statistical analysis with a t-test for independent data.
When 40 administrators who were classified as having been employed in the
current institution for ten years or less were compared on the basis of
their power style scores with 24 administrators who were classified as
having been employed in the current institution for eleven years or more,
the mean score for the first group was 0.6165, compared to a mean score
of 0.5912 for the second group. The t-score was 1.03 with a significance
level of 0.308, which was not a significant difference. A t-score of
2.000 was necessary with an N of 64 to establish a significant difference
at the .05 level.

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference
between the power style scores of administrators who have been employed
longer and shorter lengths of time at the current institution. With a
t-score of 1.03 and a level of significance at 0.308, the null hypothesis
that there would be no significant difference failed to be rejected.

Null Hypothesis 18

Null Hypothesis 18 is as follows: there will be no significant
difference in the power style scores of administrators who select one
color as their favorite and the power style scores of administrators who
select other colors as their favorite. The power style score determined
in Part II of the Power Management Inventory and question 9 of the
Personal Data Sheet were utilized for this analysis. The results of the
analysis are listed in Table 21, page 87.
Table 21

Comparison Between the Power Style Scores of Administrators Selecting Blue and Selecting Other Colors as Favorite Colors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N, Mean Score, t-score, Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator’s Favorite Color</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Colors (N=21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference was tested between the power style scores of administrators who selected blue as their favorite color and administrators who selected other colors as their favorite. The data were collapsed into two response categories: (a) other colors; and (b) blue, for purposes of statistical analysis with a t-test for independent data. Of the 64 administrators sampled, 21 of the population selected colors other than blue as their favorite color, compared to 43 administrators who selected blue as their favorite color. From the 64 responses, a comparison was made on the basis of the administrator’s power style scores. The mean score for administrators who selected colors other than blue as being their favorite color was 0.6119, as compared to a mean score of 0.6047 for the administrators who selected blue as their favorite color. The t-score was 0.28 with a significance level of 0.777, which was not a significant difference. A t-score of 2.000 was necessary with an N of 64 to establish a significant difference at the .05 level.

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference
between the power style scores of administrators who selected one color as their favorite color and those administrators who selected other colors as their favorite color. With a t-score of 0.28 and a level of significance at 0.777, the null hypothesis that there would be no significant difference failed to be rejected.

**Null Hypothesis 20**

Null Hypothesis 20 is stated as follows: there will be no significant difference between the power style scores of administrators who select one color as their least favorite and the power style scores of administrators who select other colors as their least favorite. The power style scores determined in Part II of the Power Management Inventory and question 10 of the Personal Data Sheet were utilized for this analysis. The results of the analysis are listed in Table 22.

**Table 22**

Comparison Between the Power Style Scores of Administrators Selecting Blue and Selecting Other Colors as Least Favorite Colors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrator's Least Favorite Color</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Colors (N=63)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue (N=1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N, Mean Score, t-score, Level of Significance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6062</td>
<td>0.6600</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The difference was tested between the power style scores of administrators who selected colors other than blue as their least favorite color and those who selected blue as their least favorite color. The data were collapsed into two response categories: (a) other colors; and (b) blue, for purposes of statistical analysis with a t-test for independent data. Of the 64 administrators sampled, 63 of the population selected colors other than blue as their least favorite color, compared to one administrator who selected blue as his/her least favorite color. From the 64 responses, a comparison was made on the basis of the power style scores. The mean score for administrators who selected colors other than blue as being their least favorite color was 0.6062, as compared to a mean score of 0.6600 for the administrator who selected blue as his/her least favorite color. The t-score was -0.56 with a significance level of 0.579, which was not a significant difference. A t-score of 2.000 was necessary with an N of 64 to establish a significant difference at the .05 level.

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the power style scores of administrators who selected one color as their least favorite color and those administrators who selected other colors as their least favorite color. With a t-score of -0.56 and a level of significance at 0.579, the null hypothesis that there would be no significant difference failed to be rejected.

**Null Hypothesis 22**

Null Hypothesis 22 is as follows: there will be no significant difference in the power style scores of administrators who select one
position for their office furnishings and the power style scores of administrators who select other positions for their office furnishings. The power style score determined in Part II of the Power Management Inventory and question 11 of the Personal Data Sheet were utilized for this analysis. The results of the analysis are listed in Table 23.

Table 23

Comparison Between the Power Style Scores of Administrators Placing Desk in front of Window and in Other Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positioning of Office Furnishings</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desk in Front of Window (N=14)</td>
<td>0.6086</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk in Another Location (N=35)</td>
<td>0.6034</td>
<td>0.865</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference was tested between the power style scores of administrators who chose to locate their office desk in front of their office window and those administrators who chose to place their desk at another location in their office. Fifteen administrators who had no window in their offices were not included in this analysis. The data were collapsed into two response categories: (a) desk in front of window; and (b) desk in another location, for purposes of statistical analysis with a t-test for independent data. Of the 49 administrators responding, 14 of the population sampled chose to locate their desk in front of their office window, compared to 35 administrators who chose
to place their desk at another location in their office. From the 49 responses, a comparison was made on the basis of the administrator's power style scores. The mean score for the administrators who located their desk in front of a window was 0.6086, as compared to a mean score of 0.6034 for those administrators who chose to locate their desk in another location. The t-score was 0.17 with a significance level of 0.865, which was not a significant difference. A t-score of 2.021 was necessary with an N of 49 to establish a significant difference at the .05 level.

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the power style scores of administrators who select one position for their office furnishings and those administrators who select other positions for their office furnishings. With a t-score of 0.17 and a level of significance at 0.865, the null hypothesis that there would be no significant difference failed to be rejected.

**Null Hypothesis 24**

Null Hypothesis 24 is as follows: there will be no significant difference in the power style scores of administrators whose offices are located on the middle level of their buildings and the power style scores of administrators whose offices are located on the other levels of the building. The power style score determined in Part II of the Power Management Inventory and questions 12 and 13 of the Personal Data Sheet were utilized for this analysis. The results of the analysis are located in Table 24, page 92.
The differences were tested between the power style scores of administrators whose offices are located on the middle level of their buildings and those administrators whose offices are located on the other levels of the buildings. The data were collapsed into two response categories: (a) office location on middle level of the building; and (b) office located on other levels, for purposes of statistical analysis with a t-test for independent data. Of the 56 administrators responding, 19, of the population sampled, had offices located on the middle level of their building, compared to 37 administrators whose offices were located on other levels of their buildings. From the 56 responses, a comparison was made on the basis of the administrator's power style scores. The mean score for the administrators whose offices were located on the middle level of the building was 0.6226, as compared to a mean score of 0.5930 for the administrators whose offices were located on other levels. The t-score was 1.08 with a significance level of 0.285,
which was not a significant difference. A t-score of 2.021 was necessary with an N of 56 to establish a significant difference at the .05 level.

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the power style scores of administrators whose offices are located on the middle level of their buildings and those administrators whose offices are located on the other levels of the buildings. With a t-score of 1.08 and a level of significance at 0.285, the null hypothesis that there would be no significant difference failed to be rejected.
CHAPTER FIVE

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

Summary

The problem of this study was to determine if a relationship exists between selected personal characteristics of higher education administrators and their perceived levels of power motivation and power style.

The Power Management Inventory developed by Jay Hall and James Hawker was selected as the instrument for use in this study. The Power Management Inventory was designed to provide a comparison between one's espoused theory (power motivation) and one's theory in action (power style).

The academic administrators at East Tennessee State University were chosen as being a representative group for evaluation. The research sample included one Vice President for Academic Affairs, one Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, one Assistant to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, nine Deans, twelve Associate/Assistant Deans, twenty-one Directors, three Coordinators, and forty-eight Chairpersons. This research sample comprised an intact group of academic administrators at East Tennessee State University. A total of ninety-four administrators were surveyed representing ninety-six administrative positions. A total of sixty-four administrators returned the completed survey materials. The results of these data were used in a statistical analysis of the hypotheses of the study.

The non-parametric statistic chi square was used to determine where
significant differences existed for Hypotheses 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21 and 23. A t-test for independent data was used to determine where significant differences existed for Hypotheses 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22 and 24. The .05 level of significance was established for accepting or rejecting the hypotheses of this study.

Findings

From the results of the data analysis and interpretation, the following findings are presented. Findings are reported as they pertain to each of the hypotheses originally formulated.

Hypothesis 1 stated that there would be a significant difference between the power motivation types of male administrators and the power motivation types of female administrators. No significant difference existed between male and female administrators on the basis of their power motivation type.

Hypothesis 2 stated that there would be a significant difference between the power style scores of male administrators and the power style scores of female administrators. No significant difference existed between male and female administrators on the basis of their power style scores.

Hypothesis 3 stated that there would be a significant difference between the power motivation types of taller administrators and the power motivation types of shorter administrators. No significant difference existed between the taller and shorter administrators on the basis of their power motivation type.

Hypothesis 4 stated that there would be a significant difference
between the power style scores of taller administrators and the power style scores of shorter administrators. No significant difference existed between the taller and shorter administrators on the basis of their power style scores.

Hypothesis 5 stated that there would be a significant difference between the power motivation types of older administrators and the power motivation types of younger administrators. This hypothesis was supported by the significant difference found between older and younger administrators on the basis of their power motivation type.

Hypothesis 6 stated that there would be a significant difference between the power style scores of older administrators and the power style scores of younger administrators. This hypothesis was supported by the significant difference found between older and younger administrators on the basis of their power style scores.

Hypothesis 7 stated that there would be a significant difference between the power motivation types of Vice Presidents/Associate or Assistant Vice Presidents, Deans and Departmental Chairpersons and the power motivation types of Directors, Coordinators and other administrators. No significant difference existed between administrators in these two groups of administrative positions on the basis of their power motivation type.

Hypothesis 8 stated that there would be a significant difference between the power style scores of Vice Presidents/Associate or Assistant Vice Presidents, Deans and Departmental Chairpersons and the power style scores of Directors, Coordinators and other administrators. No significant difference existed between administrators in these two groups of administrative positions on the basis of their power style scores.
Hypothesis 9 stated that there would be a significant difference between the power motivation types of administrators selected by members of their Colleges/Schools/Departments or search committees and the power motivation types of administrators selected by direct appointment by their superiors. This hypothesis was supported by the significant difference found between those administrators selected for their positions by various groups and those administrators selected by direct appointment by a superior on the basis of their power motivation type.

Hypothesis 10 stated that there would be a significant difference between the power style scores of administrators selected by members of their Colleges/Schools/Departments or search committees and the power style scores of administrators selected by direct appointment by their superiors. This hypothesis was supported by the significant difference found between those administrators selected for their positions by various groups and those administrators selected by direct appointment by a superior on the basis of their power style scores.

Hypothesis 11 stated that there would be a significant difference between the power motivation types of administrators whose positions were advertised outside their Colleges/Schools/Departments and the power motivation types of administrators whose positions were not advertised outside their Colleges/Schools/Departments. No significant difference existed between administrators whose positions were advertised outside their Colleges/Schools/Departments and those administrators whose positions were not advertised outside their Colleges/Schools/Departments on the basis of their power motivation type.
Hypothesis 12 stated that there would be a significant difference between the power style scores of administrators whose positions were advertised outside their Colleges/Schools/Departments and the power style scores of administrators whose positions were not advertised outside their Colleges/Schools/Departments. No significant difference existed between administrators whose positions were advertised outside their Colleges/Schools/Departments and those administrators whose positions were not advertised outside their Colleges/Schools/Departments on the basis of their power style scores.

Hypothesis 13 stated that there would be a significant difference between the power motivation types of administrators who have served in their current positions for a longer length of time and the power motivation types of administrators who have served in their current positions for a shorter length of time. No significant difference existed between administrators who have served longer and shorter lengths of time in their current positions on the basis of their power motivation type.

Hypothesis 14 stated that there would be a significant difference between the power style scores of administrators who have served in their current position for a longer length of time and the power style scores of administrators who have served in their current position for a shorter length of time. This hypothesis was supported by the significant difference found between administrators who have served longer and shorter lengths of time in their current positions on the basis of their power style scores.

Hypothesis 15 stated that there would be a significant difference
between the power motivation types of administrators who have been employed for a longer length of time at the current institution and the power motivation types of administrators who have been employed at the current institution for a shorter length of time. No significant difference existed between administrators who have been employed longer and shorter lengths of time at the current institution on the basis of their power motivation type.

Hypothesis 16 stated that there would be a significant difference between the power style scores of administrators who have been employed for a longer length of time at the current institution and the power style scores of administrators who have been employed at the current institution for a shorter length of time. No significant difference existed between administrators who have been employed longer and shorter lengths of time at the current institution based on their power style scores.

Hypothesis 17 stated that there would be a significant difference between the power motivation types of administrators who select one color as their favorite and the power motivation types of administrators who select other colors as their favorite. No significant difference existed between administrators who selected one color as their favorite color and administrators who selected other colors as their favorite on the basis of their power motivation type.

Hypothesis 18 stated that there would be a significant difference between the power style scores of administrators who select one color as their favorite and the power style scores of administrators who select other colors as their favorite. No significant difference existed
between administrators who selected one color as their favorite color and administrators who selected other colors as their favorite color on the basis of their power style scores.

Null Hypothesis 19 stated that there would be a significant difference in the power motivation types of administrators who select one color as their least favorite and the power motivation types of administrators who select other colors as their least favorite. No significant difference existed between administrators who selected one color as their least favorite color and administrators who selected other colors as their least favorite color on the basis of their power motivation type.

Hypothesis 20 stated that there would be a significant difference between the power style scores of administrators who select one color as their least favorite and the power style scores of administrators who select other colors as their least favorite. No significant difference existed between administrators who selected one color as their least favorite color and those administrators who selected other colors as their least favorite color on the basis of their power style scores.

Hypothesis 21 stated that there would be a significant difference between the power motivation types of administrators who select one position for their office furnishings and the power motivation types of administrators who select other positions for their office furnishings. No significant difference existed between administrators who selected one position for their office furnishings and those administrators who selected other positions for their office furnishings on the basis of their power motivation type.
Hypothesis 22 stated that there would be a significant difference between the power style scores of administrators who select one position for their office furnishings and the power style scores of administrators who select other positions for their office furnishings. No significant difference existed between administrators who selected one position for their office furnishings and those administrators who selected other positions for their office furnishings on the basis of their power style scores.

Hypothesis 23 stated that there would be a significant difference between the power motivation types of administrators whose offices are located on the middle level of their buildings and the power motivation types of administrators whose offices are located on the other levels of the buildings. No significant difference existed between administrators whose offices were located on the middle level of their buildings and the administrators whose offices are located on other levels of their buildings based on their power motivation types.

Hypothesis 24 stated that there would be a significant difference between the power style scores of administrators whose offices are located on the middle level of their buildings and the power style scores of administrators whose offices are located on the other levels of the building. No significant difference existed between administrators whose offices were located on the middle level of their buildings and the administrators whose offices are located on other levels of their buildings based on their power style scores.
Conclusions

The conclusions which follow were drawn from the results of this research project. The sample was limited to an intact group of academic administrators at East Tennessee State University. Therefore, the conclusions are applicable to state universities that meet the same criteria as East Tennessee State University.

1. The power motivation of administrators can be directly related to the ages of the administrators.

2. The power style of administrators can be directly related to the ages of the administrators.

3. The power motivation of administrators can be directly related to the method by which they are selected to their positions.

4. The power style of administrators can be directly related to the method by which they were selected to their positions.

5. The power style of administrators can be directly related to the number of years of service in their positions.

6. The power motivation of administrators cannot be directly related to sex, height, position, method of position advertisement, length of service in position, length of service at the institution, favorite color, least favorite color, position of office furnishings or location of office.

7. The power style of administrators cannot be directly related to sex, height, position, method of position advertisement, length of service at the institution, favorite color, least favorite color, position of office furnishings or location of office.
Recommendations

As a result of this study, it is recommended that further research be conducted to identify other personal characteristics that may have an impact on the power motivation and power style of higher education administrators. Additional research is warranted since neither of these complex human dimensions has been explored in its totality.

A further recommendation is that, for future studies of this nature, data be collected using the following research proposals:

1. Within five years, a replication of this study should be conducted at East Tennessee State University to ascertain the reliability of the findings.

2. A replication of this study should be conducted at other institutions of higher education in order to increase the generalizability of the findings.

3. Different research methodology, such as the use of another evaluating instrument or the selection of other groups within the higher education setting, should be chosen in order to check the validity of the conclusions.
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APPENDIX A

LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT OF EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

GRANTING PERMISSION TO CONDUCT THE STUDY
To Whom It May Concern:

Nancy Lewis Garland, a doctoral candidate at East Tennessee State University, has been granted permission to conduct a study entitled "Power Motivation and Power Style in Higher Education Administration."

This study will seek to determine the relationship between selected personal characteristics of higher education administrators, and their perceived levels of power motivation and power style. The results of this study should help bring about greater understanding of academic administration at East Tennessee State University. Participation is strictly voluntary and the confidentiality of all responses is assured.

Sincerely,

Ronald E. Beller
President
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APPENDIX B

ACADEMIC LISTING
ACADEMIC LISTING
1983-84

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Vice President for Academic Affairs - Dr. Robert J. Alfonso
24,490A
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs - Dr. David Tiffany
24,490A
Assistant to the Vice President for Academic Affairs - Wilkie
Bishop 24,290A
Administrative Coordinator, Office of Academic Program Development -
Dr. Benjamin E. Carmichael 24,290A
Director, Evening and Summer School Office - Dr. Gary Walters
24,430A

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES - Dr. Jewell Friend, Dean 24,400A
Dr. Cynthia Burnley, Assistant Dean 24,400A
Dr. Abbott A. Brayton, Assistant Dean 24,400A

ART - Mr. Jack Schrader, Chairman 23,740A
BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES - Dr. Fred Alsop, Chairman 23,590A
CHEMISTRY - Dr. Thomas Huang, Chairman 23,350A
COMMUNICATIONS - Dr. Murvin Perry, Chairman 22,310A
CRIMINAL JUSTICE - Dr. Michael Braswell, Chairman 19,150A
ENGLISH - Dr. Donald Johnson, Chairman 22,990A
GEOGRAPHY AND GEOLOGY - Dr. Donald Poole, Chairman 22,870A
HISTORY - Dr. Earl Wade, Chairman 22,660A
LANGUAGES - Dr. Eduardo Zayas-Bazan, Chairman 22,480A
MATHEMATICS - Dr. William Anderson, Chairman 22,390A
MUSIC - Dr. Richard Compton, Chairman 22,330A
PHILOSOPHY AND HUMANITIES - Dr. Jeff Gold, Chairman 22,180A
PHYSICS - Dr. James R. Miller, Acting Chairman 22,060A
POLITICAL SCIENCE - Dr. Glen Broach, Chairman 22,030A
PSYCHOLOGY - Dr. Otto Zinser, Chairman 21,970A
SOCIAL WORK - Mr. Robert Lewis, Chairman 21,830A
SOCIOLOGY - Dr. Robert Leger, Chairman 21,820A

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS - Dr. Allan Spritzer, Dean 23,470A
Dr. Herman Stribling, Director, Undergraduate
Studies 23,470A
Dr. William Galie, Director, Graduate Studies
23,470A
Dr. Steb Hippie, Director, Bureau Business and
Economic Research 23,500A
Dr. Richard Puckett, Chair of Banking 21,070A
Dr. Don Wilkinson, Director, Small Business
Institute 23,410A
ACCOUNTANCY - Dr. Thomas McKee, Acting Chairman 23,800A
ECONOMICS AND FINANCE - Dr. Michael Brown, Acting Chairman 23,080A
MANAGEMENT AND MARKETING - Dr. Ronald Zigli, Chairman 21,250A
OFFICE MANAGEMENT - Dr. Donald Wilkinson, Chairman 23,410A

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION - Dr. Charles Edwards, Dean 23,050A
Dr. Floyd Edwards, Associate Dean 23,050A

CURRICULUM & INSTRUCTION - Dr. William Pafford, Chairman 23,020A
HUMAN DEVELOPMENT & LEARNING - Dr. Norman Hankins, Chairman 18,940A
PHYSICAL EDUCATION & RECREATION - Dr. Judith Johnston, Chairman 22,120A
SUPERVISION & ADMINISTRATION - Dr. Charles Burkett, Chairman 19,000A
UNIVERSITY SCHOOL - Mr. Sam Humphreys, Director 21,460A
CHILD STUDY CENTER - Ms. Susanna Mobley, Director 18,940A

COLLEGE OF MEDICINE - Dr. Herschel Douglas, Dean 23,320A
Mr. Elmo Cavin, Jr., Associate Dean, Finance & Administration 15,100A
Dr. Charles Votaw, Associate Dean, Academic & Student Affairs 19,630A
Dr. Floyd Goffin, Assistant Dean, Continuing Medical Education 19,660A
Dr. Raymond Massengill, Jr., Assistant Dean, Medical Education, Bristol 21,130A
Dr. Ronald McGowan, Assistant Dean, Medical Education, Johnson City 15,010A
Dr. Leslie B. Reynolds, Assistant Dean, Medical Education, Kingsport 21,130A
Dr. Leo N. Harvill, Assistant Dean, Section of Medical Education 19,720A
Ms. Janet Fisher, Assistant Dean, Learning Resources 23,290A
Mr. H. Erwin Tipton, Assistant Dean for Clinical Administration 15,100A
Dr. Richard Skalko, Director, Biomedical Science - Graduate Program 19,960A

ANATOMY - Dr. Richard Skalko, Chairman 19,960A
BIOCHEMISTRY - Dr. Frank Inman, Chairman 19,930A
BIOPHYSICS - Dr. Ronald Cowden, Chairman 15,130A
FAMILY PRACTICE - Dr. David Doane, Chairman 21,130A
INTERNAL MEDICINE - Dr. J. Kelly Smith, Chairman 21,160A
LABORATORY ANIMAL RESEARCH - Dr. Brunhilde Tober-Meyer, Director 15,040A
MICROBIOLOGY - Dr. Dwight Lambe, Chairman 19,870A
OBSTETRICS/GYNECOLOGY - Dr. Dillard Sholes, Chairman 19,570A
PATHOLOGY - Dr. Phillip S. Coogan, Chairman 19,540A  
PEDIATRICS - Dr. Frank Shepard, Chairman 19,840A  
PHARMACOLOGY - Dr. Ernest Daigneault, Chairman 19,810A  
PHYSIOLOGY - Dr. Robert Rasch, Chairman 19,780A  
PSYCHIATRY - Dr. James M. Turnbull, Chairman 19,510A  
SURGERY - Dr. Lester Bryant, Chairman 19,750A  

SCHOOL OF APPLIED SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY - Dr. W. Rollin Williams, Dean 19,090A  
COMPUTER AND INFORMATION SCIENCES - Dr. Donald Bailes, Chairman 23,830A  
HOME ECONOMICS - Dr. Amelia Brown, Acting Chairman 22,630A  
INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION - Dr. Charles Story, Chairman 22,600A  
TECHNOLOGY - Dr. John Ephraim, Chairman 19,060A  
MILITARY SCIENCE - LTC. John Gross 21,940A  
DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION - Dr. Glenn Bettis, Coordinator 22,600A  

SCHOOL OF NURSING - Dr. Edith Summerlin, Dean 21,010A  
ASSOCIATE DEGREE NURSING - Ms. Linda Norman, Acting Chairman 22,780A  
BACCALAUREATE DEGREE NURSING - Dr. Rosemary McLain, Chairman 22,240A  

SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AND ALLIED HEALTH - Dr. James Vaught, Dean 21,190A  
COMMUNICATIVE DISORDERS - Dr. Susan Mattingly, Chairman 21,790A  
DENTAL HYGIENE - Dr. Jack Brooks, Chairman 23,200A  
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH - Dr. M. T. Morgan, Chairman 22,960A  
HEALTH EDUCATION - Dr. Robert Patton, Chairman 22,720A  
PARA MEDICAL CENTER - Mr. John Neece, Director 19,690A  

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES - Dr. Elizabeth McMahan, Dean 24,100A  

ADMISSIONS AND RECORDS - Dr. James Loyd, Dean 24,430A  

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT  
KINGSPORT CENTER - Dr. Michael Vavrek, Director 24,310A  
BRISTOL CENTER - Ms. Patti Hagerty, Director 24,310A  
CONTINUING EDUCATION - Dr. Howard Ledbetter, Director 22,270A  

CAREER DEVELOPMENT - Mr. Dan Emmel, Director 24,040A
LIBRARIES - Dr. Fred Borchuck, Director 22,450A

MUSEUM - Ms. Helen Roseberry, Coordinator 22,300A

INSTITUTE FOR APPALACHIAN AFFAIRS - Dr. Richard J. Blaustein, Director 19,180A

INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH - Dr. Roy Ikenberry, Associate Director 23,980A
   Ms. Ginger Hawk, Assistant Director 23,980A

SPECIAL SERVICES - Mr. James Lefler, Director 23,920A
APPENDIX C

LETTER TO TELEMETRICS INTERNATIONAL
March 1, 1984

Teleometrics International  
1755 Woodstead Court  
The Woodlands, Texas  77380  

RE: Purchase of 110 Copies of the Power Management Inventory for  
Use in Educational Research  

Several weeks ago, I spoke with a representative of Teleometrics  
International by telephone. We discussed the possibility of my  
using the "Power Management Inventory" in my doctoral dissertation  
research. My prospectus has now been approved by my Advanced  
Graduate Committee and I am ready to proceed with my study.  

I have enclosed a copy of my prospectus for your review and con­  
sideration. I wish to purchase 110 copies of the instrument for  
use in my study. If my prospectus meets with your approval, I  
would appreciate your allowing me to purchase the instruments at  
cost (50¢ each) plus postage, per our telephone conversation.  

I will be pleased to forward any additional information concerning  
my study. If approved, please forward the instruments to the  
following address:  

Nancy Lewis Garland  
Office of University Planning &  
Capital Budgeting  
Box 24,370A  
East Tennessee State University  
Johnson City, Tennessee  37614  

Phone: Home 615-743-5788  
Office 615-929-5351  

As time is of the essence, I would appreciate your forwarding the  
requested instruments by over-night delivery, either C.O.D. or bill  
me at the above address.  

I also request your written permission to use the "Power Management  
Inventory" in my research, and your permission to include a copy of  
the instrument in the final copy of my dissertation.  

I appreciate your assistance and cooperation.  

Sincerely,  

Nancy Lewis Garland

Enclosures
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LETTER FROM TELEMETRICS INTERNATIONAL GRANTING PERMISSION TO USE THE POWER MANAGEMENT INVENTORY
March 13, 1984

Ms. Nancy Lewis Garland
Office of University Planning & Capital Budgets
Box 24, 370A
East Tennessee State University
Johnson City, Tennessee 37614-0002

Dear Ms. Garland,

Thank you for your letter of March 1, including a copy of your dissertation proposal and requesting to purchase 110 copies of our Power Management Inventory at the special research price of $.50 per copy.

We are pleased to grant your request and have shipped the materials today under separate cover via Express Mail. You may take this letter as written permission to use the instrument in your research, provided you agree to supply us with a copy of your completed dissertation.

You also requested permission to include a copy of the EMI in the final copy of your dissertation. Because it is copyrighted and cannot be reproduced in any way, we ask that you include only a copy of the front cover (both sides so the copyright notice shows) and a sample question from each section. This method has, in the past, proven satisfactory both to graduate schools and to University Microfilms.

We wish you all the best in your research and look forward to seeing the final study.

Sincerely,

Susan M. Donnell
Research Associate
APPENDIX E

SAMPLE QUESTIONS FROM THE POWER MANAGEMENT INVENTORY
POWER MANAGEMENT INVENTORY

by
Jay Hall, Ph.D.
James Hawker, Ph.D.
A WORD ABOUT THE POWER MANAGEMENT INVENTORY

Power — the exertion of influence — is a fact of organizational life. Whenever two or more people convene, the dynamics of interpersonal influence may be expected to emerge rather early in the encounter. The process of management, in many respects, is an exercise in the use of formalized authority and influence. Management in its day-to-day trappings concerns many diverse situations in which the exercise of influence is called for. Solving problems, setting objectives, appraising performance, providing direction — all are managerial tasks and all involve the exercise of power. It is important — for both the manager and those he or she manages — to understand as well as possible the dynamics of interpersonal influence and the role one plays in setting these in motion.

The Power Management Inventory is designed to assess a manager's characteristic management of influence dynamics; that is, how a given manager prefers to handle situations calling for the exercise of power and authority. More to the point, the inventory is designed to give you some information about yourself regarding the methods and reasons which most characterize your handling of power situations. There are no "wrong" responses. The best response to any item is simply the one which best reflects your practices, your feelings, and your preferences in the several work situations described.

INSTRUCTIONS

The inventory is presented in two parts. Part One addresses a wide range of specific issues of concern to a manager. Your preferences or, perhaps, typical way of handling each of these will be surveyed according to the format explained below. Part Two addresses the decision structure which most characterizes your transactions with others. Part Two will be explained at the time it appears in the inventory. Please read the format for Part One and proceed accordingly.

Part One Format

Three response modes — A, B and C — are assessed in the inventory, two at a time. For each inventory item you are requested to indicate which of two alternative reactions would be most characteristic of you. Some alternatives may be equally characteristic of you or equally uncharacteristic. While this is a distinct possibility, nevertheless choose the alternative which is relatively more characteristic of you. For each item, you will have two points that you may distribute between each pair of alternatives. For example, A and B types could be rated in any of the following combinations:

1. If A is completely characteristic of your feelings and B is completely uncharacteristic, write a "5" on your test sheet under A and a "0" under B, thus: A 5 0

2. If A is considerably characteristic of your feelings and B is somewhat characteristic, write a "4" on your test sheet under A and a "1" under B, thus: A 4 1

3. If A is only slightly more characteristic of your feelings than B is, write a "3" on your test sheet under A and a "2" under B, thus: A 3 2

4. Each of the above three combinations may be used in the converse order; that is, for example, should you feel B is slightly more characteristic of your feelings than A, write a "2" on your test sheet under A and a "3" under B, thus: A 2 3

and so on for A = 1, B = 4, or A = 0, B = 5

Thus there are six possible combinations for responding to the pair of alternatives presented to you with each inventory item. USE ONLY WHOLE NUMBERS. BE SURE THE NUMBERS YOU ASSIGN TO EACH PAIR SUM TO EQUAL 5. In general, try to relate each situation in the inventory to your own personal feelings. Take as much time as you need to make a true and accurate response. There is no right or wrong answer. Attempts to give a "correct" response merely distort the meaning of your answers and render the test results valueless as a tool for personal learning.

Copyright 1981, John R. Hackman

This inventory is copyrighted. The reproduction of any part of it by mimeograph, photostat or by any other means, whether the reproductions are sold or furnished free, is a violation of the copyright law.
Power Management Inventory

Sample Questions

Part One

Following are several situations commonly encountered or considered by people such as yourself in managerial positions. Please read each carefully along with the two alternatives presented as possible ways of responding. Indicate your choices among alternatives in the spaces provided according to the format explained in the instructions. Take as much time as you need for a thoughtful and honest response.

1. In setting goals and identifying objectives, my major concern is:

   C. That the individual needs and capabilities of my people are well met and utilized.
   A. That the goals and objectives we aspire to are high enough to stretch and challenge all of us.

Part Two

In this part of the Inventory we are interested in determining the decision structure which most characterizes your transactions with those you manage. Ten (10) decision-making issues are presented below along with an 11-point scale ranging from "I decide completely" to "they decide completely." For each situation, you are simply asked to place an "X" at the point on the scale which best reflects the influence structure typically characterizing discussion of such issues. Again, there are no "right" or "wrong" answers; the best answer is the one which most accurately portrays your practices and/or preferences.

1. In making work assignments for those I manage, typically:

   I decide completely
   We decide jointly
   They decide completely

   :_____ :_____ :_____ :_____ :_____ :_____ :_____ :_____ :_____ :_____ :_____
APPENDIX F

PERSONAL DATA SHEET
Personal Data Sheet

1. Check one:  
   Male ____  
   Female ____  

2. Height:  
   5' or under ____  
   5'1" to 5'5" ____  
   5'6" to 6'0" ____  
   6'1" to 6'5" ____  

3. Age:  
   30 or under ____  
   31 to 40 ____  
   41 to 45 ____  
   46 to 50 ____  
   51 to 55 ____  
   56 to 60 ____  
   60+ ____  

4. Indicate your current position:  
   Vice President/Associate or Assistant Vice President ____  
   Dean ____  
   Departmental Chairperson ____  
   Director ____  
   Coordinator ____  
   Other—Please specify ________________________________  

5. How were you selected for your current position?  
   (a) by members of your College/School/Department ____  
   (b) by search committee comprised entirely of members of your Department/School/College ____  
   (c) by search committee comprised of members of your College/School/Department and persons outside this group ____  
   (d) by direct appointment by superior ____  
   (e) Other—Please specify ________________________________
6. Was your position advertised outside your College/School/Department?  
Yes ___  
No ___

7. How many years have you served in your current position?  
1 year or less ____  
2 to 5 years ____  
6 to 10 years ____  
11 to 15 years ____  
over 15 years ____

8. How many years have you been employed at this university?  
1 year or less ____  
16 to 20 years ____  
2 to 5 years ____  
21 to 25 years ____  
6 to 10 years ____  
over 25 years ____  
11 to 15 years ____

9. Please indicate your FAVORITE COLOR (select one) of the colors listed.  
green ____  brown ____  red ____  blue ____

10. Please indicate your LEAST FAVORITE COLOR (select one) of the colors listed.  
green ____  brown ____  red ____  blue ____

11. In the box, please indicate the arrangement of the windows, your desk and your desk chair.
12. How many levels (floors) are in the building that houses your personal office?

B _____ 3 _____
1 _____ 4 _____
2 _____ 5 _____

13. On what level (floor) is your personal office location?

B _____ 3 _____
1 _____ 4 _____
2 _____ 5 _____
APPENDIX C

COVER LETTER
Dear

The enclosed questionnaire and personal data sheet are designed to take only a few minutes to complete. Please complete each of them, along with a signed "Informed Consent Form." Return the questionnaire and personal data sheet in one envelope, and the "Informed Consent Form" in the other envelope, at your earliest convenience. Two self-addressed envelopes are enclosed to facilitate your response.

I am a doctoral student in Educational Administration at East Tennessee State University. I am engaged in a study entitled "Power Motivation and Power Styles in Higher Education Administration." More specifically, the problem of this study is to determine if relationships exist between selected personal characteristics of higher education administrators, and their perceived level of power motivation and their power style.

Enclosed are the Power Management Inventory and a personal data sheet. They are the instruments being used to collect data which will be utilized in a doctoral dissertation.

Your participation in this study will be most appreciated. Your anonymity is guaranteed because "Informed Consent Forms" and the survey instruments will be mailed under separate cover.

Copies of these data, when compiled and analyzed, will be furnished upon request. I thank you, in advance, for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Nancy Lewis Garland
Doctoral Candidate

Enclosures
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FOLLOW-UP LETTER
Approximately two weeks ago, you received a survey instrument entitled Power Management Inventory, an Informed Consent Form, and a personal data sheet, along with a cover letter and return envelopes. The instruments are being used to collect data which will be utilized in my doctoral dissertation entitled POWER MOTIVATION AND POWER STYLE IN HIGHER EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION.

To date, I have not received your Informed Consent Form. Therefore, I assume you have not returned the survey materials. It is possible that my initial correspondence did not reach you. I will be pleased to supply the needed materials upon request. You may contact me at either of these ETSU numbers: 5351/4383/4216.

I would appreciate your taking the time to complete each of these materials. Please return the questionnaire and personal data sheet in one envelope, and the Informed Consent Form in the other envelope, at your earliest convenience. Two self addressed envelopes were enclosed to facilitate your response.

Your participation in this study will be most appreciated. Your anonymity is guaranteed because the Informed Consent Forms and the survey instruments will be mailed under separate cover.

Copies of these data, when compiled and analyzed, will be furnished upon request. I appreciate your help in this project.

Sincerely,

Nancy Lewis Garland
Doctoral Candidate

College of Education
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INFORMED CONSENT FORM
Inst Trnnwssev Unlvrr*. I  ly

Institutional llrvlcw t'oord

Inform ) Consent forn

DII N C I P A L  INVtST IG A TO Iti Nancy Lewis Garland

TITlt O F  H U M EC T! P O W E R  M O T IV A T IO N  A N D  P O W E R  S T Y L E  If!

H IC H E R  E D U C A T IO N  A D M IN IS T R A T IO N

I) Indicated below are the (a) purpose of this study, (b) the procedures to be followed and (c) the approximate duration of this study:

The purpose of this study is to determine if relationships exist between selected personal characteristics of higher education administrators, and their perceived level of power motivation and their power style. Subjects will be requested to complete a survey instrument and a demographic data sheet. The instruments will require approximately 30 minutes to complete. The anonymity of the subject will be protected.

2) Discomforts, inconveniences and/or risks that can be reasonably expected are:

NONE

3) I understand the procedures to be used in this study and the possible risks involved. All my questions have been answered. I also understand that while my rights and privacy will be maintained, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare does have free access to any information obtained in this study should it become necessary and I freely and voluntarily choose to participate. I understand that I may withdraw at any time without prejudice to me. I also understand that while East Tennessee State University does not provide compensation for medical treatment other than emergency first aid, for any physical injury which may occur as a result of my participation as a subject in this study, claims arising against ETSU or any of its agents or employees may be submitted to the Tennessee State Board of Claims for disposition to the extent allowable as provided under TCA Section 9-812. Further information concerning this may be obtained from the chairman of the Institutional Review Board.

___ Date ___
Signature of Volunteer

___ Date ___
Signature of Parents or Guardian
(when applicable)

March 15, 1984
Signature of Investigator
Nancy Lewis Garland

___ Date ___
Signature of Witness (if applicable)
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