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The purpose of this study is to enrich the understanding of the power construct. The result is the IPAC Model of Power.

We are affected greatly by power, and often do not understand what power is, how it is used, and its many other facets. Power and communication are interrelated, but how they relate to each other has been hard to understand. The model presented in this thesis explicates the relationship between the two critical variables.

Power is portrayed as a hierarchical structure that is based on influence (communication) where the intensity and likelihood of success of power attempts increase as the level of power increases. The hierarchical structure has four levels, including influence at its base, and prominence, authority and control at the higher levels.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

"Nearly all men can stand adversity, but if you want to test a man's character, give him power."

- Abraham Lincoln

Power is considered by many people to be a negative term, and a term that many people do not want to discuss. Power is a concept that every person must deal with, however, both in the relationships we maintain, and in every other aspect of our life. With the impact power has on our lives, it is important that we understand power, including how it affects us, and how we use it.

Statement of Purpose

Power has been a popular area of study since the 1950s. This attention and research have confused the concept in many respects. In this thesis, many of these problems will be clarified. Four major problems have developed in the research on power. They are:

1. The use of the word power and other power related words interchangeably causes confusion and difficulty in discussing and researching the power concept;
2. The difficulty in defining power;
3. The number and diversity of taxonomies concerning bases of power,
4. The failure of many researchers to recognize or to show the relationship between power and communication.

Solutions to these problems will be accomplished by introducing a model of power that will solve many problems previously confronted by researchers.

History of Power Thought and Research

The writings on power can be traced back to Plato (427 - 347 B.C.), and Aristotle (384 - 322 B.C.) (King, 1987). The early writings on power focused on the use of power by government and the military. Plato's Republic had Thrasymachus argue that "the interest of the stronger" was a phrase that described the primary goal of every government. Government was also believed to be an invention of the strong in order to oppress the weak. The use of government to oppress the weak was justified because there was no such thing as a sense of higher public good. Plato believed oppression could be accomplished through the monopoly of intelligence, education, or information (Grube, 1970).

Marcus Cicero (106 - 43 B.C.) rose to power in Rome through a network of social exchanges. He would do favors for other people who might be useful to him, and then call in the favors when they were advantageous to him (Bailey, 1971). This gave a different twist to power thought, but did not change the general thinking about power.
Two other examples of this line of reasoning are present in Machiavelli's *The Prince* (1518), and Thomas Hobbes' *Leviathan* (1651). Machiavelli wrote *The Prince* as a manual for rulers who wished to gain and maintain power. He conceptualized power as social manipulation and as the overt use of fear by rulers. He established five guides for establishing and maintaining power.

1. The one in power should use violence sparingly, but promptly. When violence is used, it must be sudden, overwhelming, and relentless.

2. Set your enemies against one another.

3. A prudent ruler does not have to keep the faith when to do so would be to his disadvantage.

4. Be a dissembler. It is necessary to disguise one's conduct, because people only notice the surface of things, not the depth.

5. People are driven by love, hate and fear. Love only moves a few, hate tends to bring them against you, but fear is the best. Let your friends, enemies, and potential allies live in fear of you (Machiavelli, 1518).

Hobbes believed that the best possible society was one in which absolute power was vested in a single person. He argued that in order to consolidate its power, the monarchy must control the culture, laws and language of the governed.
Much of this early work was based on conflict theory, where the person with the most power was the one who won the conflict (King, 1987). The concept of "might makes right" was a commonly held belief. Callicles, a wealthy 4th century Athenian citizen, portrayed the typical thinking about power until the twentieth century. He maintained that power was the greatest gift to humankind. He believed that the highest attainment of the individual was the ability to terrify and dominate others (King, 1987). Most of the writings on power (including Plato, Machiavelli, Russell and Hobbes) focused on the powerful oppressing the weak.

Aristotle classified governments according to their locus of power within the communities as either a monarchy, oligarchy, or a democracy. In a monarchy, power is found in a single person, while in an oligarchy, power is found in a ruling class or aristocracy. Finally, in a democracy, power is spread equally among the citizens (King, 1987).

Early in the twentieth century, social psychologists began taking a behavioral approach to the study of power, examining the behavior of persons within institutions as the basis for conceptualizing power theory. The connotation of force and coercion began to disappear from the research (Jacobson, 1972).

Barnard (1938) studied the use of power within organizations. He made the original distinction between the power of position and the power of leadership. He pointed
out that the success of any attempt to use power may depend upon the position a person occupies (power of position), or upon the person's ability independent of the position (power of leadership).

Another milestone in the development of the social power concept was Weber's (1947) classic formation of power, authority, and legitimacy in large social and economic organizations. He proposed a taxonomy rather than a formal theory based upon an organization's hierarchy and structure. He emphasized status, position and control in organizational structures as the variables of power.

In the 1950s, studies investigating power increased in number and scope. These studies concentrated on more than the definitional aspects of power. More studies on the acquisition and exercise of power were being completed (Jacobson, 1972). Cartwright (1959) edited a book entitled *Studies in Social Power* that combined several important works on power completed in the 1950s. Since that time the interest in power has increased, and many articles have been written on the use and extent of power.

**Research Question**

With all the confusion created in the research on power, some structure needs to be established. With that thought in mind, the following research question is presented.
Can a model of power be developed that would give a more structured and explanatory view of the concept called "power"?

Criteria for Higher-order Systems

Earlier in the chapter, four problems with present thoughts on power were discussed. Wheeless, Barraclough & Stewart (1983) called for a higher order system that gives a better understanding of the power concept. Any higher-order system of power must meet certain criteria in order to be acceptable. The following criteria was established for this research to develop guidelines for the higher-order system presented in this text and any other higher-order system presented in the future. Any higher-order system must:

1. be more than just another taxonomy,
2. be able to conceptualize all previous and future taxonomies into a conceptual framework,
3. be able to explain power in a relational context,
4. show some interrelatedness between categories and types of power,
5. show the relationship between power and communication,
6. provide a complete definitional framework of power.
Significance of Study

The confusion and misconceptions that have arisen over power have made it difficult to compare many studies because of their terminology use. Two different studies might be studying power, but use different terminology, which makes them hard to compare. The use of different terminologies interchangeably within the same writing sometimes makes it difficult to compare findings within the same study. This thesis will attempt to provide a framework that could eliminate this confusion. Not only will the IPAC Model help with these general problems, but it will also help in the areas of power and communication research, interpersonal power research, and organizational power research.

Power and Communication

An undeniable link between power and communication exists. Many researchers write about it, and it is often alluded to, but seldom is it explained. Most of the research that deals with the relationship between power and communication deals with how powerful people and powerless people communicate. This is important in its own way, and will be discussed, but there is a more dynamic and subtle relationship between the two concepts.

The more subtle relationship that exists between power and communication is the important attribute to be discussed here. These two concepts are so intertwined that one should not be studied without also studying the other. The primary
argument of this thesis is that the very basis of power is communication, and without communication there would be no power.

People communicate differently depending on the power relationship that exists. A framework for this power relationship (who has more or less power) and how it affects communication has not been described in the literature, other than from a structural perspective. By establishing this framework, a person would be better able to choose a type or style of communication that would work in acquiring, maintaining and exercising power. This framework would also help researchers predict what level of power a person is using, based upon their type of communication.

**Interpersonal or Social Power**

The ideas of powerlessness, balance of power and empowerment has received much attention in the last few years (Berger, 1985). By showing that no one is powerless, how power can be balanced, or shared, and how people can be empowered, this model lays a groundwork for power research. It can also be used as an instructive tool for individuals exercising power by showing them how power is built, maintained, exercised, and how their power can be undermined.

**Organizational Power**

The same premise that applies to interpersonal power also applies to organizational power. Much of the thought
on organizational power is based upon the structural aspect, sometimes called legitimate power or authority. There is more to the use of legitimate power or authority in organizations than just exercising the power that the person holds because of the position held within the structure of the organization. This explains why some managers succeed, and some fail in their attempt to use authority.

Legitimate power or authority is not the only power present in organizations. People without this structural power are not powerless, and sometimes wield a great deal of power within the organization. This has been explained using the bases of power discussed in Chapter 2, but the IPAC Model will provide a more substantive grounding in how those with no structural power can acquire power within the organization. The emphasis of the IPAC Model is on communication and influence. Thus anyone in an organization that can influence others has power. By showing how power is acquired and the subsequent levels, this model also provides encouragement to those without power by demonstrating how they can gain power over themselves and others.

Scope of the Study

There are many approaches to the study of power. In this thesis, there will be no attempt to study power from any particular communication, interpersonal, or organizational perspective. Within the framework of other
discussions, a certain perspective may be used, but the intent is not to limit this discussion to a single perspective. An overall system approach to the study of power will be employed.

Power affects us in many ways during our lifetime, and although many of these will be discussed, there are some that this study will spend almost no time on. The relationship between gender and power, and power and politics in organizations will only be discussed as it relates to concepts mentioned below. Attempts have been made by researchers to find ways of measuring power that one person has over another. This attempt has run into some stumbling blocks, and will be discussed in more detail later.

Communication is very important and the core postulate in the discussion of power. The rhetorical emphasis of powerful and powerless speech and the relationship between nonverbal communication and power, although interesting, does not contribute to the development or support of the model, so will only be discussed within the context of another discussion.

Plan of Organizing

In order to introduce the concept of power and to introduce some of the problems mentioned above, Chapter 2 will consist of an overview of power. Definition of the terms "power" and "communication" will be provided, as well
as a discussion of the relationship between power and social science; and power and communication. The preview will also discuss topics such as: why people want power, locus of control, powerlessness, empowerment, and the bases of power.

Chapter 2 will consist of a review of the literature, as it relates to interpersonal and organizational relationships. The section on interpersonal power will include such areas as: power and the family, power and friendship, power and dating, and the relationship between power and aggression. The section on organizational power will include intra organizational power and interorganizational power. Interorganizational power has received little attention in the literature, but involves the power relationship between an organization and a unit or subunit outside the organization. This discussion includes studies of governmental power and organizational power over consumers. Intra organizational power is the more popular concept and receives most of the attention in the research literature. Intra organizational power involves the power relationship between subunits within the same organization.

Chapter 4 introduces and discusses the IPAC Model of Power®. This chapter contains the answers to the problems introduced above, while Chapter 5 discusses circumventing the model (limitation), and implication for future research, along with a conclusion.
CHAPTER 2

OVERVIEW OF POWER

This chapter provides a review of the more general areas in power research, and provides a more in depth discussion of the problems within the power research mentioned in Chapter 1.

To many people, the term power, and many of those relating to power, conjures up images of corrupt politicians and wealthy dictators and despots who dominate the life of others (Wickham, 1987).

Whatever we think of power, it is something we must deal with constantly. "The fundamental concept in social science is Power, in the same sense as Energy is the fundamental concept in Physics." (Russell, 1938; p. 10).

The concepts of power and powerlessness are central elements in studies of societies and formal organizations (Conrad, 1983). Power is viewed as a core dynamic in social ordering and organizations. Neither are possible without power (Bierstedt, 1950). Power processes are inherent in all organized social life (Hawley, 1963).

Defining Power

Power, influence, persuasion, coercion, dominance, leadership, authority, control, status, prestige, rank, prominence, collaboration, problem solving and compliance-
gaining are all terms that relate to the power construct. Berger (1985), Cartwright (1959) and Schopler (1965) among others have noted the use of such terms as if they had the same meaning, causing confusion in the literature. These terms have all received a great deal of attention from social scientists and organizational behavioralists, and communication scholars (Berger, 1985; Farace, Monge, & Russell, 1977).

Even though power is a basic concept of life, it remains an elusive concept, and the subject of much controversy and debate (Frost, 1987). Power is a frequently used and often abused construct. This abuse stems from equating power with coercion, manipulation, leadership and authority. Power is seen paradoxically as static and dynamic, actual and potential, moral and immoral, intentional and unintentional (Putnam & Cheney, 1985). As Wheeless, Barraclough, and Stewart (1983) point out, power has been defined in many different ways. At times, authors even provide more than one definition of power within the same piece of work (Frost, 1987).

The definitions of power in the literature can be divided into seven categories. In order to show the diversity of definitions, and the confusion in defining power, the definitions have been divided into categories including a listing of definitions that fit within each category (Table 1 provides a list of definitions that will
be discussed below, and divides them up into the seven categories). The seven categories are: influence, dependence, control, fear, compliance, structure, and communication. Whatever else is done, a definition (or definition/model in this case) must bring some semblance of order to these definitions.

Influence

Definitions provided by such scholars as Weber (1947) and Donnelly, Gibson, and Ivancevich (1987) and others use the term influence in defining power. Influence can come in many forms and have many elements, but these researchers neglect to discuss this in any depth.

Influence implies a relationship, liking or attraction, or possibly even dependence. Influence also implies that there is a means of accomplishment, and this area is also neglected in discussions. For one person to influence another there must be some level of acquaintance between the participants. This relationship should be based on some level of liking, because if the person trying to be influenced dislikes the other, the likelihood of a successful attempt is small. The relationship may also be based on dependence, either for resources or self-esteem, and this increases the likelihood of a successful attempt.

Dependence

Emerson (1962) and Thibaut and Kelley (1968) both include the criteria of dependence for defining power. Like
Table 1

**Definition of Power in Literature**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Influence</strong></th>
<th>The ability of a person in any social relationship to influence others and to overcome resistance (Weber, 1947)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The ability to influence another person's behavior (Donnelly, et al., 1987).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependence</strong></td>
<td>The power of A over B is equal to the extent to which B is dependent on A (Emerson, 1962).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The extent that a person is dependent on another, then that person is potentially subject to the other person's power (Thibaut &amp; Kelley, 1968).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td>Power results from the access to and control over person's, information, and instrumentalities (Mechanic, 1962).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With power comes the ability to control behaviors, gain compliance, and often to change beliefs, opinions, and values (Burgoon &amp; Miller, 1990).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Force</strong></td>
<td>Power is any force that results in behavior that would not have occurred if the force had not been present (Mechanic, 1962).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compliance</strong></td>
<td>The ability of those who possess power to bring about the outcomes they desire (Salancik &amp; Pfeffer, 1977).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 1
Definition of Power in Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance (cont.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A relationship among social actors in which one social actor, A, can get another social actor, B, to do something that B would not otherwise have done (Dahl, 1957).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The capacity of an actor in that relationship to prevent the emergence, for discussion and decision making, of anything other than &quot;safe,&quot; uncontraversial issues (Bachrach &amp; Baratz, 1962).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power is the ability or capacity of A to produce (consciously or unconsciously) intended effects on the behavior or emotions of another person - B (Winter, 1973).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power is the ability to cause the behaviors of others; it is the ability to cause others to perform actions that they might not otherwise perform (Vecchio, 1988).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power develops also from a sociohistorical process in which the outcomes of contests and struggles among actors over the control and management of the work process become incorporated in systems of influence in the form of rules and interpretations of reality, which shape subsequent activities of actors (Clegg, 1981; Mintzberg, 1983; Ranson et al., 1980).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table 1
Definition of Power in Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A structural phenomenon created by the division of labor and departmentation that characterize the specific organization or set of organizations being investigated (Perrow, 1970). Power is a structural aspect of organization (Frost, 1987). Socially structured and culturally patterned behavior of groups and practices of institution (Lukes, 1974).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship power is a function of the meanings introduced into an exchange between actors (Edelman, 1977). The conscious negotiation and persuasion attempts made by actors attempting to gain outcomes they value (Frost, 1987).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

many of the other categories, dependence implies a relationship between the parties. This dependence must be communicated, such as in a question, and realized/perceived in order for both parties to be aware of it.

Control
Mechanic defined power as the access to and control over a person's information and instrumentalities (he does not define instrumentalities, but it is generally accepted to be ability to take actions). Mechanic defined information as knowledge, and as Francis Bacon stated
"Knowledge itself is power" (The Oxford Dictionary of Quotations, 1980, p. 28). Plato in the Republic identified knowledge as a scarce resource, and that it should be kept away from the majority. Thus controlling knowledge is an exercise of power.

Control over a person's instrumentalities is generally accomplished through communication by giving orders and directives. Mechanic does mention exchange as a variable affecting power, but does not explore directly the affect of communication on power.

Burgoon and Miller (1990) defined power as the ability to control behaviors, gain compliance, and often change beliefs, opinions, and values. They imply that changes in beliefs, opinions, and values occur through influence attempts, or a type of persuasion.

**Force**

Force is the oldest concept of power. As noted earlier, much of the early emphasis on power related to the military, and the government oppressing its subjects. Mechanic (1962) used the term force in one of his definitions of power. He stated that power is any force that results in an action that would not normally occur.

This concept of force can include a wide range of actions. Force can be physical, or in the form of a threat. The use of physical force is simply violent aggression, and generally introduces a foreign object (ie. fist, weapon, or
other object) into the relationship. Force could also be considered as a basis of power acquisition, but because of the fact that it is violent aggression, and is not present in a healthy relationship, it will not be considered in defining part or as a source of power. Violence/aggression will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 3, as it related to power and powerlessness.

Compliance

Most of the definitions of power have some element of compliance, or getting another person to act or perform behavior that would not otherwise be performed, as the powerholder wishes (Dahl, 1957; Bachrach & Baratz, 1960; Salancik & Pfeffer, 1977; Winter, 1983; Vecchio, 1988). The means of accomplishing this task is not discussed in these definitions. Another problem with these definitions is that they are very closely related to the definitions used in the literature on compliance gaining. Having power over another person involves more than just getting someone to perform an action, as is addressed in the definitions of Ranson, Hining, and Greenwood (1980), Clegg (1981), and Mintzberg (1983).

Structure

Researchers in organizational theory and organizational communication try to define power from a structural viewpoint. People have power over other people because of the position they hold within that hierarchical structure
(Perrow, 1970; Lukes, 1974; Frost, 1987). This is a very limited definition, and is not applicable to many of the other areas of power that other authors have defined, and is not generally applicable to most interpersonal and social relationships. These definitions also neglect to address the relationship between actors, and therefore neglect the communication aspect of power.

If we treat power relations as exclusively hierarchical, as these researchers are attempting, we overlook an entire class of relations between persons and groups (Wrong, 1968). Not all relationships are between individuals who have a superior/subordinate relationship. Many relationships are between people that are equals.

Communication

The relationship between power and communication will be discussed in more detail later in this chapter. In the section on defining communication, Schacter's (1951) definition of communication is mentioned (the mechanism by which power is exerted). This strongly shows that power is exerted by communication, and has a strong impact on the definition of power. Under this category we have two interesting definitions.

Edelman (1977) defined power as a function of the meanings introduced into an exchange between actors. Through exchange, or communication, and meanings introduced into the relationship, we help create reality (Scott, 1967),
and by creating or shaping a person's reality, we acquire power over them (Clegg, 1981; Mintzberg, 1983).

Frost (1987), in one of his definitions of power, used the terms negotiation and persuasion attempts in defining power. These are both communication acts, but if a person has power, then they are not just attempts, they become an actuality. The persuasion is successful, and the individual has exerted their power. Negotiation should not be considered an element or defining characteristic of power. Negotiation implies a lack of power, the sharing of power as in two individuals who have equal power, or the willingness to give up power. Power is important in negotiation, and power is involved in negotiations, but negotiation attempts should not be used to define power.

Just like the others mentioned here, these definitions are not incorrect, they are just lacking in certain areas. The definitions do not relate the role communication plays in the acquisition, maintenance, and exercise of power, or only explore sections of power (ie. dependence, compliance, influence, etc.).

Power may be difficult to define, but when asked who has power in an organization, people have little problem identifying those who have power (Pfeffer, 1981). Goldberg, Cavanaugh and Larson (1983) at the University of Denver, surveyed organizational members for their definitions of power. They then defined power using six dimensions
including: (1) instinctive drive, (2) personal charisma, (3) influence, (4) politics, (5) resource dependence, and (6) a good force (an exciting, desirable action).

Considering all these categories, it appears that power is a very complex phenomenon. As Dahl (1957) stated:

"If so many people at so many different times have felt the need to attach the label power, or something like it, to some Thing they believe they have observed, one is tempted to suppose that the Thing must exist; and not only exist, but exist in a form capable of being studied more or less systematically. . . A Thing to which people attach many labels with subtly or grossly different meanings in many different cultures and times is probably not a Thing at all but many Things" (p. 201).

This is why power is so difficult to define. It is not just one simple "Thing." Therefore, any definition must take into consideration this wide range of "things" which make up the "elixir" called power. Bierstadt (1950) noted that the more things a term could be applied to, the less precise its meaning. March (1966) described power as a tautology, in that it has been used to explain almost everything, including concepts, actions, and outcomes, that cannot be explained by other ideas. By looking at the many definitions of power, understanding these ideas is not hard.
These definitions are not incorrect, but they are very diverse. The definitions do, however, tend to have a common theme. The common theme among them is the capacity or potential for getting desired results in one or more other persons that would not otherwise occur (Wheeless, et. al., 1983). For this thesis and in the model (presented in chapter 4) the following definition will be used:

**Power is the ability or capacity of an individual in a relationship to produce (consciously or unconsciously) intended affects on the behavior, attitudes, beliefs, interpretation of reality, and/or emotions of another (dependent) person or persons in the relationship, through communication, and the ability to resist similar attempts of others.**

In order for power to be exerted, it must be through communication, and thus the contents of the communication must be understood by all parties involved. If actor A gives actor B instructions, and B misunderstands the instructions, then A did not produce the intended effect. Therefore, there must be communication as a means of exercising power, and there must be mutual understanding (see definition of communication, next section).

Notice in the definition that the terms ability or capacity was used. A person does not have to exert power in order to have power (Wrong, 1968). Oppenheim (1961)
distinguished between "having power" and "exercising power." A person can have power without using it or exercising it, but cannot exercise power without having power, although attempts may be made. Wrong (1968) makes a similar distinction between potential power (having) and actual power (exercising).

Another aspect of this definition that has become a stumbling block in attempting to define power is whether the exercise of power must be intentional, or if it can be unintentional. Dahl and Lindblom (1953) sharply distinguish between intentional, or what they call deliberate control, and unintentional, which they call "spontaneous field control." Wrong (1968) states that "The affects that others have on us, unintended by and even unknown to them, may influence us more profoundly and permanently than direct efforts to control our sentiments and behavior." (p. 676). The emphasis of deciding if someone has power should not be placed on the exerciser, but on the person being influenced, because that is the person who has the choice to accept or reject the attempt.

Kelley and Thibaut (1978) identified two "kinds of power." They identified fate control and behavior control. This provides a differentiation between the control of a single particular behavior (behavior control), and the control over many behaviors and a person's future (fate control). The definition provided for this study
encompasses both power over the fate of another person, and power over another person's behavior.

Another aspect of power that must be dealt with is the view that power is either a finite or an infinite resource. Hocker and Wilmot (1991) and King (1987) distinguish between the two views with simple statements. The finite view is POWER OVER OTHERS, where the total amount of power is finite and if A gains power, B must lose power, and vice versa. Infinite power is POWER WITH OTHERS, and not only contends that two individuals can both gain power without one losing power. The view that power is infinite also leaves us with some important assumptions about power. Hocker and Wilmot (1991) provide us with six assumptions that we can make about power.

1. Power is present in all social interactions.
2. Power is neither positive nor negative - Power just is.
3. Power is a product of the interpersonal relationship, not of the individual.
4. If one individual gains power, others do not necessarily lose it.
5. People attempt to balance power, either productively or destructively.
6. Productive power balancing can occur by expanding the sources or bases of power.
We have discussed the idea that power is present in all social interactions, and that power is a product of the relationship and not of the individual. The idea that power is negative comes from the history of power thought, emphasizing that power is used to oppress others. Although power can be used in that manner, it is not power that is negative, it is the use or misuse of power that can be negative (Hocker & Wilmot, 1991). The same is true about power being positive as in leadership. Power is neutral, it is the use of power that gives it the positive or negative connotation.

In ongoing relationships, an individual strives for a balancing of power with the other person (Hocker & Wilmot, 1991). This can be done in a manner that may destroy the relationship (i.e. manipulation, coercion, or force), or can be done productively by expanding the sources or bases of power. Power can be increased through acts of nurturing and cooperation, or it can be generated out of one's own beliefs and actions, and through individual reflections and decisions (King, 1987).

Defining Communication

Many definitions have been proposed for communication. Dance (1970) studied 95 definitions that were in the literature at that time. Dance divided the definitions into 15 different categories, ranging from symbols, to understanding, to process, to power. Schacter (1951)
defined communication as "the mechanism by which power is exerted" (p. 191). Shannon and Weaver (1949) defined communication as the way one mind influences another. These definitions, although interesting in relating communication and power, do not give us an operational definition of communication.

As Dance's (1970) indicated in his research and the definitions added since then, many definitions exist for communication. We will define communication using the convergence model definition. The convergence model of communication defines communication as:

- a process in which the participants create and share information with one another in order to reach a mutual understanding (Rogers & Kincaid, 1981, p. 63).

This definition is more in line with the Latin root communicare (meaning share), than many of the present definitions (Cherry, 1978). This definition also implies a joint occurrence, or that actions are taken by both parties in the process of sharing to reach mutual understanding; and implies a relationship (Rogers & Kincaid, 1981).

Power permeates every aspect of our society and is a factor in all human interaction (Jacobson, 1972; Simmel, 1896). Thus, power is a property of social relations among people, and not an attitude or characteristic of individuals (Dahl, 1957; Duetsch, 1958; 1973; Emerson, 1962; Harsanyi,
1962; King, 1987; Soloman, 1960). It is embedded in the mutual dependency that occurs in all social relationships (Emerson, 1962).

Not only is power a property of social relations, but it is also a basic human need. Many researchers have emphasized the human need for power (McClelland, 1975; Murray, 1938; Schutz, 1966). McClelland stated that humans have the need to make others behave in a way that they would not otherwise behave. Schutz (1966) described the need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relationship with people with respect to control and power. Murray explained that people have a need to influence and control others through persuasion, prohibiting, and dictating.

Striving for and Acquisition of Power

Nietzsche's statement "Not for pleasure does man strive: but for power" may contain a great deal of validity. In our Western cultures, the exercise of power is satisfying and even produces joy (Bowers & Ochs, 1971; May, 1972). Researchers (ie. French and Raven, 1959; Etzioni, 1961; Russell, 1938; Kipnis, 1976; May, 1972; and others) have identified ways or means that people have of exercising power, but how and why do people strive to acquire and exercise power?

Need for power

The need for power has been defined as primarily the need to feel strong, and secondarily to act powerfully
(McClelland, 1975). Many researchers believe that the primary reason individuals strive for power is their innate need for power. McClelland (1975), Schutz (1958), Murray (1938), and Veroff (1957) have all promoted the idea that individuals have an innate need for power as a part of their personality. They also state that some individuals have a higher need for power than others.

Some individuals are more inclined than others to want power, to seek it out and to wield it (House, 1984). People differ in their need for power and in their ability to seek and use it. They also differ according to the nature of their expectations of power and what they learn from such experiences (Frost, 1987). Individuals with a high need for dominance are more likely to acquire and exercise power than those with a low need (Dyson, Fleitas, & Scioli, 1972; Gough, 1968).

Case studies of entrepreneurs that show a high need for achievement and a willingness to acquire and use power provide us with examples. They use this power as a means to ensure that their ideas, inventions, and innovations become accepted within their organization (Pinchot, 1985).

Predispositions of individuals toward the acquisition and use of power are relatively enduring over time, but is subject to change with experience (House, 1984). Persons who have and/or observe positive experiences with power are likely to increase their predisposition toward power and
seek opportunities to exercise it in organizations (House, 1984).

Researchers have attempted to define characteristics of individuals high in the need for power, or what Winter (1973 called the "power motive." McClelland, Davis, Kalin, and Wanner (1972) found four variables that correlate significantly with a high need for power. Individuals with a high power motive read and watch more power oriented material (p < .01), accumulate prestigious possessions, participate in competitive sports (usually physical and contact sports), and hold memberships (and probably leadership roles) in many organizations (p < .05). Boyatzis (1973), McClelland et. al. (1972), and Winter (1973) reported that the number of credit cards a person has is positively and significantly associated with the need for power.

Although these studies give of some ideas about an individual with a high need for power, and gives us one idea of why individuals strive to acquire and maintain power, are these the only explanations?

Adler (1966) distinguished between healthy and neurotic striving for power. Healthy striving for power is balanced against social interest, while neurotic striving for power is a result of a feeling of powerlessness, or an inferiority complex. Freud (1924) stated that a person's ego strength and narcissism (abnormal love for oneself) are positively
correlated and that power striving is related to narcissism. Horney (1937), like Adler, stressed a difference between the desire for power that comes from a sense of strength and the desire for power that comes from feelings of insecurity and weakness. Could individuals strive for power to compensate for low self esteem, or for a feeling of belonging (sense of weakness), or to feel that they are in control of others' actions and their relationship with others, and therefore, have control over themselves and their outcomes (sense of strength)?

Veroff and Veroff (1972) asserted that the striving for power should not be taught of as a positive goal in which one derives joy from influencing others, but as a negative goal in which one avoids feelings of having no control and powerlessness.

Measuring power

Attempts have been made to measure how much power a person has or does not have. Two separate types of measures have been introduced into the literature. Process measures, such as total talking time and successful interruptions, view the attempt at power, or is considered to be the activity of a person with power. Another type of test is outcome measures, such as unrevealed difference technique (Bodin, 1966) and coalition game (Vinacke & Arkoff, 1957). The outcome measures look at the result of the power attempt.
Attempts have been made by researchers to find validity in these measures. Bodin (1966), Alexander (1970) and Hadley & Jacob (1973) have found mixed results. Researchers argue that it might not be how much a person speaks, but the content of the speech. The same can be with interruptions. It may not be the success of interruption, if the other person is completely rude.

A third type of study has researched perceived power. These researchers have asked participants to tell which person has the most power, or to rank several people in order of power. Similar attempts have been made to design tests, such as dominance scales and other self-report measures of power. Mixed results have been found using these types of measures also.

Locus of control and powerlessness

At this point the concepts of locus of control and powerlessness must be discussed. Heider (1958) distinguished between two types of causality: internal and external. Individuals presume that particular events are caused by factors that reside within the individual's control (internal), or factors that reside outside the individual's control (external). Rotter, Seeman, & Liverant (1962) and Rotter (1966) made a similar distinction in his discussion of internal and external locus of control. Rotter (1966) defined locus of control as a set of generalized expectations for external or internal control of
reinforcement(s). Rotter (1966) distinguished between the two loci, saying:

"When a reinforcement is perceived by the subject as following some action of his own hand but not being entirely contingent upon his action, then, in our culture, it is typically perceived as the result of luck, chance, fate, as under the control of powerful others, or as unpredictable because of the great complexity of forces surrounding him. When the event is interpreted in this way, we have labeled this a belief in external control. If the person perceives that the event is contingent upon his own behavior or his own relatively permanent characteristics, we have termed this a belief in internal control." (p. 1).

Collins (1974) found that individuals might have an external locus of control, because they believe that the world is difficult, unjust, governed by luck, or politically unresponsive. Although the term power is not used in Rotter's definition, the relationship should be obvious. Those individuals who have an internal locus of control, believe they are responsible for affecting their environment, while those who have an external locus of control feel that they are controlled by their environments, and have a feeling of powerlessness (Berger, 1985). Seeman (1963) characterized the locus of control construct in terms
of a continuum of powerlessness. Internally and externally controlled persons are seen as high and low in powerlessness respectively (Goodstadt & Hjelle, 1973).

Powerlessness is caused by feelings of isolation (Jacobson, 1972), helplessness, and alienation (Berger, 1985; Seeman, 1959). The recent presidential run of Ross Perot has given many people a renewed feeling of power that they had not had for many years. Suddenly, they did not feel isolated from the process, they felt they could do something that would make a difference, and no longer needed to feel alienated by the process, and their politicians.

Individual power needs are met when the person perceives that they have power or believe that they can adequately cope with situations, events and/or the people they confront. Individual power needs are frustrated when they feel powerless, or they believe that they are unable to cope with the physical and social demands of the environment (Conger & Kanungo, 1988).

Ransford (1968) found that racial isolation and feelings of powerlessness are strongly correlated with the willingness to use violence in an effort to equalize power differences. The recent riots in Los Angeles, and the Watts Riot in Los Angeles in the 1960s are both examples of this. The recent incident involving George Lott shooting up a Ft. Worth courtroom, and similar incidents across the country, also help to establish that point. These incidents also
show that it is not only a result of race and racial tensions. The relationship between power and violence will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 3.

**Empowerment**

Much of the writings on empowerment relates to education (Coll, 1986), or with the sharing of power, as in delegation, or sharing resources (Burke, 1986; Conger & Kanungo, 1988; House, 1988; Kanter, 1983). The Oxford English dictionary defines the verb empower as "to enable" (Conger & Kanungo, 1988). Empowerment should therefore not only be considered as a sharing of power and resources, but also enabling individuals through enhancing personal efficacy (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Neilson, 1986; Whetten & Cameron, 1984).

Conger and Kanungo (1988) developed a five-stage process of empowerment. The first stage identifies those conditions that are responsible for feelings of powerlessness. Stage two involves the use of strategies to eliminate those conditions that promote powerlessness, and prepare individuals for personal efficacy information provided in stage three. The first three stages lead to a feeling of empowerment in stage four, and the behavioral affects seen in stage five.

Defining empowerment as enabling another person includes the idea of sharing resources and the delegation of power. It also provides us with a possible solution to
powerlessness when delegation is not a solution. In our relationships, we can help individuals control their feelings of powerlessness by making them feel good about themselves, and their ability to affect the relationship.

Power and Communication

If power is a basic innate need, is present in all human relationships (Berger, 1985; Blakar, 1979; Emerson, 1962; Frost, 1987; Jacobson, 1972; King, 1987), and all human relationships are based on communication (Capella, 1988), then power and communication are clearly intertwined. Although scholars realize that power is an element of communication, it is a relational concept that has become axiomatic (Jacobson, 1972), referring to the fact that the relationship is often talked about, but seldom studied.

The idea that power and communication are related becomes clearer when we consider Watzlawich, Beavin, and Jackson's (1967) axioms of communication. They proposed five axioms of communication, but the third and fifth axioms relate to power and communication. The third and fifth axioms of communication state respectively:

3. Every communication has a content and relationship aspect, such that the latter classifies the former and is therefore metacommunication.
5. Communication is either symmetrical (based on equal power) or complimentary (based on differences in power).

Watzlawich, et. al. (1967) argue that not only is there a content aspect (what is being said), but also a relationship aspect to communication. The relationship aspect can refer to type of relationship (ie. stranger, friend, or intimate other), but also refers to the balance or imbalance of power between the two parties in the interaction.

Blakar (1979) agreed with the axioms proposed by Watzlawich, Beavin and Jackson when he argued that communication, through language, is not only an obvious means for exerting power, but there is a more subtle relationship between communication and power. He contends that language helps structure a person's experiences even when two individuals are engaged in informal social interactions not directly concerned with social influence suggests this more subtle relationship. The study of all aspects of communication must, therefore also include the study of power.

There is also the less subtle relationship between power and communication. We defined communication as the creating and sharing of information, so attempts to control a person's use or access to information is thus an attempt to control their communication and an exercise of power.
Mechanic (1962) discussed the control of information (or communication) as a type of power. Centrality within a communication network is one way which a person controls information (Burt, 1982; Berkowitz, 1982). A person who is the only link "between" two individuals holds the position of centrality within that network (Berkowitz, 1982). This person has also been called a broker (Burt, 1982). This position is powerful in that it can potentially shape or distort the flow of communication between the actors (Berkowitz, 1982) or prohibit the flow of communication (Burt, 1982; Granovetter, 1973). Another way a person can control a person's information, communication, or knowledge is by becoming an opinion leader (Rogers & Kincaid, 1981). Rogers and Kincaid (1981) defined an opinion leader as a person who can informally influence other individuals' attitudes or overt behavior in a desired way with relative frequency.

In the U. S. the First Amendment to the Constitution gives each individual power by guaranteeing freedom of speech. Whether or not we use that power is up to us.

Leadership and Power

Many researchers do not use the term power in the same context as leadership. They most often use the term influence to describe this aspect of power (Yukl, 1989). When power is discussed, it is in regards to the bases of power, such as French and Ravens' (1959) referent power.
A primary aspect of leadership is influence. The ability of the leader to influence the other person is one of the tests of leadership. This influence is not unidirectional. Although a leader may be able to influence, the "subordinate" will also be able to influence the leader (Yukl, 1989).

The effectiveness of a leader is many times determined by the effectiveness of the influencing method they choose. Marwell and Schmidt (1967) among others have listed influencing, or what they often call compliance gaining strategies, and some have even discussed the likelihood of successful attempts.

Bases of Power

Etzioni (1961) states that "power differs according to the means employed to make the subject comply" (p. 5). Many researchers have provided taxonomies or list of ways in which power can be attained, maintained, or exercised. In researching and studying these various taxonomies, four categories have emerged. It is not my intent to create yet another taxonomy (although in actuality, that is what is occurring), but to develop categories that can be used to further the understanding of power. The categories developed for that purpose are: influence, prominence, authority, and control. Dividing these bases into any categorical system is difficult, because many of them will fit more than one category. In the following sections, I
have attempted to divide them into the category they seem to fit within the best.

Influence

Influence is the simplest form of power. Influence is the ability to affect or persuade another person or persons. Many researchers have just those terms: influence of opinion (Russell, 1938), or persuasion ((skills) Folger & Poole, 1984; Kipnis, 1976; & Parsons, 1963). Russell's (1938) influence of opinion is simply another term for persuasion. Folger and Poole (1984) include the skills of persuasion, while Kipnis (1976), and Parsons (1963) use the term that we use in communication when we are speaking about gaining a desired effect from another person. While Parsons (1963) defined influence as the attempt by one person to influence another person with positive sanctions (approval, support, consent, etc.), he also includes the opposite where a person attempts to influence through negative sanctions (not approving, not supporting, not consenting, etc.), which he calls activation.

May (1972) defined two bases of power that would also seem to fit within this category. Competitive power occurs when one person wins, not because of anything they did, but because the other person loses. Integrative power is indicated by the sharing of power, and people working together.
We may also influence people by playing upon their own personal values. Kelman (1958; 1961; 1974) called this internalization, and stated that individuals will accept induced behavior that is consistent with the individual's value system.

**Prominence**

Prominence power is the second category of power bases. Prominence power extends from the respect or liking that one person has for another in the relationship. For example a person may have referent power (French & Raven, 1959) if someone has the want or the need to be identified or associate with that person. Kelman (1958; 1961; 1974) identified this type of power as identification power, while Cuming (1981) termed it as associative power, and included the idea that we have power because of who we know. Folger and Poole (1984) listed physical attractiveness, and loyal allies as bases of power.

People may gain respect and power in a relationship because of their expertise (Folger & Poole, 1984; French & Raven, 1959), or because of their access to or the amount and importance of knowledge they possess about a particular subject (Kipnis, 1976; Mechanic, 1962; Raven, 1965).

Etzioni (1961) listed normative power, or the control of symbolic rewards and deprivation, as a basis of power. He differentiated between pure normative power, based on the manipulation of esteem, prestige, and other ritualistic
symbols, and social normative power, based on the allocation and manipulation of acceptance and positive response.

May (1972) identified two bases of power that fit within this category. He defined manipulative power as power over another person, that the person may have originally invited by the person's own desperation or anxiety. A person may put themselves in a situation where they give another person power over them because of something that has happened in the past, or the current situation. In these cases, a person would put their trust in someone they respect.

May (1972) also identified nutrient power in his list of bases of power. Nutrient power is exemplified by a parent's nurturing for their children. We all get pleasure out of exerting ourselves from time to time for the sake of others.

The last basis of power in this section is reinforcement, identified by Kipnis (1976). Reinforcement is anything that either increases (through positive reinforcement) or decreases (through negative reinforcement) that likelihood that a behavior will be repeated. Reinforcement is much like the reward and punishment bases mentioned in the next section, but reinforcement includes many aspects of Etzioni's (1961) normative power. We can also receive reinforcement from individuals who do not have authority.
Authority

Authority is power that is based upon the structure or hierarchy of an organization or society. Much of this power is based on what French and Raven (1959) called legitimate power, and what Folger and Poole (1984) called formal power. The most common bases of power in this section are reward and punishment (French & Raven, 1959) called punishment power coercive power.) (French & Raven, 1959; Folger & Poole, 1984; Russell, 1938). Reward power is the ability to compensate a person for doing what you want them to do. Punishment is just the opposite. Kelman (1958; 1961; 1974) listed compliance power as the acceptance of another person's power to gain rewards or to avoid punishments. This seems to suggest that one person has the authority to reward or punish.

Remuneration is the control over material resources (Etzioni, 1961). Folger and Poole (1984) also include in their list, control over group processes and resources. This is very common in hierarchical systems such as organizations and societies. Individuals higher in the hierarchy may withhold resources from individuals lower in the hierarchy. A very common resource that is withheld is information (Kipnis, 1976; Mechanic, 1962; Raven, 1965) mentioned in the previous section.
Control

Control is the strongest form of power. Control is complete domination of another person to the extent that they have no other choice than the choice given by the person with power. Many bases mentioned in this section are attempts to gain this "ultimate" power, such as Kipnis' (1976) threats and promises, and Russell's (1938) direct physical power. Etzioni (1961) stated that coercive power is achieved through threats, restrictions, or control.

Probably even a better example is given by Parsons (1963) when he explains inducement and deterrence as bases of power. Inducement is when one actor seeks through positive sanction (approval, consent, permission, etc.) to control the situation. Deterrence occurs when an individual seeks through negative sanctions (disapproval, nonconsent, not giving permission, etc.) to control the situation.

The best example of control is given by May (1972) when he discusses exploitative power which he refers to as "the most destructive kind of power" (p. 105). Exploitative power is subjecting a person to whatever use the person with power deems necessary or appropriate. Slavery is a very good example of exploitative power, in that the slaves were used for whatever their masters deemed necessary.

In the preceding four subsections, 11 researchers and their taxonomies of bases of power were discussed. It is
important that we understand these, because these bases are the means by which power is gained, exercised and maintained. Although several taxonomies were discussed, and many did not include some elements that other taxonomies included, that is not to suggest that any taxonomy is better or worse than another. By studying them all we do obtain a much better understanding than we would if we only studied one.

Several researchers, such as Marwell & Schmitt (1967) with their 16 compliance gaining strategies, and Wheeless, Barraclough & Stewart (1983) have attempted to reconcile the taxonomies of bases of power into an all inclusive taxonomy. Wheeless, et. al. (1983) divided all taxonomies into three classifications: (1). expectancy/consequences; (2). relationship/identification; and (3). values/obligations. Expectancy/consequences operate based on expectancies or consequences of a behavior (ie. reward, coercion, or punishment). Relationship/identification functions on the basis of interpersonal relationships or the need to identify with another person (ie. referent, social, or identification). Values/obligations rely on values and/or obligations (ie. legitimate, internalization, persuasion, or activation of commitment). Wheeless et al. (1983) admit that such analyses remain unsatisfying. They go on to say "What is needed, then, is not to choose from among them or to crunch them together, but to find some higher-order
system that subsumes all of the power types previously discussed" (p. 124). Not only must a higher-order system subsume all taxonomies previously discussed, but must also meet other criterion set forth in the next section.

Conclusion

The groundwork of power research has been presented. In the next chapter methodology of theory and model development will be discussed.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

In this chapter the development, usefulness, and other aspects of theories and models are discussed. A theory as defined by Hoover (1984, p. 38) is "A set of inter-related propositions that suggest why events occur in the manner that they do." A model is "a structure of symbols and operating rules which is supposed to match a set of relevant points in an existing structure or process (Deutsch, 1952). Based on Deutsch's assertion that each model implies a theory asserting a structural correspondence between the model and certain aspects of the thing supposed to be modeled, we will use the terms somewhat interchangeably (This assertion also agrees with Whetten, 1989 and Dubin, 1978).

Models and theories range from very complex to very simple. Theories and models represent various ways in which observers see their environment, but theories and models are not reality (Littlejohn, 1989). Models and theories are used to explain reality. Abraham Kaplan (1964: p. 309) wrote:

The formation of a theory [or model] is not just the discovery of a hidden fact; the theory is a way of looking at the facts, of organizing and
representing them. . . . A theory must somehow fit God's world, but in an important sense it creates a world of its own.

Theories are used as a way to observe and interpret facts, but "the goal of theory building is to provide an understanding of how a phenomenon operates" (Littlejohn, 1989; p. 16).

Basic Elements of Theories

Theories include basic elements. Littlejohn (1989) identified two: Concepts and Explanations.

Concepts

The first is that a theory is a set of concepts. Individuals are by nature concept-processing beings. Everything we know was developed from concept formation. Concepts are the grouping of things and events into categories according to observed commonalities (Littlejohn, 1989). Some theories stop at the concept level, and become taxonomies, although many theorists do not believe that taxonomies are theories. By stopping at the concept level, theories do not attempt to explain the phenomenon that it has conceptualized.

Explanation

The second element of a theory is explanation. Explanation identifies regularities in the relationship among the variables, or in other words, it answers the question "Why?".
Besides having the capability of conceptualizing and explaining phenomena, theories also have other functions.

The Function of Models

Nine functions of theories can be identified:

1. Communicative
2. Organizing and summarizing
3. Focus
4. Clarifying
5. Observational
6. Predictive and measurative
7. Heuristic
8. Control

Each of these functions are important to theory building. The first function is communicative. A theory gives theorists the ability to communicate their observations and speculations to other persons and theorists. Second, theories organize and summarize knowledge. Theories and models are one way of accomplishing the organization of knowledge, and sometimes finding patterns and connections between the knowledge. Theories allow us to focus attention on important variables and relationships within our knowledge.

Theories provide the advantage of clarifying what is observed. Theories provide "guideposts" for interpreting,
explaining, and understanding the complexity of human relations. The clarification function of theories helps the observer to understand relationships, and to interpret specific events.

Fifth, the observational function points out not only what to observe, but how to observe. Similar to the focus function, the observational function focuses attention on important variable and relationships, but also gives the most precise indicators of a particular concept or variable.

One of the most commonly mentioned functions of models is the function of predictability and measurability. Predictability allows the inquirer to make predictions about outcomes and effects in the data based on the theory. Although some models provide "yes or no" predictions, some provide more qualitative predictions of similarity or matching. The seventh, or the heuristic function, is based on how well the theory or model encourages others to generate further research.

Evaluation of Models

Theories or models are evaluated largely based on the functions just discussed. Littlejohn (1989) also includes the following:

1. Theoretical scope
2. Appropriateness
3. Validity
4. Parsimony.
A theory's scope is its comprehensiveness and inclusiveness. A theory's explanation must be general enough to cover a range of events instead of beyond a single observation. Two types of generality exist. First, is the explanation of many events or phenomenon, and the second is the ability to explain a narrow range of events or a single event in a number of situations (Littlejohn, 1989).

Appropriateness of a model or theory indicates whether the theory perspective is appropriate for the theoretical question the theory addresses. Validity simply questions whether the theory is true, or the results are true (Littlejohn, 1989).

If two theories are equally valid, then the test of parsimony is used to decide between them. The test of parsimony asks which theory is the most logically simplistic (Littlejohn, 1989), or should some factors be deleted because they add little additional value to the theory (Whetten, 1989).

Theory Development

Theories are "discovered" in many different ways. Some start as a hypothesis and are then tested, some start with questions and then tests are performed. Many theory-development authorities argue the development must complete the following stages set forth in Whetten (1989).
What

Of all the related factors which should be logically considered as part of the explanation of the phenomena under investigation, "what" is very important. This includes two tests: comprehensiveness and parsimony. Comprehensiveness considers whether all and the "right" factors are included. Parsimony, as discussed above considers whether factors should be eliminated because they add no value to the theory (Whetten, 1989).

How

Having identified a set of relevant factors, the researcher must then determine how they are related. This adds order, and shows such information as flow or causality. Restrictions in the ability to test these links adequately does not invalidate the value of the theory (Whetten, 1989).

Why

Why should other researchers give credibility to this particular representation of the phenomena? In the theory development process, logic becomes more important than does the data. To answer the question "Why?", and if they have any hope to have any impact on the practice of research, theorists must convince other researchers that the theory they are proposing makes sense (Whetten, 1989).

Who, Where, When
These temporal and contextual factors set the boundaries of generalizability, and as such constitute the range of the theory. Whetten goes on to explain that:

... Unfortunately, few theorists explicitly focus on the contextual limits of their propositions. In their efforts to understand a social phenomenon they consider it only in familiar surroundings and at one point in time.

Although it is unfair to expect that theorists should be sensitive to all possible boundary constraints, clearly there is value in conducting some simple mental tests of the generalizability of core propositions (Whetten, 1989: p. 492).

The approach set forth by Whetten is the approach used in developing the model set forth in the next chapter. These steps follow the same path as the model in this study.
CHAPTER 4

POWER MODEL

Much has been said about the power construct, or power types, or what gives a person power. A conceptual construct of power must be established that takes everything discussed to this point and gives it a structure and interrelatedness that have been missing in the past.

This study began with the consideration of all logical factors. This research considered the many definitions used in the research for power, and the many words that had been used as synonyms for power. After identifying the factors that must be considered, how they were related began to bring formation to the model.

The structure or model, eventually named the IPAC Model of Power, was then taken to the classroom and other gatherings where it was presented and defended in an attempt to test its validity, logic, generalizability and the possible usefulness of the model. To this date, it has stood up to all logical tests that have been used.

The IPAC Model of Power

The IPAC Model of power is based on several principles. The following is a list of those principles.

1. There is more than one way a person obtains power, as well as more than one type of power.
2. There is a hierarchical structure based upon these types of power.

3. Power is based on communication.

4. Power is a relational concept that exists in all relationships, and must be granted by each person.

5. Within each relationship between two individuals, there are many 'sub'relationships.

Each of these principles is important to the study of power. The primary efforts in power research have focused on the first principle. These principles have been discussed in previous chapters, so will only be discussed as they relate to the context.

The IPAC Model of Power is based on a hierarchical structure, defining different levels or degrees of power. The levels of power range from the simplest form of power at the base of the model to the extreme at its top. Each level is interrelated with the other levels. Each level builds off the level below it, and maintains the qualities of the level or levels below it. This will become more apparent as we look at the model, beginning with the base, called influence. Each of these levels was introduced in chapter 2, under the section called, Bases of Power.

Influence

The base of the model, and the bases for defining other terms is influence. Influence is the ability to affect or
persuade another person. We influence our family, friends, coworkers and acquaintances all the time. Actor A can have influence over actor B without B giving formal or even conscious consent to the influence. Not only do we influence others, but we are influenced by others. All power has its roots in influence, and influencing can be the most productive form of power. Influence is also the most tenuous of the levels of power. This means that actor A might be able to exert power (influence alone) in situation A, but might not be able in situation B. Influence requires the most effort to exert and maintain.

Influence is based on persuasion, and persuasion is communication. Many communication theorists believe that all communication is persuasion. If that is true, then all communication is also an attempt to exert power, however minute. Since all power is rooted in influence, all power is communication based.
Prominence

Prominence is legitimized influence one person has over another. The term legitimized means that individuals themselves have "approved of" the influence in some way. One of the most common examples of this would be French and Raven's referent power. Actor A gives actor B power, because actor B is an expert in subject X, and actor A respects actor B.

Society has legitimized influence (prominence) to individuals, by giving prestige and power to those with wealth, position, education, beauty and other "societal advantages."

Prominence is based on competence, credibility or having something regarded highly by another person. Each person allows or disallows another person to gain and maintain prominence power over them.

Authority

When a person thinks about power, they often think about authority. Authority is formalized and explicit power. Authority is a structural aspect of society or organizations rather than being based only on the interpersonal relationship. A person has authority because of a formal position, and the authority is explicit in that it is visible and known to all actors. As with all other levels of power, an actor must agree to be subject to the authority.
Organizations give authority based on their organizational chart. When individuals join organizations, they agree to subject themselves to the people of authority. Society also gives power to individuals. In the United States, we elect representatives, and abide by the laws they pass. We as a society give police officers the authority to enforce the laws and to arrest those who do not abide by the laws. We give judges the authority to determine guilt and innocence, and sentence those found guilty. Other individuals are also given authority in our and other societies.

Any person attempting to exert the authority level of power must also have influence and prominence power. If the person has these levels also and has legitimate authority, there is usually no problem (unless the person who is receiving the power attempt refuses the power). One major problem many individuals have when attempting to use authority power is that they do not have either the influence or prominence level of power.

A manager who has lost the respect of its subordinates will not be effective. It is my argument that this is one of the major reasons why managers fail. We also see this phenomenon when police lose control of a situation, because they do not have the respect of the people with whom they are dealing.
Control

At the top of the hierarchical structure is control. **Control is stronger than authority and is the complete domination of one person by another.** This may be complete domination of all aspects of a person's life or just one part of that life. Control may be gained in many ways. For a person to gain control, the person attempting to exert control must be able to reduce the number of possible choices that the other person has down to one, and that one must be the choice that the person attempting to exert control desires.

This type of power is what we generally consider as negative power attempts, but it is not always that way. Control in the negative situations is usually maintained with negative consequences. These negative consequences can range from verbal threats, to the taking away of something important, all the way to beatings.

When we are babies, our parents control all aspects of our lives. They decide when and if we will eat, what we are or are not allowed to do, among other aspects of our young life. Although when we are older, this might be considered negative, the fact that our parents protect us is essential to our growth.

In later life, we sometimes see this occur. Recently the media has covered the phenomenon of spousal abuse and spousal control, bringing it into the limelight. Most
people would consider this to be negative. Some individuals believe that marriage gives the male "ownership" of the woman. This gives him the authority over her, and he then expands this into the next level of power and tries to control her life.

Age does not make control negative. In the prison situation, guards have a great deal of control over inmates. If the inmate does not abide by the rules, they may be punished. Guards tell them when to get up, when to go to bed, when to eat, and also control many other aspects of their life.

Relational/situational context

People relate to each other within a system, and within this system maintain relationships of many kinds. As presented throughout, power is a concept based on relationships and on the many roles each person plays. All members of an organized society, or within a system must have more than one role if they are to reciprocate and cooperate effectively with others (Cameron, 1950). A role is a part or position that a person plays (Sarbin & Allen, 1968).

The roles that individuals play determine or define their relationship. Two individuals may play more than one role within their relationship. They may be superior-subordinate, neighbors, and friends.
The two individuals may obtain differing levels in each set of roles they maintain. This requires that the level of power be determined based on the roles each individual is playing.

The level of power that a person attains is also based on the situation the individual is in. This complicates the interpretation of the model tremendously, but must be considered for reasons of validity.

Moving through the levels

As is suggested by this model, power has different levels based on the roles of the two individuals involved. Each level of the hierarchical structure also has what will be called "degrees". A person may have a small amount of influence, or a great deal of influence; a little prominence, or a great deal of prominence, and so forth.

Almost everyone has at least a little influence over others, even in situations of authority and control. For a person to obtain power, it must be given or allowed by the other individual.

Authority is the unique element of this model. All other levels of the model refer to the relationship on an individual level. Authority, however, deals with power on an organizational or societal level. Organizations give individuals authority to enhance the performance of the organization. Society gives people authority to make and
enforce laws (police, judges, elected representatives, etc.) and other responsibilities.

When people are given authority in an organization or society, they also automatically receive influence and prominence. They may lose much of their influence and/or prominence if they are incompetent or others lose respect for them. The individuals the person may have authority over may still do their job, because of the larger organization or society, and then again they may not. The person with the "authority" may still hold the title, but has lost the ability to exert authority, other than possible threats.

Circumventing

A person may circumvent the hierarchical structure of this model by introducing a foreign element (i.e., weapon, fear or a threat) into the relationship. When a person is committing armed robbery, that person will be in control of the victim, but may not have any influence, prominence or authority without the introduction of the foreign element. The same is true with kidnapping. The kidnapper will have control of the person who has been kidnapped, and may do a number of things with the victim, but have no level of power lower than control. This may seem like a major contradiction to the model, but this model as with all other models cannot accommodate all temporal and contextual situations, and it is the intent of this model and study to
define power in interpersonal relationships without these foreign elements.

**Powerlessness**

One of the greatest aspects of this model is that it shows that all power must be given and is based in communication. That may sound simple, but the implications to those who feel powerless, it may be extremely important. People who feel powerless can be told that they give others power, and they can take it back, but this model shows them how they give power, first by allowing others to influence them, and then by giving other prominence, and so on. By showing them the model they can take control of their lives.

Using this model to help individuals who are feeling powerless is not the only use. Helping managers and leaders in their positions, along with many day to day interactions and activities make the IPAC Model an important piece of work.
CHAPTER 5

LIMITATION, FUTURE RESEARCH AND CONCLUSIONS

This study has discussed the problem with current research on power, the difficulty in trying to define the concept, and given a general review of some of the literature on power. The bases of power have been presented, and divided into a framework that became the structure for the model.

A discussion of methodology for model building was presented, along with the process of how this particular model was developed. The actual model was then presented and discussed in the previous chapter.

As with any other new study, the limitations and implications for future research must be presented.

Limitations

As with any type of theory, there are some limitations. Two of these limitations were discussed in the previous chapter. As with many other theories, it is situational. The problem is not that the model will work in only a few situations, but that the dynamic may change as the roles of the individuals change. This was discussed in the last chapter, and fits well within the model. The model looks at each relationship that the individuals may have, and then places them within the model based upon those relationships.
The second limitation mentioned in the previous chapter is the entrance of a foreign object, such as a gun into the situation. This is ruled out of the realm of the model, since it becomes more than just a matter of the interpersonal relationship.

Two other limitations may also be attributed to this model. First, it is either difficult or impossible to detect when one level is passed and another is entered. Most situations are easily placed with a level, but some situations are fit more into the gray areas of the levels. This is possibly the greatest limitation to the model. It may not be the case that a situation fits into a "gray area", but may rather fit into both levels of the model.

Secondly, there is no argument that there are differing degrees of power, and there are even differing degrees of influence, prominence, authority and control, but the simplest form of this model does not differentiate between them. The model does provide an explanation for the differing degrees of power with the levels of the model. It does not now distinguish between what may be variation in degree within a particular level.

Future research

The limitations mentioned above provide a framework of some research that could be done in the area of power. Other research that provides a measurement framework that fits within this model would also provide research possibilities.
Studies on the affect of losing influence and prominence, and how it affects the use of authority would present some interesting and possibly important data both for organizations and society.

Conclusion

Power has long interested researchers, but has often been confusing. This thesis has attempted to provide some framework that will help other make sense of the concept we call "POWER".
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