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ABSTRACT

AN ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
POWER STYLE, AND LOCUS OF CONTROL
FOR SELECTED ACADEMIC DEANS

BY

Carla Rahn Warner

The concept of locus of control, as an aspect of the human personality, has remained of interest to researchers since its identification by Julian Rotter in the 1960s. Beginning with the work of French and Raven in the 1950s, the concept of power and its interrelationship with leadership ability has also continued to be of interest to social scientists and educators. This study was completed in response to the lack of previous research on the relationship of locus of control to power style use and preference.

Four hundred eighty academic deans from 109 Comprehensive I institutions within the Southern Region completed the Rotter Internal/External Locus of Control Scale and Hersey, Blanchard, and Natemeyer's Power Perception Profile—Perception of Self to identify: (1) their locus of control orientation and (2) their preferred power style(s). Other variables examined were age, gender, and academic discipline. These variables were measured through responses to a demographic survey developed by the researcher.

Three hundred and twenty two (67%) responses were received. Two hundred and eighty two (58%) sets of responses were used in the analysis of data. Chi square was the primary means of analysis for hypotheses one, two, three, six, and seven that examined the significance of the relationship between the following variables: (1) locus of control orientation and power style, (2) years of experience and power style, (3) years of experience and locus of control orientation, (4) academic discipline and power style and, (5) academic discipline and locus of control orientation. A correlation matrix, followed by the Fisher's z for two independent correlation coefficients, was computed to determine results for hypotheses four and five. Hypothesis four examined the difference in the size of the relationship between locus of control orientation, perceived power style, and gender. Hypothesis five examined the size of the difference in the relationship between locus of
control orientation, perceived power style, and "older" versus "younger" deans. The level of significance was set at .05.

Patterns of power style preference endorsed by deans were independent of locus of control orientation, age, and gender for the coercive, connection, expert, information, legitimate, referent, and reward power styles. A statistically significant relationship was found between deans with undergraduate majors classified as "hard, nonlife" and the expert power style. Deans in "hard, nonlife" disciplines scored higher, and more frequently selected, items on the expert power style than did deans in "soft, life" disciplines. Years of experience in the deanship was found to be significantly related to the preference for and usage of connection power. Connection power was selected more frequently by the responding deans with the fewest years of experience than by deans with the greatest number of years of experience.

A greater percentage (87.2%) of the respondents was found to be internally oriented with a Rotter Scale mean score of 6.84. The most frequently endorsed power styles were expert, legitimate, and reward. The mean number of years in the deanship was 7.7 with 67.7% of the deans aged 55 and younger. The ratio of males to females was 4.4 to one.

The findings of this study contribute to the body of knowledge regarding the impact of personality variables upon performance in the workplace and the potential for leadership of individuals of differing sexes, ages, and academic disciplines. They appear to be instructive for social scientists and educators interested in the impact of individual differences upon behavioral choices.
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...light for good and for evil is given to you, and free will, which, though it endures fatigue in the first battles with the heavens, afterwards, if it be well nurtured, overcomes everything.
Dante Alighieri

It is commonplace observation that the way in which individuals perceive themselves and each other has a significant influence on the way they relate to one another. Human perception impacts upon the social power and influence process. These processes have been under much scrutiny for the past few decades by social, industrial, and organizational psychologists (Podsakoff & Schriesheim, 1985). An individual's effectiveness in interpersonal and supervisory relationships can be enhanced by use of a variety of power bases.

Newer paradigms of leadership associate leadership with power (Fay, 1991). Power may also be conceptualized as the leader's "influence potential" (Hersey, Blanchard, & Natilemeyer, 1979, p. 418). An understanding of current interpretations of the leadership/power connection must begin with the pioneering work of French and Snyder (1959) who proposed restricting the definition of leadership by defining it in terms of power. "Leadership is the potential social influence of one part of the group over another. If one member has some degree of influence over another, then he has some degree of leadership" (French & Snyder, p. 118).
According to McClelland (1970) there is a close relationship between power and leadership. A good manager seeks power as a means of influencing others' behavior for the good of the organization (McClelland & Burnham, 1976). Numerous researchers have explored the relationship between a leader's most used power base and the resulting behavior of the follower (Hersey, Blanchard, & Natemeyer, 1979). The results of these works suggested that selection and use of an appropriate power base is affected by situational variables and should vary dependent upon environmental circumstances (Hersey, Blanchard, & Natemeyer). It would follow that the academic discipline selected by an individual would serve as an environmental circumstance.

Biglan (1973b) pioneered examination of the relationship among academic disciplines and concluded that academic discipline impacts the organization of academic departments. Hayward (1986) supported Biglan's work in finding differences in the perceived influence of chairpersons between departments of biology and departments of English. Of further import, Hayward (1986) established that department size and highest degree offered are important to perceived influence. It would seem that structural variables within the environment, such as highest degree awarded, size and university type also serve as discriminators between departments as does discipline.
In addition to environmental circumstances, the phenomena of power and influence involves a relationship between two agents, that which determines the behavior of the power wielder and that which determines the reaction of the power recipient (French & Raven, 1959). The source of power is the result of the relationship between these two agents. Typically, this relationship will be characterized by a variety of variables which have been termed bases of power.

A given power relationship will ordinarily include several power bases used by the players in a complementary way (Raven & Kruglanski, 1970). Beginning with the five bases of power identified in the work of French and Raven (1959) and continuing with the work of Raven and Kruglanski (1970) and Hersey, Blanchard, and Natemeyer (1979), the following seven bases of power have been identified:

(Hersey, Blanchard, & Natemeyer, p. 419)

1) Coercive power is based on fear. A leader high in coercive power is seen as inducing compliance because failure to comply will lead to punishment such as undesirable work assignments, reprimands, or dismissal.

2) Connection power is based on the leader's "connections" with influential or important persons inside or outside the organization. A leader high in connection power induces compliance from others because they aim at gaining the favor or avoiding the disfavor of the powerful connection.

3) Legitimate power is based on the position held by the leader. Normally, the higher the position, the higher the legitimate power tends to be. A leader high in legitimate power induces compliance from or influences others because they feel that this person has the
right, by virtue of position in the organization, to expect that suggestions will be followed.

4) Referent power is based on the leader's personal traits. A leader high in referent power is generally liked and admired by others because of personality. This liking for, admiration for, and identification with the leader influences others.

5) Expert power is based on the leader's possession of expertise, skill and knowledge, which, through respect, influences others. A leader high in expert power is seen as possessing the expertise to facilitate the work behavior of others. This respect leads to compliance with the leader's wishes.

6) Information power is based on the leader's possession of or access to information that is perceived as valuable to others. This power base influences others because they need this information or want to be "in on things."

7) Reward power is based on the leader's ability to provide rewards for other people. They believe that their compliance will lead to gaining positive incentives such as pay, promotion, or recognition.

Each participant in a power relationship enters into the situation with a set of preconceptions of self and other. An individual's tendency to rely upon particular bases of social power may be better understood in light of attribution theory (Kelley, 1967).

According to attribution theory, individuals attribute the locus of environmental causality either to their own behavior or to factors separate from the self. This locus of environmental causality may be internal or external depending upon the extent to which the individual perceives a contingency relationship between their actions and their outcomes (Rotter, 1966). Rotter has termed this the internal versus external locus of control.
Locus of control is a personality variable influencing an individual's determination of causality (Rotter, 1966). Rotter (1990) defined internal versus external control as the degree to which persons attribute an outcome to their own behavior or personal characteristics (internals) versus the degree to which persons expect that the outcome is a function of chance, under the control of powerful others, or is simply unpredictable (externals).

Internals are individuals who believe they have some control over their destinies. Externals believe that the outcomes of their behavior, and of the events in their lives, are determined by powerful and unpredictable extrinsic factors and agents such as chance or fate. An internal orientation is healthier and an indicator of greater success in dealing with everyday life (Robinson & Shaver, 1973). Researchers have shown that internally oriented individuals are more perceptive, inquisitive, and efficient in processing information and achieve higher scores on measures of academic achievement than externally oriented individuals (Lefcourt, 1976).

Locus of control has been related to such diverse phenomena as achievement behavior, birth control practices, rioting, automobile seat belt use, and psychopathology (Robinson & Shaver, 1973). Thus, the internal/external locus of control construct is generalizable to a multiplicity of circumstances. Locus of control can be
shifted from external to internal (Omizo, Cubberly, & Omizo, 1985) and may be adopted in various degrees of strength (Rotter, 1966).

Internal persons are more resistant to attempts to influence (Biondo & MacDonald, 1971; Hjelle, 1970), more successful in persuading others to adopt their viewpoint (Phares, 1965), and more likely to use persuasive power than coercive power when attempting to influence others (Goodstadt & Hjelle, 1973) than external persons. In addition, gender may be an important variable when examining the relationship between internal/external locus of control and power (Deutchman, 1985).

Theory indicates that an individual's locus of control orientation impacts upon power style selection and use. The manner in which an individual attempts to determine the locus of causality in his/her environment provides a key to the understanding of the pattern and use of the various power bases (Raven & Kruglanski, 1970). "Prior cognitions about self and other [sic] determine the choice of power base which each attempts to use, the extent of compliance of the recipient of influence, the degree of acceptance of change, and subsequent patterns of interaction" (Raven & Kruglanski, p. 82).
Statement of the Problem

Due to role responsibilities frequently exceeding position authority, academic deans often rely upon their abilities of influence and persuasion in their efforts to accomplish departmental goals (Loston, 1979). Feelings of personal causation impact upon an individual's motivation, outlook and resulting behavior (deCharms, 1977). Dependent upon the individual's sense of internal versus external personal causation, the occurrence of particular power styles may be seen more or less frequently. Therefore, the problem of this study was the analysis of the frequency of occurrence of particular power styles between academic deans with an internal versus external locus of control orientation to determine if the distribution of power bases for internally oriented individuals is independent of that of externally oriented individuals.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to analyze the relationship between the perceived dominant power style(s) and locus of control orientation of selected academic deans. Focus was placed upon the relationship between the internal/external locus of control personality construct as defined by Rotter (1966, 1990) and the seven power bases as defined by Hersey, Blanchard, and Natemeyer (1979).

Given the interrelationship between power and influence potential, the purpose of this study was to investigate the
impact of personality variables, and self perceptions as potential determinants influencing an individual's choice of power style. A current view of the relationship between locus of control and perceived power style would provide additional insight into the impact that personality plays in leadership.

Specifically, the researcher analyzed the relationship between locus of control orientation and the preferred choice of power style of selected academic deans. In this process, the nature of the relationship between these two variables was examined. Implications for contemporary men and women, exercising power in leadership positions, were explored.

Significance of the Study

According to Garland (1984) "The need for a thorough understanding of the dynamics and psychology of power is, perhaps, greater today than at any other period of human history" (p. 2). In spite of this, the concept of power, in education, has not received the attention it would seemingly warrant as an area of fundamental social interest (Tauber, 1985). In addition, the study of individual differences is of central importance to researchers (Borg & Gall, 1989) and internal/external locus of control continues to be used as one indicator of those differences (Rotter, 1990).

It is well known that industry has long used the administration and interpretation of personality type
inventories, such as the Myers-Briggs Personality Type Indicator, the Self Directed Search and the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire, in staff selection and staff development (Waldo & Reschetz, 1990). These instruments contribute to an understanding of individual differences through clarification and examination of personality variables. Locus of control is one such personality variable.

The study of the relationship between an individual's locus of control orientation, and perceived power style is important due to the impact that these variables have upon an individual's ability to develop and maintain interpersonal relationships, make decisions and exert influence in the allocation of increasingly scarce resources (Risner, 1987). In spite of this, little is known about the relationship between locus of control, and perceived power style and the impact of these variables upon leadership. An understanding of the influence locus of control orientation has upon an individual's attraction to a particular power base will add to the general knowledge of the many facets of contemporary leadership.

This has theoretical significance for self-development and self-knowledge for leaders in both the public and private sectors. In addition, practical implications may be made to the induction phase of personnel selection and
promotion of individuals into leadership roles in education and industry alike.

Limitations

This study was limited to the 480 academic deans at the comprehensive, public, Carnegie Classification I institutions in the Southern region of the United States. The instruments used in data gathering relied upon individual deans accurately representing their feelings, beliefs, and behavior on the research instruments used to gather data for this study. Use of the "Power Perception Profile-Perception of Self" narrowed the survey focus to the measure of self perception. No attempt was made to investigate the power perceptions of others.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were considered relevant to this study:

1) Power is an important element in organizational leadership.
2) Locus of control orientation is a relatively stable and integral part of the personality.
3) Individual deans are able to assess their personal use of a variety of power bases.
4) The instruments were completed by the individual deans identified to participate in the study.
Hypotheses

Based upon a review of the relevant literature and research currently available on the constructs of power and locus of control, the following seven null hypotheses were developed.

H01. There is no significant relationship between the locus of control orientation of selected academic deans and their perceived power style.

H02. There is no significant relationship between years of experience in the deanship of selected academic deans and their perceived power style.

H03. There is no significant relationship between years of experience in the deanship of selected academic deans and their locus of control orientation.

H04. There is no significant difference in the size of the relationship between locus of control and power style between selected male and female academic deans.

H05. There is no significant difference in the size of the relationship between locus of control and perceived power style between older and younger selected academic deans.

H06. There is no significant relationship between academic discipline in selected academic deans and their perceived power style.
Ho7. There is no significant relationship between academic discipline in selected academic deans and their locus of control orientation.

**Definition of Terms**

Academic Dean - The academic dean is the executive officer responsible for the administration of a major curriculum area division within a college or university and responsible for the supervision of department chairs within the division (Loston, 1979). The academic dean reports directly to the chief academic officer.

Internal/External Locus of Control - Locus of control refers to the extent to which individuals perceive contingency relationships between their actions and their outcomes as measured by the Rotter Scale of Internal/External Locus of Control (Rotter, 1966).

Power Style - For the purposes of this study, power style was defined as the participant's self-perception of his/her most used base of power as defined and measured by Hersey, Blanchard and Natemeyer's Power Perception Profile (Hersey, Blanchard & Natemeyer, 1979).

Years of experience - Years of experience was defined as the knowledge and insights gained in a specific position in one's own place of employment. In this study, work experience is operationalized as the number of years of employment, in an institution of higher education, as an academic dean.
Older versus Younger - Older was operationalized to reference deans aged 56 and above (Havighurst, 1952). Younger was operationalized to reference deans aged 55 and below (Havighurst, 1952).

Overview of the Study

Chapter I includes the introduction, the statement of the problem, the significance of the study, assumptions, hypotheses, limitations, definition of terms, and an overview of the study.

Chapter II contains a review of relevant literature and research.

Chapter III is a description of the methods and procedures used in the study.

Chapter IV is the analysis of data and presentation of the research findings.

Chapter V presents a summary of the study with conclusions and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER 2
Review of Relevant Literature

Introduction

This chapter is divided into three major sections. First, an analysis of power is introduced to provide a background for the inclusion of the bases of power in the study. A discussion of the propositions used by French and Raven (1959) and Hersey, Blanchard, and Natemeyer (1979) to develop the seven bases of power follows. Discussion then continues to the research studies that used French and Ravens' bases of power typology as a conceptual base of power. Second, the discussion relates to the concept of internal/external locus of control with a review of the literature using this construct as it relates to the development of the personality and to the use of power. Third, a discussion of academic discipline will conclude the review of literature.

Bases of Power

Understanding power and the concept of power bases is an important, yet complex task, for the modern leader in today's information society (Stotts, 1987). The classic taxonomy of the bases of power defined by French and Raven (1959) still appear to be fairly representative and popular in application (Rahim, 1989). The five French and Raven power bases are defined as follows:
1. Coercive power is based on a subordinate's perception that a superior has the ability to punish him or her for failure to conform to the superior's influence attempt.

2. Reward power is based on the perception of a subordinate that a supervisor can reward desired behavior.

3. Legitimate power is based on the belief of the subordinate that the superior has the right to prescribe and control behavior.

4. Expert power is based on the subordinate's belief that the superior has job experience and special knowledge or expertise in a given area.

5. Referent power is based on a subordinate's desire to identify with a superior because of admiration or personal liking of the superior (Rahim, 1989).

Information power was described in the original statement by French and Raven (1959) but not referred to as a type of power until later works (Raven, 1965; Collins & Raven, 1969; Raven & Kruglanski, 1970). French and Raven's six bases of social power were further differentiated in terms of whether the altered state in the person was continually related to the influencing agent or socially dependent versus socially independent (Raven, 1974).

Hersey, Blanchard, and Natemeyer (1979) integrated their concept of situational leadership with that of power
by relating a leader's perception of power to various leadership styles. The authors define power as a leader's influence potential. Beginning with the six bases of power identified by French and Raven (1959), Hersey, Blanchard, and Natemeyer defined one additional power base: connection power.

According to Hersey, Blanchard, and Natemeyer (1979) the increased competence and confidence that come with maturity impact on the behavior of people at a variety of levels of maturity. "Just as the leadership style should vary according to the maturity of the follower, effective power bases also vary" (Hersey, Blanchard, & Natemeyer, 1979, p. 423). An effective leader will use different forms of power depending upon the subordinates' willingness to accept responsibility, ability to set and attain high goals, and level of experience.

Not unlike Bertrand Russell (1938) who compared power's relationship to social science to that of energy in physical science, Lilly (1989) defined power as energy with the capacity to mobilize resources and get things done. "Power does not have to be an adversarial game with a zero-sum outcome, but a variable-sum opportunity to empower all involved in the process" (Lilly, p. 281). Lilly also stated that leadership styles differ from power styles due to being non-role-specific nor dependent on organizational hierarchy or the needs or wishes of others.
Bennis and Nanus (1985) equate power to the energy that initiates and sustains action. Ignorance of the importance of power in providing the nucleus for successful leadership will lead to problems in leadership (Bennis & Nanus, 1985).

...power is at one the most necessary and most distrusted element exigent to human progress...We must learn to perceive power for what it really is. Basically, it's the reciprocal of leadership...

...Leadership is the wise use of this power...

...Vision is the commodity of leaders, and power is their currency (Bennis & Nanus, pp. 16-18).

Rahim (1989) investigated the effectiveness of the bases of power in relation to influencing behavioral compliance with superior's wishes and satisfaction with supervision. Rahim reported that legitimate, expert, and referent power bases generally induce subordinate compliance and expert and referent power bases are positively correlated with subordinate satisfaction with supervision. As might be expected, coercive and legitimate power bases were found to be ineffective in enhancing satisfaction from supervision. Coercive and reward power bases were not significantly associated with subordinate compliance or satisfaction (Rahim). In regard to his findings on the impact of reward power, Rahim (1989) stated the following (pp. 553-554):
The relationship between reward power and satisfaction is inconsistent with the literature on leader behavior. The studies on leader behavior cited above show that performance-contingent reward behavior of the leader is positively associated with satisfaction with supervision. This possibly indicates the possession of reward power (power base) is different from the use of reward power (power behavior) of a leader. This power base may not be associated with compliance and satisfaction unless it is exercised contingent upon performance...The implication of this study is that managers can be more effective in increasing their subordinates' compliance and satisfaction by enhancing their personal power bases, such as expert and referent.

Interaction Among Bases of Power

Initially, descriptions of the bases of power were made as if one existed independently of another (Raven, 1974). A pure form of a particular base of power would be rare, indeed. More commonly, the various bases "...exist in differing combinations and configurations, with perhaps one basis being more dominant in one situation, another in a different situation" (Raven, 1974). Individuals ordinarily choose the bases of power used (Raven, 1974). The same factor that enhances ability to influence others in one
dimension might decrease this ability in other dimensions (Raven, 1974).

Raven (1974) reported on a study of the bases of conjugal power finding a relationship between power bases and age and sex. Referent power increased with age while expert power decreased with age except in the cases of the highly educated. Wives were likely to attribute expert power to their husbands while husbands were wont to attribute compliance with their wives to referent power (Raven, 1974).

When the goal is to influence others with the end result being their self-attribution of change, then use of informational power would be most appropriate (Raven, 1974). The use of coercion results in dislike of the power wielder by the person affected, causing a negative halo effect that impacts the power wielder's ability to use referent or informational power. On the other hand, due to the tendency to associate the receipt of a reward with the influencing person, referent power will be enhanced through reward power (Raven & Rubin, 1983).

**Enhancing Power Base Usage**

It follows that managers may be more effective in increasing subordinates' compliance and satisfaction through increased use of the personal power bases, such as, expert and referent (Rahim, 1989). Although use of the legitimate
power base tends to increase compliance it may lead to a slight reduction in supervisory satisfaction (Rahim, 1989). The amount of position power necessary for leader effectiveness depends on the nature of the organization, task, and subordinates. If the leader has too much reward and coercive power, he is tempted to rely on them excessively instead of using referent and expert power. This path leads to resentment and rebellion. On the other hand, if the leader lacks sufficient power to provide equitable rewards, make necessary changes, and punish chronic troublemakers, then he will find it difficult or impossible to develop a high-performing group (Yukl, 1981, p. 65).

Yukl (1981) suggested the following guidelines to enhance use of personal power bases: (1) provide instructions clearly and confidently, (2) ascertain that instructions are legitimate, (3) provide a rationale for the instructions, and (4) follow the chain of command. Yukl (1981) suggested that appropriate education, experience and professional development be offered to individual's deficient in their expert power base. Human relations training can be used to enhance the use of the referent power base by increasing a supervisor's sensitivity to the needs and feelings of their subordinates.
The highly praised Japanese style of management emphasizes shared power, decentralized decision making and worker involvement (Ouchi, 1981). Roberts (1986) labels this manner of using power as collective. Problem solving and consensus building skills are important to the successful interpretation of power as collective rather than self-interested action (Roberts, 1986).

The first empirical evidence for the independence of the social power constructs is given by Frost and Stahelski (1987) in their study of the measurement of French and Raven's bases of social power. The authors found that reward, coercive and legitimate power are used more frequently by higher level leaders than by lower level leaders. Frost and Stahelski (1987) cite evidence which correlates the five bases of social power with leadership behaviors such as consideration and initiation of structure. For example, referent power enables a leader to attempt more influence and create more efficient work groups (Frost & Stahelski, 1987).

Effective managers in large organizations need power more strongly than they do affiliation (McClelland & Burnham, 1976). Effective managers may be characterized as having a socialized power orientation with greater interest in strengthening the organization than in personal aggrandizement (Yukl, 1981). There is a tendency toward the pragmatic and an orientation toward results rather than in
fruitless domination of others (Yukl, 1981). Power is exercised, subtly, to uplift subordinates, enhancing their competence while minimizing status differentials (Yukl, 1981).

McClelland and Burnham (1976) concluded that a top manager must possess a high need for power tempered by discipline and directed toward the benefit of the institution and not toward self-aggrandizement. McClelland and Burnham spoke of the socialized face of power that is inhibited by a tendency toward altruism and self-control.

Affiliative managers, those who are concerned about being liked by their subordinates, tend "...to have subordinates who feel that they have very little personal responsibility, that organizational procedures are not clear, and that they have little pride in their work group" (McClelland & Burnham, 1976, p. 104). The authors further state, although somewhat more effective, managers motivated by a need for personal power do not have the self-discipline to contribute to institutional growth.

**Gender and Power**

Due to sex role socialization, the life experiences of women tend to cause them to channel their power needs toward an informal arena (Deutschman, 1985). The author maintains this results in females being less dependent upon internal motivation to influence others. For men, in both formal and
informal power situations, a higher internal control exists when attempting to influence others (Deutchman, 1985).

**Power Preference**

How do individuals decide which bases of power to use in a given situation? Logic would lead us to assume that individuals select that power base most likely to lead to successful achievement of the goal, with the least amount of ongoing supervision but with the greatest likelihood of endurance. An individual's preference for a particular mode of power may be related to the individual's orientation toward, and expectations of, work (Rosenberg & Pearlin, 1962).

Individuals who value the extrinsic rewards of work (i.e. economic prestige) are more likely to use legitimate authority than those individuals who are more concerned with helping others (Rosenberg & Pearlin, 1962). "Legitimate authority is an objective, impersonal method of influence, based on formal rank and position, and operating independently of those who occupy the position (Rosenberg & Pearlin, 1962, p. 348). In addition, length of service was found by Rosenberg and Pearlin (1962) to be related to use of legitimate authority.

Information power is attractive due to the self-attributional effect it has upon the person influenced. The amount of effort and resources that must be expended to achieve successful compliance of others are factors in the
selection of power base used (Rosenberg & Pearlin, 1962). Individuals intuitively realize that the power act is not divorced from social norms and, thus, must be evaluated in terms of possible repercussions (Rosenberg & Pearlin, 1962).

The Repercussions of Power Acts

In their study of power orientations in mental hospitals, Rosenberg and Pearlin (1962) found that nursing personnel do not tend to react to situations as events isolated from all others but rather are cognizant of the possible repercussions of their actions. In essence, their present actions were interpreted in light of future consequences. Thus, coercing a patient now might result in making the patient more hostile and uncooperative in the future. Therefore, although persuasion might be more difficult to use in the immediate situation, it is perceived as having a greater likelihood of producing long-term compliance in the future.

In addition, Rosenberg and Pearlin (1962) found what they termed a "spreading effect" or consequences of the use of a particular power act on other patients not directly impacted. Offering patients benefits as a reward for compliance was often resisted by nurses in their anticipation of other patients' demand for similar rewards. Although these effects may be accentuated in the environment studied by Rosenberg and Pearlin, it may be generalized to most situations involving interpersonal interaction. "We
thus see that the power act is not based upon a decision divorced from time and society but is, on the contrary, consistently evaluated in terms of potential repercussions" (Rosenberg & Pearlin, 1962, p. 346).

Raven and Kruglanski (1970) examined needs of the power wielder such as personal satisfaction and self-esteem as other, less subtle, motivations for selecting a particular power base. The influencing agent is as subject to the attribution process as is the person influenced (Raven, 1974). Use of coercive power may build self-esteem through attribution of locus of control to the power wielder and away from the influence (Raven, 1974).

Situational Bases of Power Motivation

Latent concerns and situational forces contribute to the power motivation of an individual (Veroff & Veroff, 1971).

A motive is rarely extinguished but can become lower in a hierarchy of motives, as other motives develop or as it loses some affective significance. We therefore anticipate relative stability of a motive like the power motive - being weaker or stronger at different points in the life cycle, but always being within certain bounds because of early fixations (p. 60).
The Effects of Power Motivation on Behavior

While exploitation is most clearly perceived as power behavior, other behaviors with less explicit power orientation may result from arousal of power motivation (Veroff & Veroff, 1971). "Indeed, one might guess that a measure like Rotter's Internal or External Control might be a very useful contingent indicator as to whether overt power behavior will occur (Veroff & Veroff, p. 66). Veroff and Veroff developed the following five assertions regarding the development of power motivation (pp. 66-68):

1. High power motivation occurs in status groups concerned about their weakness.
2. High power motivation can lead to the avoidance of the power situation, including self-destruction.
3. High power motivation produces positive social performance and adjustment when the power demands are not directly salient.
4. High power motivation can underlie apparently successful life styles if affiliation motivation is low, but such a life style with a single motivational base can be fraught with conflict.
5. High power motivation in combination with other strong motives (affiliation and achievement) can contribute to a differentiated and zestful life.
Locus of Control

Does an individual's ability to perceive a causal relationship between behavior and achievement of rewards or failures create a difference in the overall lifestyle of that individual? A person who perceives rewards and punishments as contingent upon personal actions will behave differently than a person who fails to see this relationship.

A host of behaviors may be mediated by locus of control orientation. "We have suggested that perceived locus of control may be viewed as a somewhat narrow expectancy arising out of a specific situation or it may be viewed as a relatively stable characteristic that persons carry with them from situation to situation" (Phares, 1976, p. 6). Phares (1976) noted the importance of recognizing that while an individual's beliefs about control affects their resultant behavior, the structure of the situation must also be taken into account.

Both situational structure and expectancies contribute to the resultant behavior exhibited by an individual. An understanding of social learning theory helps to explain the manner in which internal/external locus of control impacts human behavior. The following are the most important assumptions of social learning theory:
To deal accurately with behavior, personal determinants and environmental determinants must be used.

2. The emphasis of the theory is on learned social behavior.

3. Individuals' experiences - their interactions with their meaningful environment - though varied, are interrelated.

4. Social learning theory emphasizes both general and specific determinants of behavior. Within social learning theory it is possible to infer consistency in personality from different behaviors that occur across situations.

5. There is a purposeful quality to human behavior. Behavior may be said to be goal-directed in the sense that people strive to attain or to avoid certain aspects of their environment. This is the familiar notion that behavior is motivated.

6. Finally, expectancies are regarded by social learning theorists as prime determinants of behavior; reinforcement alone does not explain behavior adequately. In other words, according to this theory, behavior is determined by the degree to which people expect that their behavior will lead to goals, as well as by reinforcement through goal achievement (Phares, 1976, p. 11).
Phares (1976) saw locus of control as a quantifiable dimension of personality that may be used along with other variables of social learning theory to predict human behavior. Indeed, the attribution process for internals differs from that for externals with internals allocating causality more frequently to the self rather than to the environment (Rotter, 1966). The attribution process instigates activities such as information-seeking, communication and persuasion (Kelley, 1967). "Attribution refers to the process of inferring or perceiving the dispositional properties of entities in the environment" (Kelley, p. 193). A similarity exists between the human processes of self- and other-perception (Kelley).

The literature suggested that not enough regard has been paid to other variables when researching locus of control. The characteristics of the situation are important to instigation of the internal/external reaction. It is important to recognize the impact of the perception of an individual as to whether or not the situation involves skill or chance, is predictable or unpredictable and controllable or uncontrollable (Phares, 1976). In addition, Phares (1976) contended that an individual's perception of a situation as being unpredictable and uncontrollable affects his/her ability to learn and may result in debilitating affective responses.
Phares (1971) investigated the potential defensive functions of an external orientation. Phares (1971) related the belief that one exerts little control over the occurrence of reinforcements to the psychological defense mechanism known as rationalization (Phares, 1971). Attributing failure to sources external to oneself may serve as a means of avoiding punishment (Phares, 1971). To internally oriented individuals, failure becomes a commentary on their abilities (Phares, 1971).

In a comparison of locus of control with levels of creativity, Kneipp and Gadzella (1990), found external locus of control to be negatively correlated with creativity. Most people associate creativity with the ability and willingness to think and act in unconventional ways (Sternberg, 1985).

Similar terms are used to describe persons with an internal locus of control orientation (Kneipp & Gadzella, 1990). The production and development of original concepts may be suppressed by an external orientation that would predispose one to judge one's own ideas by conventional or others' standards (Strickland, 1989).

Collins (1974) asserted that an individual may achieve an external score on the Internal/External Locus of Control Scale by subscribing to any of four views (1) the world is difficult, (2) the world is unjust, (3) the world is governed by luck, or (4) the world is politically
unresponsive. "Since Locus of control refers to expectancies for control over one's surroundings, a higher level of coping and activity would be anticipated from internals" (Phares, 1976, p. 60).

It would follow that internally focussed individuals would tend to achieve more positive results, in a variety of situations, by exerting more active control. Seeman (1967) found that the negative impact an external orientation has upon learning is apt to occur more often in situations that deal with issues of control and were not generalizable to all learning situations.

Locus of Control and Power

An individual's belief in the internal or external control of reinforcement plays a determining role in that individual's expectancy of successful influence (Goodstadt & Hjelle, 1973). Externally controlled persons expect to lack success in influencing others, therefore leading them to rely less on forms of personal persuasion than internally oriented persons (Goodstadt & Hjelle, 1973).

In a study examining the relationship between internal/external control orientation and political activity and power behavior, Deutchman (1985) found a modest negative relationship between power drive and externality (r=.36). This indicated that individuals with an external orientation would have a lower power drive. Internality would then tend to be associated with high power drive.
Deutchman (1985) found I-E control to be an important variable in understanding the amount of power sought by individuals, that is, their power motive. In spite of the fact that internals have no more awareness of power than externals and tend not to manifest their power behavior differently, Deutchman (1985) found internals to be more likely to have higher power drives than externals.

In studies done by Biondo and MacDonald (1971) and Hjelle (1970), internally oriented persons were found to be more able to resist influence and more likely to use persuasive rather than coercive power in their own attempts to influence others than externally oriented persons (Goodstadt & Hjelle). "The psychologically powerless or externally controlled individual, when faced with the problem of influencing a resistant other, was less likely to rely upon personal persuasion and more likely to use coercive power than the internally controlled individual" (Goodstadt & Hjelle, p. 194).

Veroff and Veroff (1971) discuss power need as a neurotic tendency evolving out of feelings of personal inadequacy. Deutchman (1985) hypothesized that if indeed power drive is a compensatory trait developed to alleviate low self-esteem then a positive relationship between external control and power drive might well be expected. Externally oriented individuals would exhibit a high power drive. Internally oriented persons, having already
satisfied their need for control, would not need to strive for power.

Goodstadt and Hjelle (1973) conducted an experiment in which internally and externally controlled subjects were asked to supervise three employees. One of the fictitious employees was a problem worker. These researchers found externally controlled "supervisors" to use significantly more coercive power than did the internally controlled "supervisors."

Raven and Kruglanski (1970) suggested that successful results gained through the use of coercive power have the effect of enhancing the self esteem of the influencing agent. In a similar study by Goodstadt and Kipnis (1970) supervisory problems dealing with discipline tended to evoke use of coercive power while supervisory problems relating to ineptness evoked the use of expert power.

As opposed to internally controlled people, Goodstadt and Hjelle (1973) concluded that externally controlled persons expect to be unable to influence people and events. Thus the use of more coercive forms of power tend to be consistent with the expectations of externally controlled persons. These findings indicate that internals tend be more persuasive than externals.

Antecedents of Locus of Control

It was hypothesized by Rotter (1966) that consistency of parental attitudes and behaviors is one antecedent of an
external orientation. Phares (1976) looked at factors within the parent-child relationship that might account for an internal or external locus of control and found permissiveness and flexibility of parental attitudes and expectations to be linked with internality. A child's perception of parental behavior relates to the development of locus of control.

Internal locus of control is linked to warm, positive, protective and nurturing child rearing practices. It is likely that parental influence is only the beginning and that other factors, such as ordinal position in the family and/or being a member of a social group that cannot compete effectively for social status or power, will contribute to development of an external locus of control orientation (Phares, 1976).

deCharms, Carpenter, and Kuperman (1965) looked at individuals attributing responsibility for events to others and labeled them "pawns" versus "origins" of their behavior. They found that subjects with internal expectancy beliefs perceived mythical heroes as origins rather than pawns. deCharms (1972) defines origin versus pawn as follows (p. 96):

When a person initiates intentional behavior, he experiences himself as having originated the intention and the behavior. He is the locus of causality of the behavior and he is said to be
intrinsically motivated. Since he, himself is the originator, we refer to the person as an Origin.

... When something external to the person impels him to behavior, he experiences himself as the instrument of the outside source and the outside source is the locus of causality. He is said to be extrinsically motivated. Since the person is impelled from without we refer to him as Pawn.

Stemming from the work of deCharms, Frankel (1985) conducted a study of causal attribution of control on 10 variables effecting student attrition/retention in college. A significant difference between internal and external locus of control was found. Frankel attributes this to the self-determining effect that an internal locus of control has upon the self-concept of individuals.

Frymier (1987) referenced a tendency in the literature to describe motivation in terms of locus of control. Internals are more highly motivated due to their feeling of being on top of things. A feeling that what they are doing is important is enhanced by "a sense of being in charge of their own lives and of events and things around them" (Frymier, p. 12).

On the other hand, individuals who develop an external locus of control lack this confidence and do not believe that what they do will make a difference and may tend to be
fatalistic. "Such people lack the motivation to work hard, to learn, to change (Frymier, 1987, p. 12).

Gender Differences and Locus of Control

In research concerning sex differences in perceived locus of control, De Brabander and Boone (1989) collected and analyzed Rotter Scale responses from 87 male and 60 female undergraduate students. Results indicated females to be more external than males. De Brabander and Boone suggest that the Rotter Scale may have a different meaning for females resulting in some construct validity problems in measuring the female perception of control. The authors hypothesize that female responses to the items are determined by what they perceive to be socially acceptable, that is, the dependency of women upon external factors.

In her study of control, power and political participation Deutchman (1985) concluded the following: As a result of sex-role socialization, nonformal political participation may come "naturally" to most women, a situation not true for men. Women's life experiences channel their power needs toward the nonformal arena such that they need not be particularly internally motivated to influence others. For men, the I-E dynamic works in both the formal and nonformal spheres: participating men have higher internal control regardless of the domain in which they attempt influence (p. 841).
Brown, Furr, Fulkerson, Voight, and Ware (1984) reported that female leaders attribute the cause of their success and failures in a manner similar to that of males. Males tend to take responsibility for their successes while attributing failure to external factors. Gender differences in achievement have been attributed to a perceived female tendency to attribute success to luck or to luck and effort rather than to their abilities (Deaux & Emswiller, 1974).

**Academic Discipline**

"In 1973, Biglan published the first definitive statement concerning the relationship among academic disciplines" (Hayward, 1986, p. 136). Biglan analyzed the perceptions of subject matter similarities among a large group of scholars from differing academic disciplines. His findings revealed that regardless of academic discipline, respondents perceived the same degree of similarity among the subject matter areas. Biglan further established the following three dimensions allowing for separation between academic disciplines (Biglan, 1973a):

1. The degree to which a paradigm exists (hard vs. soft).
2. The degree of concern with application (pure vs. applied).
3. The degree of concern with life systems (life vs. nonlife).

Further expansion of Biglan's categories was accomplished by Drees (1982).
According to Biglan (1973b), academic discipline effects the organization of academic departments. "He warned that lumping all disciplines together in order to generalize about the academic organization as a whole may mask some real differences and may result in poor decisions based on a hypothetical 'department' which, in fact, does not exist" (Hayward, 1986). Therefore, the use of alternate strategies may be necessitated in management strategies for the differing academic disciplines.

In her study of the perceived influence of chairpersons in differing academic disciplines, Hayward (1986) supported the work of Biglan's model through the establishment of the following three major points (p. 144):

(1) The structural variables of highest degree offered by the department and department size are each more important to perceived influence than is discipline.

(2) Those areas of influence which best discriminate between biology and English department chairpersons are different than those which best discriminate between groups defined by the other structural variables; and

(3) There is a great deal of redundancy among those variables which distinguish among groups defined by highest degree, size, and university type.

It has been suggested that differences between academic disciplines may arise out of an underlying recruitment process that is selective and replete with biases and definitions of orthodox cognitions and actions (Smart & Elton, 1982).

Faculty in engineering and agriculture (hard-applied) were found to be the two most politically conservative
disciplines while faculty in the humanities and social sciences (soft-pure) represented the two most liberal disciplines. Disciplines representing hard-pure and soft-applied categories were located between these extremes on the liberalism-conservatism scale (Smart & Elton, 1982, p. 224).

### Clustering of Academic Task Areas in Three Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Areas</th>
<th>Hard</th>
<th>Soft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pure Nonlife system</td>
<td>Life system</td>
<td>Nonlife system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astronomy</td>
<td>Botany</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Entomology</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>Microbiology</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Physiology</td>
<td>Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Nonlife system</td>
<td>Life system</td>
<td>Nonlife system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic engineering</td>
<td>Agronomy</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil engineering</td>
<td>Dairy science</td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer science</td>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical engineering</td>
<td>Agricultural economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*From Biglan (1973b), reprinted by permission. Copyright 1973 by the American Psychological Association.*

### Summary

The research on the topics of power and locus of control is expansive and varied. The literature selected for review in this chapter concerned itself primarily with the definition, theoretical basis, research, development,
and practical application of the concepts of power and locus of control; their impact upon the individual singularly and their impact upon individuals as they relate to each other.

The review of the literature led the researcher to the following postulates:

1. Bases of power may be differentiated as socially dependent versus socially independent (Raven, 1974).

2. An individual's style of leadership may be related to his/her perception of power (Hersey, Blanchard, & Natemeyer, 1979).

3. Power may be defined as an individual's potential for influencing others (Hersey, Blanchard, & Natemeyer, 1979).

4. The increased competence and confidence that come with maturity impact upon power style use and selection (Hersey, Blanchard, & Natemeyer, 1979; Bennis & Nanus, 1985).

5. Situational and personality factors influence an individual's ability to vary and utilize a variety of power bases (Raven, 1974; Hersey, Blanchard, & Natemeyer, 1979; Rahim, 1989).

6. Maturity and gender impact upon an individual's selection and use of power bases (Raven, 1974; Deutchman, 1985; Veroff & Veroff, 1971; De

7. Through education and training individuals may learn to enhance their usage of the personal power bases (Yukl, 1981).

8. An individual's orientation toward and expectations of work impact upon choice of power styles (Rosenberg & Pearlin, 1982).

9. The personal needs of an individual (i.e. personal satisfaction, self-esteem, etc.) provide motivation for selection of a particular power base (Raven & Kruglanski, 1970; Veroff & Veroff, 1971).

10. Locus of control is a relatively stable characteristic that impacts upon an individual's behavior as they move from situation to situation (Rotter, 1966, Phares, 1976).

11. It is possible to infer consistency in personality from different behaviors that occur across situations (Phares, 1976).

12. Locus of control is a quantifiable dimension of personality that may be used along with other variables to predict human behavior (Phares, 1976).

14. Externally controlled individuals rely less on forms of personal persuasion than internally oriented persons (Goodstadt & Hjelle, 1973).

15. Internals are more likely to have higher power drives than externals (Deutchman, 1980).

16. Ordinal position in the family and parental behavior contribute to the development of internal/external locus of control (Phares, 1976).

17. Use of alternative strategies may be necessitated in management strategies for the differing academic disciplines (Hayward, 1986).

18. Differences between academic disciplines may arise out of an underlying recruitment process that is selective and biased with definitions of orthodox cognitions and actions (Smart & Elton, 1982).
CHAPTER 3
Research Methodology

Introduction

The purpose of this study was the analysis of the relationship between the internal/external locus of control orientation of academic deans and their perceived power style. The objectives of this study were as follows: (1) to obtain a measurement of preferred power style as perceived by academic deans; (2) to obtain a measurement of locus of control (internal or external) as perceived by academic deans; (3) to determine the relationship between locus of control orientation of academic deans and their perceived power style; (4) to determine the relationship between academic discipline of academic deans and their perceived power style and locus of control; (5) to determine the relationship between gender and the perceived power style and locus of control of academic deans; and (6) to determine the relationship between age and years of experience between locus of control and power style of academic deans.

Population

The target population was comprised of the academic deans employed in the 109 institutions (Appendix A) within the 15 Southern Region Education Board states (Appendix B) defined by the Carnegie Commission as public, comprehensive colleges and universities I (1987). As defined by the
Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1987), these institutions offer baccalaureate programs and, with few exceptions, graduate education through the masters degree (1987). Four hundred eighty academic deans were identified (Torregrosa, 1991). For the purposes of this research, the population, in its entirety, was studied.

The 15 states from which the 109 institutions were selected are: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia (Marks, 1986). Names of academic deans were obtained from the HEP...Higher Education Directory. Addresses were obtained from The College Handbook. The total list of 480 deans was distributed by gender as follows: 372 males (77.5%); 95 females (19.8%) and 13 unknown (2.7%) (Torregrosa, 1991).

**Instrumentation**

Two instruments were used in collecting data. The "Power Perception Profile--Perception of Self" (Appendix C) developed by Hersey, Blanchard, and Natemeyer was used to determine perceived power style. The purpose of the instrument was described as follows: "Evaluates the way an individual uses power as the basis for asserting leadership" (Sweetland & Keyser, 1983). The "Power Perception Profile--Perception of Self" is a 21 item paper-pencil test. It
assesses seven power bases: coercion, connection, expert, information, legitimate, referent, and reward.

The profile required respondents to allocate 3 points among 21 sets of two alternative choices based on their self-perception of why others comply with their wishes (self-perception) and reflecting one of the seven sources of power (Hersey, Blanchard, & Natemeyer, 1979). Respondents were instructed to allocate their points based on the relative importance of each alternative, indicating their perception of why subordinates comply with their wishes. Respondents received a score representing their perception of the relative strength of each of the seven bases of power.

The Power Perception Profile-Self was altered from its published version (with permission from The Leadership Studies Inc.) to include only the scale itself without the self-scoring mechanism. This change was made for two reasons: (1) upon agreement with the owner of the copyright, the capturing device was altered, and (2) including the self-scoring device would have jeopardized the integrity of the results due to potential altering of responses by the participating deans.

In his study of the validity and reliability of the Power Perception Profile, Delaney (1980) established construct validity through use of two expert panels yielding 79 and 75% agreement, respectively, when matching scale
definitions to power base category titles. Coercive and reward power bases were found to be fully valid with high validity being established for connection, legitimate, and information power. Referent power received the lowest scores for agreement for both the descriptor and definition and expert power was rated moderately high.

Delaney (1980) determined a .51 (with a range from .27 to .70) test-retest correlation coefficient for 40 pairs of test result scores using the Spearman-Brown formula. Delaney (1980) reported the results to be significantly below the .05 level for six of the seven power bases with "Expert" power receiving a reliability determination in an acceptable range for use in human relations training. An identified weakness of the Power Perception Profile is the forced-choice response format that results in quasi-ipsative measurement due to the respondents restriction to choose between a given pair of reasons (Richardson, 1989).

The Rotter Scale of Internal/External Locus of Control (Appendix D) is the most widely used measure of locus of control and is referred to as the I-E Scale (Duttweiler, 1984). The Rotter Scale was administered as published. Rotter's I-E Scale is considered to be a measure of generalized expectancy. The scale's items deal with the subjects' belief about the nature of reinforcement and about how it is controlled (Rotter, 1966). It consists of 23 question pairs, using a forced choice format, plus six
filler questions for a total of 29 items. Internal and external statements are paired. Internal statements receive no points; external choices receive one point.

The test yields one global score. The most "internal" individuals receive a score of zero; the most "external" receive a score of 23 (Robinson & Shaver, 1973). Respondents may be classified as "internal" or "external" based upon this score. Correlations with the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability scale were -.07 to -.35 (Wilkinson, 1990). Test-retest reliability has ranged from .49 to .83 for time periods varying from one week to two months (Omizo, Omizo, & Michael, 1987; Hersch & Scheibe, 1967; Rotter, 1966).

Rotter (1966) indicated significant correlations of the Rotter I-E Scale scores with measures of intelligence and reported internal consistency estimates ranging from .69 to .73 for combined sex samples. More recently Goodman and Waters (1987) reported coefficient alpha reliability estimates for the Rotter Scale as .46 with the Norwicki-Strickland locus of control scale for adults.

In spite of its widespread use, Duttweiler (1984) noted the following criticisms of the Rotter I-E Scale:

(a) low item total-score correlations
(b) the multi-dimensionality of the scale
(c) the forced choice format
(d) the inclusion of items that are not representative of the construct.

(e) the item referents, and

(f) the heterogeneity of external control orientation (p. 210).

A questionnaire (Appendix E) was developed by the researcher to collect demographic data on the subjects participating in the study. Respondents were requested to provide the following information: (1) age, (2) gender, (3) academic discipline, (augmented version, Drees, 1982), and (4) years of experience in the deanship. Institutional size was identified and verified by the researcher.

Research Design

The design of this study was descriptive using survey methodology. The purpose of this design was to describe relationships between variables. The data gathered were analyzed using the chi square test for independence. According to Borg and Gall (1989) the chi square is a nonparametric test that is used when the research data are in the form of frequency counts that can be placed into two or more categories. "The chi square can be used to compare frequencies occurring in different categories or the categories may be groups, so that the chi square is comparing groups with respect to the frequency of occurrence of different events" (Gay, 1987, p.397). Given the classification of the chi square test as nonparametric, it
is limited in its ability to detect Type II errors. A factorial chi square may be used when frequencies are categorized along more than one dimension in order to determine the independence of the variables under consideration (Gay). A secondary analysis was completed using correlations between raw scores on both the Rotter Internal External Control Scale and the Power Perception Profile. Correlations were calculated using the Pearson $r$ product moment correlation coefficient.

Data Collection and Procedure

Approval was obtained during the fall of 1991 from the Institutional Review Board of East Tennessee State University to conduct research on human subjects. Permission to use the Rotter Internal External Locus of Control Scale was granted by Dr. Julian Rotter during the summer of 1991. Permission to adapt the capturing device of the Power Perception Profile for research purposes was granted by Leadership Studies, Inc. during the summer of 1991.

During the winter of 1992, packets containing the two instruments and a demographic data sheet were mailed, along with a cover letter and a postage paid returned envelope, to the 480 individuals identified as academic deans in the previously identified Southern Region Education Board institutions. Academic deans were identified through use
of the HEP—Higher Education Directory and the SREB Fact Book.

An initial mailing was made in which the identified deans received a packet containing the two instruments, demographic sheet, and cover letter along with a request that they be completed and returned within a two week period. Within three weeks of the initial mailing, a follow-up letter along with another set of instruments was mailed to the non-respondents. If the subsequent reminder produced a low response rate, the researcher planned to conduct a telephone survey of approximately 10% of the non-respondents to determine if demographic differences existed between respondents and non-respondents. Each academic dean was assigned an identification number. Responses to the instruments were scored according to their respective designs.

Data Analysis

The Rotter Scale of Internal/External Locus of Control resulted in an individual score on a scale from 0-23. It was related to the score obtained from the "Power Perception Profile--Self". Other variables examined and related to locus of control and power style preference included gender, age, years of experience, and academic discipline. Methods of analysis as they pertained to the related null hypotheses included the chi square test of independence, the Pearson
Chi Square, and the Fisher's $z$ for two independent correlation coefficients.
Chapter 4
Analysis of Data

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to analyze the relationship between internal and external locus of control (a personality variable) and preferred power style of academic deans within Carnegie classification I, comprehensive institutions of higher education. Demographic variables found in the literature to be of influence to these variables were also examined.

Internal versus external locus of control was determined through administration of the Rotter Scale developed by Julian R. Rotter that yields a score from 0-23 with 0 being the most internal and 23 the most external (1966). Preferred power styles of the participating academic deans was measured through the administration of the Power Perception Profile—Perception of Self developed by Hersey, Blanchard, and Natemeyer (1979). This scale yields scores between 0 and 18 on seven types of power style.

Data Collection

The first administration of the surveys to the 480 academic deans identified in the population resulted in 255 (53%) responses. A second mailing of the surveys to the 225 non-respondents resulted in an additional 67 responses. A total of 322 (67%) responses was received. Of those 322, 12
(3.7%) individuals declined to participate in the study. Of the remaining 310, 28 sets of responses were determined to be unusable due to one or more of the following reasons: (1) incomplete Rotter scale, (2) incomplete Power Perception-Profile. Telephone calls were made to 21 respondents to receive accurate data on the demographic survey items dealing with total number of years in the deanship and number of years in the deanship at the respondent's present institution.

Description of the Population

Two hundred and eighty two (58%) sets of responses were used in the analysis of data. A chi square goodness of fit test was run to determine if the responses received were representative of the population. Geographic distribution and academic discipline were used because of the importance of achieving a representative geographical distribution while avoiding an over-representation of any particular academic discipline.

The chi square analysis of the proportions of respondents by state, resulted in a value of 12.88 at the .05 level with a critical value of 23.9. The null hypothesis was retained as balance was achieved, demographically. The states with the largest and smallest percentage of respondents, respectively, were Texas (21%) and Mississippi (0.7%). North Carolina and Alabama followed Texas as states with high response rates.
It was determined that additional follow-up was not needed. Illustrated in Table 1 are the number and percent of respondents by state.

Table 1
Respondents by State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The academic discipline of respondents was examined using Biglan categories for classification purposes. Expected frequencies were derived by multiplying the total number in the sample by their respective expected percentages. These percentages were based on the Biglan categorization of the actual schools and divisions of the deans in the original mailing.

Approximately 60% of respondents were representative of three of the "soft" disciplines which include soft, nonlife pure; soft nonlife, applied; and soft, life, applied. These disciplines include history, English, anthropology,
psychology, education, accounting, and economics. The distribution between "pure" and "applied" disciplines was 44.5% and 55.5%, respectively, as shown in Table 2.

The chi square analysis resulted in a value of 2.49 at the .05 level with a critical value of 14.07. A representative distribution was obtained among the eight Biglan categories for academic discipline.

Table 2
Distribution of Academic Discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biglan Categories</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard, NonLife, Pure</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard, NonLife, Applied</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard, Life, Pure</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard, Life, Applied</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft, NonLife, Pure</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft, NonLife, Applied</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft, Life, Pure</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft, Life, Applied</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remainder of this chapter is devoted to presenting characteristics of respondents and analysis of the data. First, the results of the demographic survey of the population is presented and illustrated. Second, results of the statistical analyses for each of the seven hypotheses are presented. Last, the chapter concludes with findings relevant to the seven proposed hypotheses.

Characteristics of Respondents

The entire population of 480 academic deans was surveyed in this study. Demographic data and statistical
results were analyzed using the 282 respondents with accurately completed response sets. Of that number, 52 (18.5%) were female and 230 (81.5%) were male.

Age of respondents was divided into two categories: (1) "Older" (age 56 and older), and (2) "Younger" (age 55 and younger). Among the deans responding 191 (67.7%) were "Younger" and 91 (32.3%) were "Older". Of the females responding (78.8%) were "Younger" and (21.2%) were "Older". Of the males responding (65.2%) were "Younger" and (34.8%) were "Older". The age and sex distribution among respondents are presented in Figure 1.

![Figure 1. Respondents by Age and Gender.](image-url)
As the figure indicates, 21.5% of the responding deans 55 years of age and younger were female and 12.1% of the responding deans 56 years of age and older were female. This is an obvious reflection of the growth of women in higher education administration in the last two decades.

Academic discipline was examined as a variable with potential impact upon preferred power style and locus of control. Respondent's undergraduate college majors were placed in the Biglan categories represented in Figure 2.

Figure 2. Number of respondents by Academic Discipline
Participants were asked to cite the number of years that they have been in the deanship and the number of years that they have been in the deanship at their present institutions. The ranges were 30.5 and 25.5 years, respectively.

The mean for number of years in the deanship was 7.7. The mean for number of years in the deanship at the present institution was 6.3. Figure 3 presents respondents' total number of years of service as an academic dean.

![Bar graph showing total years of service as a dean](image)

*0 years indicates less than 12 months*

**Figure 3.** Total Years of Service as a Dean.

**Measures of Central Tendency and Variability**

Of the power styles assessed using the Power Perception Profile—Perception of Self, expert power had the highest
mean followed by legitimate and reward power. Coercive and connection power had the lowest mean scores. Reward power had the least amount of variability followed by expert and legitimate power (see Table 3).

Scores on the Rotter Internal/External Locus of Control Scale may range from zero (the most internal) to 23 (the most external). Therefore, the mean Rotter Scale score, at 6.84, is clearly indicative of internality. However, the standard deviation of 4.01 reflects the wide variability of scores around the mean. The median Rotter Scale score was determined to be 6.00.

Table 3
Measures of Central Tendency & Variability for Power Styles and Rotter Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rotter Scale</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercive</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>12.38</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referent</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings for Hypotheses

The central question of the study concerned the nature and extent of the relationship between power style and locus of control orientation of selected academic deans. Null hypothesis 1 stated that there is no significant relationship between the locus of control orientation of
selected academic deans and their perceived power style. Data was analyzed by collapsing each of the seven power style ranges of scores into categories labeled "Low" "Medium" and "High". This was accomplished by converting each power profile score into a Z score. Scores were then divided into categories of "Low" "Medium" and "High" with the middle category representing .16 of a standard deviation on either side of the mean for each power profile category. Scores on each power style had a possible range of 0 - 18.

A Pearson Chi Square was used to analyze the data. For each power style, chi square values did not exceed the critical value of 5.09. Therefore, the null hypothesis, was retained. Locus of control orientation did not influence the preference for, or strength of, power style for the deans participating in the study.

Table 4
Chi Square Values for Power Style by Locus of Control Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POWER STYLE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coercive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.20 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.53 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.80 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.37 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.77 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.62 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.35 NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS = Not Significant

Certain demographic variables were expected to influence the findings. Presented in this section are the
findings relevant to the hypotheses addressing demographic variables.

Null hypothesis 2 stated that there is no significant relationship between years of experience in the deanship of selected academic deans and their perceived power style. Deans were asked to respond to one of two categories, on the demographic survey, denoting either "less than one year" of experience in the deanship or to list the actual number of years of experience in the deanship. Years of experience ranged from less than 1 year to as many as 30 years.

Four categories were determined representing the following numbers of years in the deanship: (1) 0-3.0, (2) 3.5-6.5, (3) 7.0-11.0, and (4) 12-30. Categories represented the following numbers of deans, respectively: 74, 70, 70, and 68.

The Pearson Chi Square was used to analyze the data. For the coercive, expert, information, legitimate, referent, and reward power styles, the chi square values did not exceed the critical value of 12.59. For these power styles the null was retained.

Years of experience did not influence the participating dean's selection of the coercive, expert, information, legitimate, referent, and reward power styles. The chi square value for connection power at 13.55 exceeded the critical value and allowed for rejection of the null. Years of experience was found to be of influence upon the
preference for, and strength of, the selection of connection power for the deans participating in the study (see Table 5).

Table 5
Chi Square Values for Years of Experience and Power Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POWER STYLE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coercive</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.63 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.55 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.13 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.73 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.34 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.46 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.17 NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p ≤ .05
NS = Not Significant

Null hypothesis 3 stated that there is no significant relationship between years of experience in the deanship of selected academic deans and their locus of control orientation. Of the 282 deans in the sample, 246 were identified as "internal" and 36 were identified as "external" in their locus of control orientation. A Pearson Chi Square analysis of locus of control by years of experience resulted in a chi square value of .68 with a critical value of 7.82 at the .05 level. The null was retained. No significant relationship existed between years of experience in the deanship and locus of control orientation.

Null hypothesis 4 stated that there is no significant difference in the size of the relationship between locus of control and power style between selected male and female
academic deans. The data were analyzed by first computing a correlations matrix between power style and locus of control for males and females independently. The size of the difference between males and females on these variables was then analyzed using the z test for two independent correlation coefficients.

There was no statistically significant difference in the size of the relationship between locus of control and power style between male and female academic deans (see Table 6). The null hypothesis was retained.

Table 6
Fisher's z Values for Locus of Control and Power Style for Male vs. Female Deans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POWER STYLE</th>
<th>Fisher's z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coercive</td>
<td>.27 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection</td>
<td>.03 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>.80 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>.66 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate</td>
<td>.20 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referent</td>
<td>.39 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>.29 NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS = Not Significant

Null hypothesis 5 states there is no significant difference in the size of the relationship between locus of control and perceived power style between older and younger selected academic deans. As with hypothesis 4, a correlations matrix was first computed using the variables of locus of control, power style, and "older" versus "younger". The Fisher's z test for two independent correlation coefficients was then used to compute the
significance of the size of the difference between these variables.

There was no statistically significant difference in the size of the relationship between locus of control and power style between older and younger academic deans in the study (see Table 7). Although a close relationship was found to exist between expert power and older versus younger academic deans, it did not prove to be significant. The null hypothesis was retained.

Table 7
Fisher's z Values for Locus of Control and Power Style for Older vs. Younger Deans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POWER STYLE</th>
<th>Fisher's z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coercive</td>
<td>.10 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection</td>
<td>1.17 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>1.89 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>.02 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate</td>
<td>.98 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referent</td>
<td>.08 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>.12 NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS = Not Significant

Null hypothesis 6 stated that there is no significant relationship between academic discipline in selected academic deans and their perceived power style. Data were analyzed using the Pearson Chi Square. An attempt to run the chi square analysis using all eight Biglan categories for each power style resulted in a three by eight matrix with a range of 25.0% to 33.3% of the cells with expected frequencies less than five. A rate of over 20.0% threatens the validity of the analysis (Norusis, 1991).
As a result, Biglan's eight categories of academic discipline were divided into 3 subsets of two categories each: "hard" vs. "soft", "life" vs. "nonlife", and "pure" vs. "applied". The academic undergraduate major of participants was categorized into each of three subsets and a chi square analysis was run on each of the three subsets for each of the seven power styles.

A significant positive relationship was found to exist between the expert power style and academic discipline in the "soft" versus "hard" and "life" versus "nonlife" Biglan subsets but not in the "pure" versus "applied" subset. For "hard" versus "soft" academic disciplines, more "soft" disciplined deans had low scores on expert power than did those deans in "hard" disciplines.

For "life" versus "nonlife" disciplines, more deans in "life" disciplines had low scores on expert power than did those deans in "nonlife" disciplines. The chi square values for the Power Perception Profile-Self categories of coercive, connection, information, legitimate, referent, and reward power styles did not exceed the critical value of 5.09 thus, the null hypothesis was retained. For these power styles no significant relationship was found to exist in relation to academic discipline. In like manner, resulting data is displayed in tables 8, 9, and 10.
### Table 8
**Chi Square Values for Academic Discipline and Power Style (Soft vs. Hard)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POWER STYLE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coercive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.68 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.63 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.74 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.55 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.22 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.29 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.42 NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p ≤ .05
NS = Not Significant

### Table 9
**Chi Square Values for Academic Discipline and Power Style (Life vs. Nonlife)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POWER STYLE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coercive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.88 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.71 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.03 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.28 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.31 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.81 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.63 NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p ≤ .05
NS = Not Significant

### Table 10
**Chi Square Values for Academic Discipline and Power Style (Pure vs. Applied)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POWER STYLE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coercive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.02 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.48 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.17 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.72 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.43 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.11 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.99 NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS = Not Significant
Null hypothesis 7 stated that there is no significant relationship between academic discipline in selected academic deans and their locus of control orientation. As with hypothesis 6, Biglan subsets were used in the analysis of hypothesis 7. Data were analyzed using the Pearson Chi Square. For each of the three subsets, the chi square value failed to exceed the critical value of 3.84. The null was retained.

Table 11
Chi Square Values for Academic Discipline and Locus of Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hard vs. Soft</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.79 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life vs. Nonlife</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure vs. Applied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.17 NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS= Not Significant

Summary of the Findings

Findings Related to Research Question 1

Although it would appear logical that a psychological characteristic such as locus of control would impact upon the selection and use of power style, the statistical analysis in this study did not support this assumption. No relationship was found between locus of control orientation of academic deans and their preferred choice of power styles. A greater percentage of the respondents was found to be internally oriented. Independent of this orientation, the three most preferred power styles as defined by Hersey,
Blanchard, and Natemeyer (1979) were expert, legitimate, and reward. Of the seven Pearson Chi Square analyses computed on the relationship between power style and locus of control, none was statistically significant.

Findings Related to Research Question 2

Research question 2 examined the impact of years of experience in the deanship upon preferred power style. A statistically significant relationship was found to exist between years of experience in the deanship and the selection and use of "connection" power. A larger proportion of deans who had the least experience rated themselves high on connection power. Years of experience ranged from 0 to 30. Forty-four percent of deans with between 12-30 years of experience rated themselves low on their use of connection power. Forty-seven percent of deans with between 0-3 years of experience rated themselves high on their use of connection power.

Findings Related to Research Question 3

No statistically significant relationship was found as the result of the Pearson Chi Square analysis of years of experience in the deanship and locus of control orientation. Both internally and externally oriented deans were evenly distributed throughout the four categories representing years of experience. Years of experience did not impact upon the locus of control orientation of academic deans.
Findings Related to Research Question 4

No statistically significant relationships were found between gender and locus of control orientation and power style preference. Female deans were no more likely to be external in their locus of control orientation than were male deans. Female and male deans were found to be similar in their preferences for expert, legitimate, and reward power styles. Female respondents were slightly more likely than males to prefer expert, legitimate, and referent power styles. Male deans were slightly more likely than female deans to select coercive and information power styles. These differences were slight, and, overall, no significant difference was found in the size of the relationship between these factors for male and female academic deans.

Findings Related to Research Question 5

Null hypothesis 5 stated there is no significant difference in the size of the relationship between locus of control and perceived power style between older and younger academic deans. Although no statistically significant difference was found, younger deans were slightly more likely than older deans to prefer coercive and information power. Older deans were more likely than younger deans to prefer referent and reward power styles.
Findings Related to Research Question 6

Null hypothesis 6 examined the relationship between academic discipline and perceived power style. Pearson Chi Square analyses generated mixed results. The underlying assumption that persons within similar academic disciplines would be prone to prefer certain power styles over others was found to be true for deans with undergraduate majors in "hard" disciplines for the expert power style. Disciplines classified as "hard" by Biglan include the physical sciences and engineering.

A statistically significant relationship was found between deans in undergraduate majors classified as "life" versus "nonlife" for the expert power style. Deans in nonlife disciplines scored higher on the expert power style than did deans in life disciplines. Disciplines categorized as "nonlife" include astronomy, chemistry, geology, math, physics, and engineering.

Findings Related to Research Question 7

The distribution of internally versus externally oriented deans between hard versus soft, life versus nonlife, and pure versus applied academic disciplines was not found to be significant. A higher percentage of externally oriented deans was found to have undergraduate disciplines classified as soft, nonlife, pure. Of internally oriented academic deans, a greater percentage was
found to have undergraduate majors classified as hard, life, applied.
Chapter 5
Conclusions and Recommendations

Introduction

Seven research questions were proposed and examined in this study. Conclusions drawn from the major findings related to these questions will be presented in this chapter along with recommendations for further research on power styles and locus of control.

Summary

Throughout the past four decades, social scientists have maintained interest in the phenomenon of locus of control (Rotter, 1990). Within the previous decade, the concepts of authority and self-efficacy were popularized and reidentified as personal power with a movement to overcome previous negative connotations of the term. Our society's preoccupation with these concepts continues (Podsakoff & Schriesheim, 1985).

It has been argued that, due to our culture with its notions of what is appropriate behavior for women and for men; females are more apt to be external in their locus of control orientation than are males (De Brabander & Boone, 1989). Popular notions lead us to believe that women and men will naturally differ in the types of power styles they feel comfort in using.
It has also been argued that locus of control is a relatively fixed personality trait, but one that may be modified, albeit, not with ease (Phares, 1976). An effort to explore the possible relationship between locus of control, preferred power style, age, academic discipline, years of experience, and gender was the purpose of this study.

The design of this study was descriptive using survey methodology. Instruments selected for use were the Power Perception Profile-Perception of Self by Hersey, Blanchard, and Natemeyer (1979); the Internal/External Locus of Control Scale by Rotter (1966); and a demographic survey. The population was comprised of 480 academic deans within the 15 Southern Region Education Board states. One hundred and nine Carnegie Classification I schools were surveyed.

A total of 282 (58%) usable responses was attained. Variables examined were internal versus external locus of control; the seven power styles: coercive, connection, expert, information, legitimate, referent, and reward; and gender age, years of experience, and academic discipline.

Data derived from these surveys were analyzed using the chi square goodness of fit test, the Pearson Chi Square, Pearson $r$ correlations and the Fisher's $z$. The statistical analysis of the data was intended to determine the extent of the relationship between the variables. The level of statistical significance was set at alpha = .05
Conclusions

Seven null hypotheses were researched and analyzed in this study. Conclusions drawn from the major findings related to these seven research questions will be presented in this section.

1. No evidence was generated through statistical analysis of Rotter Scale scores and Power Perception Profile-Perception of Self scores to support a relationship between the two variables of locus of control and preferred power style.

According to Rotter (1975) three major determinants contribute to predicting behavior based upon locus of control orientation: (1) expectancy, (2) value of the reinforcement to the individual and (3) the psychological situation. Some measure of a specific generalized expectancy allows for greater prediction of behavior in a given situation (Rotter, 1975).

Since the present study was one that attempted to show a relationship between locus of control and social action (in the form of power style preference) control of reinforcement value was not practical or achievable. Although internal versus external control may play a role in impacting an individual's behavior, other influencing factors exist, i.e., motivation, individual values, life experience.
Results of this study supported the importance of these other influencing variables. Attaining the position of academic dean was a life achievement reached by both internally and externally oriented individuals. Rotter (1975) warned against attributing only positive characteristics to internals and negative characteristics to externals. Results of this study supported this conclusion.

Independent of their locus of control orientation, individuals achieving the role of academic dean were remarkably similar in their selection of preferred power style when attempting to influence their subordinates.

2. As defined by Hersey, Blanchard, and Natemeyer (1979), a leader scoring high in connection power induces compliance from others who seek to gain the favor of, or avoid the disfavor of, an influential "connection" of that individual.

Commonplace experience tells us that the more seasoned individuals are in a position, the more connections they will tend to have. Logically, it would follow that connection power would be more readily used by the most experienced deans in the study. However, this was not the case. Of the 74 deans with zero to three years of experience, 47% achieved a score between 8 and 18 on the connection power choice profile. Of the 68 deans with years of experience ranging from 12 to 30 years, 23% achieved a score between 8 and 18.
The higher scores of the less experienced deans reflected their more frequent choice and usage of connection power as a preferred power style. It may be concluded that less experienced deans call upon their influential connections more frequently than do more experienced deans when attempting to influence others.

3. No significant relationship was found to exist between years of experience in the deanship and locus of control orientation. These results further supported the picture presented by Rotter (1975) of locus of control as a predictor of behavior susceptible to influence by other forces within the individual (individual differences) and within the individual's environment (situational parameters). These results are also reflective of the relative stability of locus of control as a personality variable.

4. No significant relationship was found to exist between locus of control and power style preference and gender. These results are in conflict with the popular notion of masculine and feminine attributes as exclusive to their respective sexes. Female deans were as likely as male deans to include in their behavioral repertoires those behaviors which increase leadership effectiveness, such as use of the expert and referent power styles, independent of their locus of control orientation, and societal expectations of their mode of behavior.
5. No evidence was generated to support a relationship between locus of control and power style preference and age. Based upon the work of Havighurst (1952) the ages of the deans were divided into two categories (Older versus Younger) with "younger" equating to 55 and below and "older" equating to 56 and above.

Since locus of control is a relatively fixed personality variable, it is not surprising to find that age appears to have little impact upon it. In regard to power style, younger deans were found to use the coercive and information power styles more frequently than older deans. Older deans were more likely than younger deans to use referent and reward power. The difference, although not statistically significant, may be due less to younger deans preference for coercive power and information power but more to their relative inability to garner the resources (both personal and external) to bestow rewards and/or time to have gained the respect inherent in referent power.

Inherent in younger deans' more frequent use of coercive power is an irony. The use of coercion results in dislike of the power wielder by the person affected, causing a negative halo effect that impacts the power wielder's ability to use referent or informational power (Raven & Rubin, 1983). Younger deans may not have had the time to have discovered the long term ineffectiveness of coercive power. As the older deans seemed to have realized, referent
power is enhanced through the use of reward power (Raven & Rubin, 1983).

6. Again, it would appear logical to assume that an individual's choice of academic discipline would relate to patterns of behavior when attempting to influence others. A statistically significant positive relationship was found to exist between deans whose academic disciplines were categorized as "hard, nonlife" (Biglan, 1973a, 1973b & Drees, 1982) and use of the expert power style.

This relationship may be attributed to the nature of the fields classified as "hard, nonlife". These include astronomy, chemistry, geology, math, physics, and engineering. Differences in the perceived influence of chairpersons between departments of biology and of English have been documented (Hayward, 1986).

The more prevalent use of expert power for individuals in these disciplines may be attributed to the following qualities of these disciplines: (1) the degree to which a paradigm exists (hard versus soft) and (2) the degree of concern with life systems (life versus nonlife). These qualities lend themselves to a dogma more conducive to the use of expert power which is based upon possession of expertise, skill and knowledge.

7. No significant relationship was found between locus of control and academic discipline. The concept of locus of control deals with both individual differences and
situational parameters (Rotter, 1975). Although a higher percentage of externally oriented deans was found to have undergraduate majors classified as "soft, nonlife, pure", the relationship was not statistically significant. These results are indicative of the independence of academic discipline to a personality variable (internal versus external control of reinforcement). The manner in which an individual determines causality has no significant impact upon the selection of an academic field.

Recommendations

Based on the conclusions cited in this chapter, the following recommendations are made for further research on the concepts of locus of control and power style preference:

1. Further study needs to focus on discovering the forces that helped to shape both internally and externally oriented deans in their common preference for use of three of the most effective power styles when attempting to influence subordinates. Independent of their locus of control orientation, responding deans shared preferences for modes of persuasion that ultimately lead them to success in their fields. Examining those situational parameters and experiences would be of importance in furthering the work begun by this research.

2. Further study using other forms of instrumentation and methodology would be advised to verify the validity of the findings. It would be of interest to examine these
variables altering the classification of institution and region of the country.

3. Further efforts should be made to examine subordinate's perceptions of power style use by the population under study. Discrepancies between self-perceptions of power style usage and others' perceptions may prove enlightening.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A
Institutions Surveyed by State

ALABAMA
Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical University
Alabama State University
Auburn University at Montgomery
Jacksonville State University
Troy State University
University of Alabama in Huntsville
University of North Alabama
University of South Alabama

ARKANSAS
Arkansas State University
Arkansas Tech University
Henderson State University
University of Arkansas at Little Rock
University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff
University of Central Arkansas

FLORIDA
Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University
Florida International University
University of Central Florida
University of North Florida
University of West Florida

GEORGIA
Armstrong State College
Augusta College
Columbus College
Georgia College
Georgia Southern University
Kennesaw State College
Valdosta State College
West Georgia College

KENTUCKY
Eastern Kentucky University
Morehead State University
Murray State University
Northern Kentucky University
Western Kentucky University

LOUISIANA
Grambling State University
Louisiana State University in Shreveport
McNeese State University
Nicholls State University
Northeast Louisiana University
Northwestern State University
Southeastern Louisiana University
Southern University and Agricultural and Mechanical College at Baton Rouge
Southern University at New Orleans
University of Southwestern Louisiana

MARYLAND
Morgan State University
Frostburg State University
Salisbury State University
Towson State University
University of Baltimore

MISSISSIPPI
Delta State University
Jackson State University

NORTH CAROLINA
Appalachian State University
East Carolina University
Fayetteville State University
North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University
North Carolina Central University
University of North Carolina at Asheville
University of North Carolina at Charlotte
University of North Carolina at Wilmington
Western Carolina University

OKLAHOMA
Cameron University
Central State University
East Central University
Northeastern State University
Southeastern Oklahoma State University
Southwestern Oklahoma State University

SOUTH CAROLINA
The Citadel, The Military College of South Carolina
College of Charleston
Francis Marion College
South Carolina State College
University of South Carolina-Coastal Carolina
University of South Carolina-Spartanburg
Winthrop College

TENNESSEE
Austin Peay State University
East Tennessee State University
Tennessee State University
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
University of Tennessee at Martin
TEXAS
Angelo State University
Lamar University-Beaumont
Midwestern State University
Sam Houston State University
Southwest Texas State University
Stephen F. Austin State University
Corpus Christi State University
Prairie View A & M University
Tarleton State University
Texas A & I University
Texas Southern University
University of Houston - Clear Lake
University of Houston - Downtown
University of Texas at El Paso
University of Texas at San Antonio
University of Texas at Tyler
University of Texas - Pan American
West Texas State University

VIRGINIA
Christopher Newport College
George Mason University
James Madison University
Longwood College
Mary Washington College
Norfolk State University
Radford University
Virginia State University

WEST VIRGINIA
Bluefield State College
Fairmont State College
Shepherd College
West Liberty State College
West Virginia Institute of Technology
West Virginia State College
Marshall University
SREB Board States

- Alabama
- Arkansas
- Florida
- Georgia
- Kentucky
- Louisiana
- Maryland
- Mississippi
- North Carolina
- Oklahoma
- South Carolina
- Tennessee
- Texas
- Virginia
- West Virginia
**POWER PERCEPTION PROFILE**

**PERCEPTION OF SELF**

*Developed by Paul Hersey and Walter E. Reameyer*

**Instructions for completing this instrument**

- Listed below are 21 pairs of reasons often given by people when they are asked why they do the things the leader suggests or wants them to do.

- Allocate 3 points between two alternative choices in each pair. Base your point allocation on your judgement of each alternative's relative importance as a reason for others' compliance to you.

- Allocate the points between the first item and the second item based on perceived importance as shown in the examples below, making sure that the numbers assigned to each pair add up to 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 A</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>2 C</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>1 E</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>0 G</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>2 F</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>3 A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Others respond to my leadership attempts because:

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I can administer sanctions and punishment to those who do not cooperate with me.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>They realize that I have connections with influential and important persons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>They respect my understanding, knowledge, judgment and experience.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I possess or have access to information that is valuable to others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>My position in the organization provides me with the authority to direct their work activities.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>They like me personally and want to do things that will please me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>I can provide rewards and support to those who cooperate with me.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I can administer sanctions and punishment to those who do not cooperate with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>They realize that I have connections with influential and important persons.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>They respect my understanding, knowledge, judgment, and experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I possess or have access to information that is valuable to others.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>My position in the organization provides me with the authority to direct their work activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>They like me personally and want to do things that will please me.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>I can provide rewards and support to those who cooperate with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I can administer sanctions and punishment to those who do not cooperate with me.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>They respect my understanding, knowledge, judgment, and experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>They realize that I have connections with influential and important persons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I possess or have access to information that is valuable to others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>They respect my understanding, knowledge, judgment, and experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>My position in the organization provides me with the authority to direct their work activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I possess or have access to information that is valuable to others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I can administer sanctions and punishment to those who do not cooperate with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>My position in the organization provides me with the authority to direct their work activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>They realize that I have connections with influential and important persons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>They like me personally and want to do things that will please me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>They respect my understanding, knowledge, judgment, and experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>I can provide rewards and support to those who cooperate with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>They realize that I have connections with influential and important persons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I can administer sanctions and punishment to those who do not cooperate with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>My position in the organization provides me with the authority to direct their work activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>They realize that I have connections with influential and important persons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>They like me personally and want to do things that will please me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>They respect my understanding, knowledge, judgment, and experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>I can provide rewards and support to those who cooperate with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I possess or have access to information that is valuable to others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>They like me personally and want to do things that will please me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>My position in the organization provides me with the authority to direct their work activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>I can provide rewards and support to those who cooperate with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>They like me personally and want to do things that will please me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I can administer sanctions and punishment to those who do not cooperate with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>I can provide rewards and support to those who cooperate with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I possess or have access to information that is valuable to others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Directions:

This is a questionnaire to find out the way in which certain important events in our society affect different people. Each item consists of a pair of alternatives lettered a or b. Please circle the one statement of each pair (and only one) which you more strongly believe to be more true rather than the one you think you should choose or the one you would like to be true. This is a measure of personal belief: Obviously there are no right or wrong answers.

Please answer these items carefully but do not spend too much time on any one item. Be sure to find an answer for every choice. In some instances you may discover that you believe both statements or neither one. In such cases, be sure to select the one you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you're concerned. Also, try to respond to each item independently when making your choice; do not be influenced by your previous choices.

1. a. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.
   b. The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them.

2. a. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
   b. People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.

3. a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.
   b. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.

4. a. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.
   b. Unfortunately, an individual's worth passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.

5. a. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.
   b. Most students don't realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.
6. a. Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.
b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.

7. a. No matter how hard you try some people just don't like you.
b. People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.

8. a. Heredity plays the major role in determining one's personality.
b. It is one's experiences in life which determine what they're like.

9. a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
b. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.

10. a. In the case of the well prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.
b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.

11. a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.

12. a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.
b. This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.

13. a. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.

14. a. There are certain people who are just no good.
b. There is some good in everybody.

15. a. In my case, getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.
16. a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability, luck has little or nothing to do with it.

17. a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand, nor control.
b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs the people can control world events.

18. a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
b. There really is no such thing as "luck".

19. a. One should always be willing to admit mistakes.
b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.

20. a. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.
b. How many friends you have depends upon how nice a person you are.

21. a. In the long run, the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.
b. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.

22. a. With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.
b. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.

23. a. Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.
b. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.

24. a. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.
b. A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are.

25. a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.

26. a. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.
b. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you.
27.  
a. There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.  
b. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.

28.  
a. What happens to me is my own doing.  
b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.

29.  
a. Most of the time I can't understand why politicians behave the way they do.  
b. In the long run the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as on a local level.
APPENDIX E
DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY
OF THE
ACADEMIC DEANSHIP

1. Please mark the appropriate age category according to your last birthday: (please circle)
   1. 56 and older
   2. 55 and younger

2. What is your gender? (please circle)
   1. Male
   2. Female

3. How many years have you been in the deanship? (please check)
   1. Less than one year
   2. Number of years

4. How many years have you been in the deanship at your present institution? (please check)
   1. Less than one year
   2. Number of years

4. Please circle your undergraduate academic discipline:

   Accounting  Engineering, other  Nursing
   Agricultural Econ.  Engineering Tech.  Philosophy
   Agronomy  English  Physical Education
   Allied Health  Entomology  Physical Sciences
   Anthropology  Environmental Health  Physics
   Art  Environmental Sci.  Physiology
   Astronomy  Finance  Political Science
   Biology  Foreign Language  Psychology
   Biological Sciences  Geography  Science
   Botany  Geology  Secon. & Contd. Ed.
   Business Admin.  Health Education  Social Work
   Ceramic Engineering  History  Sociology
   Chemistry  Home Economics  Special Education
   Civil Engineering  Horticulture  Speech
   Communications  Humanities  Speech & Hearing
   Computer Science  Management Science  Statistics
   Economics  Math  Zoology
   Educ. Admin. & Supv.  Mechanical Engr.  Other
   Electrical Engr.  Microbiology
   Elementary Educ.  Music

5. Would you like a copy of the study results? yes no (please circle)

6. Would you like a copy of your individual survey results? yes no (please circle)
January 22, 1992

Dr. John Doe  
Academic Dean  
State University, USA  
100 Main Street  
Anyplace, USA 00000

Dear Dr. Doe,

The need for a thorough understanding of the dynamics and psychology of power is, perhaps, greater today than at any other period of human history. In spite of this, the concept of power, in education, has not received the attention it would seemingly warrant as an area of fundamental social interest. Due to role responsibilities frequently exceeding position authority, academic deans often rely upon their abilities of influence and persuasion in their efforts to accomplish departmental goals. Feelings of personal causation impact upon an individual's ability to successfully use a variety of power styles. Thus, the study of individual differences continues to be of central importance to researchers.

As a doctoral candidate at East Tennessee State University, I would appreciate your participation in my research. You are one of 480 academic deans (within Carnegie Classification II, comprehensive institutions) in the Southern region to be asked to participate in dissertation research examining the relationship between locus of control (an individual personality trait) and power style preference. Enclosed you will find two instruments and a demographic survey. These instruments may be completed in less than twenty minutes.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality. The surveys have an identification number for follow-up purposes only. This is so your name may be checked off of the mailing list when your surveys are returned. In addition, I will gladly mail to you your individual scores as well as the results of the study upon request. Simply circle "yes" on the final item of the demographic survey.

I would be most happy to answer any questions you might have. Please write or call. The telephone number is (615) 929-XXXX.

Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,

Carla E. Warner  
Doctoral Student
February 14, 1992

Dr. John Doe  
Academic Dean  
State University, USA  
100 Main Street  
Anyplace, USA 00000

Dear Dr. Doe,

Dissertation research is underway involving, you, as one of the 480 academic deans (within Carnegie Classification II, comprehensive institutions) in the Southern region. On January 22, 1992, two surveys and a demographic sheet were mailed to you requesting your participation in my doctoral dissertation research.

Dr. Doe, my response rate is encouraging, but your input is needed. If you have already completed and returned them, please accept my sincere thanks. If not, I have enclosed another set of instruments along with a return mail envelope for your convenience. I would appreciate your taking the time to respond by February 28th.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality. At your request, I will gladly mail to you the results of the study as well as your individual scores. To do this, simply circle "yes" on the final two items of the demographic survey.

I would be most happy to answer any questions you might have. Please write or call, my office telephone number is (615) 929-XXXX.

Thank you for your participation and support in my endeavor!

Sincerely,

Carla E. Warner  
Doctoral Candidate
VITA

Carla Elizabeth Rahn Warner

Personal Data:  
Date of Birth: May 18, 1953  
Marital Status: Married

Education:  
B.A. in English  
Western Illinois University; 1976

M.A. in Adult and Continuing Education  
University of Nebraska-Lincoln; 1980

Ed.D. in Higher Education Administration  
East Tennessee State University; 1992

Professional Experience:  
Counselor/Student Support Services  
East Tennessee State University  
Johnson City, TN, 1986-present

Interim Counselor/Counseling Center  
East Tennessee State University  
Johnson City, TN, 1985-1986

Counselor/Educational Opportunity Center  
Louisville, KY, 1984-1985

Project Director/ NHSCVO  
Louisville, KY, 1982-1984

Coordinator of Health Services/  
Council for the Aging and Aged  
New Albany, IN, 1980-1982

English Teacher/Norris High School  
Lincoln, NE, 1976-1980

Professional Activities:

Co-Editor of the ETSU Phi Delta Kappa  
Chapter "Kappan" newsletter.

Member of the Appalachian Educational  
Opportunity Center Advisory Board.

1991 Howard M. Soule Graduate Fellowship  
in Educational Leadership from Phi Delta  
Kappa

Member Phi Delta Kappa

Member Kappa Delta Phi