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The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between position-related sources of power and person-related sources of power in organizations. The subject is the power of an organizational sub-unit compared to other units. Theory on the structural sources of power is well established in the literature. The question in this study is whether the individual manager, the person, is another major source of power for the organizational unit. A major objective of the study is to fill this gap in the literature on power in organizations. A secondary objective of this study is to see if one can rank the individual position-related sources of power and person-related sources of power, identified through a literature review, within each group in terms of their relative importance.

The type of this study is exploratory. It is a descriptive study explaining the "what is" about the relationship between position and person sources of power in a manufacturing company. Results indicate that there is a two-way relationship between manager power and department power, and that one can rank order the sources of power in terms of
their contribution to a department's or manager's power.

Power is defined in this study as the ability to get things done.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In 1960, at a seminar conducted by the Foundation for Research on Human Behavior, at Ann Arbor, Michigan, Abraham Kaplan said that perhaps one one-hundredth is known of the things about power, and even that one one-hundredth is sometimes regarded with secret doubt (1964). More than a quarter of a century later, it can be safely assumed that more is known about power than was then. The fact that, in a meeting on August 12, 1986, the Academy of Management Board of Governors approved the formation of a new "Interest Group" on Power, Negotiation and Conflict Management, and the increasing number of studies on power are indications that more is known and that there is an interest in knowing even more. However, the real question is, "How much more is known?" Probably not enough, because there are still no dissertations or articles on the subject that reports a "field experiment" on power.

This study is an attempt to explore the relationship between the two major sources of power in organizations: position-related sources and person-related sources. It is a preexperimental, exploratory study of a manufacturing company. The question asked is whether the manager of an organizational sub-unit, as an individual, is a source of
intra-organizational power for that sub-unit. Common sense and logic may suggest an easy answer, but there are no easy answers found in the literature surveyed. Some of the recent literature, though, seems to support the theory that the manager does have an effect on an organizational unit's power (Gupta 1984; Hambrick and Mason 1984; Ketz de Vries and Miller 1986; Meindl and Ehrlich 1987; Pfeffer and Davis-Blake 1986; Smith, Carson, and Alexander 1984). It is encouraging to see that the field has kept away from easy answers, recognizing the fact this is a complex phenomena.

Power is a perceptual construct. If others think that you have it, you have it. If this and other requirements are fulfilled, as explained later by the process-approach-to-power, then someone has power. The problem is obvious. Like many other constructs in the social sciences, power is something that can be recognized when seen or felt, but coming up with a clear-cut operational definition is difficult.

Power is an uncomfortable subject due to the negative connotations attached. Those who have power deny that they have power, and those who want power do not admit that they want it (Burns 1982). This may be due to a widely-accepted dominational-adversarial view of power, where power is an end in itself and is defined by the amount of control a person has over others.
Whether recognized or not, power exists and affects all aspects of human relationships. Philosophical essays on power (Aristotle 1981; Hobbes 1962; Machiavelli 1981; Mills 1963; Neitzche 1968; Russell 1938; Siu 1979) treat power as a fact and a necessary dimension in any administrative situation. The attention paid to power in political science (Howard 1982), political economy (Frieden and Lake 1987), anthropology (Fogelson and Adams 1977), sociology (Manning and Van Maanen 1978), social-psychology (Ng 1980), and organizational sciences (Crozier 1964; Jacobson 1972; Weber 1947; Zald 1970; Zaleznick and Ketz de Vries 1975) undeniably asserts the fact that power permeates all human relationships.

Since the 1970s, there has been a significant increase in the writings on power in organizations (Allen and Porter 1983; Bacharach and Lawler 1980; Mintzberg 1983; Pfeffer 1981; Srivasta 1986). More recent approaches to power in organizations adopt an alternative view of power: the process approach to power. Here, power is the means to an end rather than being an end in itself and is defined as the ability to get things done. Thus the morality attached to power becomes neutral. The purposes and way it is used may be positive or negative, but power by itself is neutral (Pfeffer 1981; Ralston 1985). Since management is the process of "getting things done through other people" (Follett 1941) and leadership is the "ability to influence
others' behavior," power is essential in both processes. Social power is like physical power. Where the power is "on," the system can be productive. Where the power is "off," the system bogs down (Kanter 1979). This study adopts the process view of power and defines power as the ability to mobilize resources to get things done.

Statement of the Problem

The question in this study is: "Is the individual manager a source of power for the sub-unit he or she is managing, or is the source of power only the position itself and its structural characteristics?" There are two major sources of power in organizations; position-related sources and person-related sources. This applies to individuals. In explaining the power of an individual, the literature is very clear about the fact that power coming from the position is a major part of the total power of an individual. However, when power of an organizational sub-unit is compared to others, a void is found in the literature. There are many articles and books on structural sources of power for a sub-unit, but the individual manager is missing in this literature.

Some recent literature indicates that the manager has an effect on a department's power relative to other organizational units. It should be mentioned, however, that the influence between the organization and the manager is
reciprocal (Ketz de Vries and Miller 1986). While mutual causation is the rule, the effect of the manager on the department is missing in power literature. The manager's effects on organizational performance (Pfeffer and Davis-Blake 1986; Smith, Carson, and Alexander 1984), strategy (Gupta 1984), structure (Hambrick and Mason 1984), and culture (Ketz de Vries and Miller 1986) are becoming accepted facts in prestigious management journals. The power effects of the manager, however, are different at different stages of the life cycle of an organization (Gray and Ariss 1985; Mintzberg 1984). Following the argument that the attributions to the manager's effect are subjective (Meindl and Ehrlich 1987), this study is based on a survey of the perceptions of employees in a medium-sized manufacturing company. They were asked whether their manager affects their department's power in the organization.

**Purpose of the Study**

The major purpose of this study is to find answers to the research question through a survey of the perceptions of individuals in a manufacturing organization. The research question concerns whether individuals think their manager is a factor in the power of their organizational unit compared to the power of other units.

A secondary outcome of this study is a rank ordering of the sources of power under each major group; structural
sources and person-related sources. The questionnaire items pertain to sixteen sources under the two major groups, identified through an extensive review of literature.

**Significance of the Study**

The primary significance of this study comes from the fact that it contributes to knowledge about power in organizations. The gap identified earlier is due to the compartmentalization and over-specialization in research on organizations. Organizational behavior (OB) and organizational theory (OT) research focus on two units of analysis; OB on individuals or groups and OT on structural sub-units. The single-level approach in most studies cannot deal with the interaction between individuals and structural variables in organizations (Rousseau 1985). This study employs a multilevel approach, taking both the individual and organizational unit as units of analysis. Therefore, it may provide some answers to the research question.

The empirical nature of the study contributes to its significance. Most of the literature on power in organizations has been conceptual theories and essays. Recently, there has been an increase in the number of empirical studies on power in organizations, and this study adds to the pool of case studies available. The more that is known about the subject, the greater the ability to design methodologically
rigorous research testing the hypotheses generated by this and other exploratory studies.

**Limitations of the Study**

This study focuses on the sources of power in organizations. It is an attempt to see if there is any relationship between the two major sources.

This research is descriptive, rather than prescriptive. Performance-related data were not collected. Thus, the study does not produce suggestions or recommendations on the "how to" of related issues. It reflects and describes "what is" rather than "what should be."

The instrument is a survey of perceptions, since power is an ill-defined perceptual construct, leading to some measurement problems. Due to the ordinal nature of the data related to the major variables, non-parametric statistics are used in data analysis.

The type of the research is exploratory, which leads to another major limitation: external validity. Since this is a single case study, results are valid for only the sample used. No attempt is made to generalize from this study.

Again, the purpose is to determine whether a relationship exists between two variables. Causal inferences about the relationships cannot be made in this study due to its design and statistics used, but are recommended for future research on the subject.
Variables and Definitions

The variables under investigation can be grouped under two major areas, position-related sources of power and person-related sources of power in organizations. The purpose of the study is to explain the relationship between these two variables. The basic research question is whether the manager is a source of power for an organizational unit. The major variables of the study are defined as follows:

**Power** is the ability to mobilize things (material, people), to get things done.

**Position Sources** are those aspects of the position and the nature of the task that increase the power of the position-holder.

**Person Sources** are personal characteristics of the position-holder that increase his or her power.

These two basic sources consist of many dimensions. They are listed in Figure 3, and are defined below.

I. **Position Sources**

**Centrality:** The location of a position on the information flow in an organization. The more information passes through (in and out) a position, the more power it has.

**Criticality:** The location of a position or a unit on the workflow in an organization. The more critical the task of a unit or position in the overall workflow, the more power the position or unit has.
Relevance: The extent to which the task and the activities of a position are directly related to the central objectives and issues. Relevance to the dominant competitive issues, contribution to the bottom line, and adding value to the final product are dimensions of this variable. The more relevant the task, the more power the position has.

Visibility: The extent to which the activity is seen by powerful individuals, usually higher level managers. The amount of contact with higher level management in the organization increases visibility, which increases the position's power.

Providing Resources: The more dependent other positions or units are on the particular position or unit for resources (information, material, financial, people, equipment, service, etc.) the more power it has.

Coping with Uncertainty: All organizational units face uncertainty from both the external and the internal environments. If any unit absorbs or reduces the uncertainty for other units, they become dependent on this unit and it has power over others. This unit is providing a valuable service (resource) to others. The more it is, the more power the unit has.

Substitutability: The extent to which the unit or the position is replaceable. If others can perform the function then substitutability increases. This has a
negative relationship with power. More substitutability causes less power for a position or unit.

Flexibility: How routine the activity is. Non-routine tasks create more discretion to be vested in a position. Strict job-descriptions decrease it. Autonomy in decision-making is directly related to this. The more flexible a task is, the more power the position has.

Hierarchical Authority: The place of a position on the vertical hierarchy in an organization. The higher a position is, the more authority is vested in it, and the more power it has.

Consensus: The extent of agreement on issues in an organizational sub-unit. This generally creates an advantage in the political struggle within an organization. High consensus over issues in a sub-unit increases its power.

Political Process: The ability to play the game. Adeptness of a sub-unit in participating in the political processes in an organization increases its power. Basically this is an ability to affect the decision making process in an organization. This has a positive relationship with the sub-unit's power.

II. Person Sources

Expertise: The amount of knowledge and experience a person has in his or her field. This is one of the major
sources of personal power, and has a positive relationship with power.

Information: Access to critical information in an organization. Those who are knowledgeable about the dominant issues in an organization increase their power.

Connection: Access to influential others in an organization, the network. Power rubs-off. Acquaintance to powerful others increase a person's power.

Personal Attraction: Referent power. Personal identification of others with the person. The more others are attracted to a person, the more the person has power and influence over others' behavior.

Effort: Hard work. One's effort helps others, especially superiors, to perform better in their jobs, and they reciprocate with formal or informal rewards to the person, which increases his or her power in the organization.

**Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses are made for this study.

1. The individual manager is perceived as a source of power for an organizational unit.

2. There is a ranking of the importance of individual sources listed within each group.
Research Methodology

There are no standardized tests that measure power in organizations. Most research on this issue just bluntly asks subjects to provide a power ranking of a manager or a department, assuming that the subject understands what it is.

For this study, a questionnaire was developed, based on a review of the literature on the subject, that includes questions regarding sources of power for the department and the manager. The instrument was pretested on forty-five subjects from nine different organizations, each cell having approximately five subjects who worked in the same department. The instrument provided the expected differences for the groups from different organizations and departments, thus establishing construct validity. Since there was no aggregation of items into a scale, reliability is assumed for the individual items on the questionnaire. The questions are stated in simple, clear language.

The pretested questionnaire was administered in a medium-sized manufacturing company, located in Texas. Out of a total of sixty-nine employees and managers, forty-four participated in the study giving a 64 percent return rate. The results provided in Chapter IV are from this study. This exploratory study uses a pre-experimental (case study) methodology. The results will not be generalized. The same study can be replicated in different sizes and types of
organizations in different industries. Then, the combined results may be generalizable.
REFERENCES


This chapter provides a review of the literature on power in organizations. In this study, power is defined as the ability to get things done, and management and leadership are considered basically as manifestations of power. A process approach to power is taken here, rather than a domination (confrontational) view of power. After a general review of the literature on power, a review of the sources of power in organizations is presented. The two basic sources of power in organizations are the structural (positional), and the individual (personal) sources. After reviewing these two basic sources, the relationship between the two is explored. There is a gap in the literature regarding this relationship. While the influence between the organization and the manager is reciprocal, the literature on power leaves out the manager as a source of departmental power (Ketz de Vries and Miller 1986). This gap provides the research question for this dissertation.

Social Power

Power is an uncomfortable topic because of the negative connotations attached. People who have power deny that they do, and those who want power do not admit they want
power (Kanter 1979). However, power is the basis of all relationships among persons, and permeates all human relationships (Burns 1982). Power is a perceptual construct and if the person and others believe that a person has power then he or she has power.

Power plays an important part in the symbolic processes in organizations (Frost 1985; Jongbloed and Frost 1985; Pfeffer 1981 (b); Pfeffer and Salancik 1974; Trice and Beyer 1984). Pfeffer (1981) argues that much of the organizational action associated with decision making is rituals and ceremonies. He also shows clearly that power and politics are inevitable and important parts of administrative activity and that they should be viewed as such and analyzed. Pfeffer (1981) and Mintzberg (1983) support the fact that power is empirically researchable and analyzable. According to Lucas (1987) and Mintzberg (1983), a political conceptualization of organizations provides a better understanding of organizational structure and processes.

"Power" comes from the Latin word "potere," the central meaning of which is "to be able" (Silber 1982). To define power is a difficult task. It is one of those concepts like leadership (Bass 1981) which can be discussed on whatever terms one wishes to discuss it. Reich (1982), for example, says that power is a thing that everybody wants the most that they can possibly have. Most organizational-theory related works on power refer to the classic definitions of Weber's
(1947) "ability of a person to carry-out his own will despite resistance" or Dahl's (1957) "ability of A to get B to do something that he would not otherwise do." Other social sciences like sociology and political science also make considerable use of the concept of power and they mostly refer to other definitions like Hobbes' (1962) "present means to secure some future good"; Nietzsche's (1968) "freedom, strength, self-overcoming, ability to help and the ability to harm"; Russell's (1938) "the production of intended effects"; and Mills' (1963) "the capacity to make and to carry out decisions even if others resist." These and other works are reviewed in two excellent books on the social-psychology of power by Ng (1980) and Siu (1979).

As mentioned above, most literature on power in organizations generally begins with a discussion of the confusion in defining what power is. The fact is that we all know what power is, but are having difficulty expressing it in words. Perrow (1970) asked managers about departmental power without defining it and measured the departmental rankings in terms of their power relative to others in the organization, with no problem at all.

For this study, Kanter's (1979) definition, "Power is . . . the ability to mobilize resources (human and material) to get things done," is used. The fact that Management and Leadership are manifestations of power is clear in the following definitions. Management is the ability to get
things done through other people (Follett 1941). Leadership is the ability to influence others (Bass 1981). Influence is a product of power difference between two persons or groups (Emerson 1962).

Another source of confusion in the literature concerns the distinctions between power, politics, authority, and influence. Pfeffer (1981) defines politics as all the activities related to gaining, using, and keeping power in organizations. Bacharach and Lawler (1980) have an excellent review on this issue. Their review leads one to think that authority and influence are the two major types of power; authority as power coming from the position, and influence as power coming from the person. This contradicts the generally-accepted proposition by Emerson (1962), that influence is a product of power. The process approach in this study accepts authority as legitimate power coming from the position, and influence as a product of power difference between two parties.

It is effective and certainly normal that managers engage in political behavior and use power in organizations (Kotter 1978; Pfeffer 1981). However, one of the questions in organizational behavior is how much political activity is beneficial and should be tolerated in organizations (Thibodeaux and Powell 1985). Excessive amounts of politics and unethical use of power threaten the self-interest of others and may even be detrimental to the organization.
(Christie and Geis 1970). Employee ingratiation (Ralston 1985) and organizational romances (Mainiero 1986) are two examples to this situation. Mintzberg (1983) calls highly politicized organizations "political arenas" and suggests that if not controlled it may lead to an organization's death. The above arguments and Lord Acton's assertion that "power corrupts, absolute power corrupts absolutely" suggests that high levels of politics lead to low levels of organizational performance. The other end of the continuum is lack of power and politics in an organization, which is almost impossible because of the fact that human organizations are political structures (Zaleznick 1970). Powerlessness of a manager leads to routine, rules-minded, and dictatorial management and ultimately to the disability to manage or lead (Bacharach and Lawler 1980; Crozier 1964; Kanter 1979; Kerr and Jermier 1978; Zaleznick and Ketza de Vries 1975). This possibly indicates a curvilinear relationship between politics and organizational effectiveness with moderate levels of politics leading to higher levels of effectiveness.

What are the types of power? French and Raven (1959) identify five types of power: (1) reward power—the ability to reward another person; (2) coercive power—the ability to punish another person; (3) legitimate power—the right to influence another person, the authority coming from the position; (4) expert power—the perception that a person has some expertise or special knowledge related to a particular
issue; and (5) referent power—the desire of other persons
to identify with or imitate the person based on the admira-
tion that they have of the person's traits. Bass (1981) and
Bacharach and Lawler (1980) group the first three types under
position power and the last two under person power. This
also leads to the two major bases or sources of power
(position-related and person-related) which are discussed in
a later section.

How can we measure power? There are two approaches.
First, Tannenbaum (1968) provides the concept of power-curves
which are lines on a two-dimensional diagram, which can be
used to measure a person's or department's power relative to
others in the organization. The horizontal axis presents the
actors (president, managers, workers, etc.) or departments
and the vertical axis presents a perceptual measure of the
power (very low, moderate, very high, etc.) of these actors.
An example is provided in Figure 1. The plotting of the
lines is derived from surveying the perceptions of all or
some of the participants in that particular organization.
The classic Perrow (1970) study of fourteen industrial
firms found that marketing departments had more power than
production departments in his sample, using the power-curve
approach.

Hollander (1964) provides a second measure of
interpersonal power, idiosyncratic credits, the measure of
how much a person can deviate from group norms. The more
credits you have, the more you can. Jacobson (1972) proposed that the use of power is like using your bank account; you can withdraw at times (power-episodes [Cobb 1984]) or you can deposit at times (building up idiosyncratic credits [Hollander 1964]). Andrew Young once said that "influence is like a savings account. The less you use it, the more you've got." Since the credits-approach does not have an operational definition yet, the first approach (power-curves) is still the more widely-used one.

How do managers acquire power? The more generally accepted path to power is for a person or group to focus on the sources of power and try to increase the power coming from each of those sources (Whetten and Cameron 1984). Pfeffer (1981) says that the other way is through political language and symbolic behavior. Siu (1979) says that "if you wish to be king, the obvious first step is to find out who
the kingmakers are." His book treats power as a craft, nothing scientific and measurable about it. The popular literature on power (Harragan 1977; Kennedy 1984; Korda 1975; Molloy 1975) also treats power as a craft, focuses more on office politics, and is basically comprised of how-to cookbooks for young professionals, which may lead them into more Machiavellian tactics.

How do managers keep their power? According to Pfeffer (1981) there are three causes of power perpetuation: organizational commitment to prior decisions, institutionalization of the decisions, and power itself. Power itself brings more power and also helps maintain power. Machiavelli (1981) says that it is more difficult to maintain power than to get it, and suggests that Princes should avoid being hated more than anything else. Siu (1979) says that "to the person of power, the retention of control is of the highest priority." The danger in maintaining one's power is that the welfare of the organization itself may be compromised.

How do managers use power? Bertrand Russell (1938) points out three ways: direct physical power, rewards and punishments, and influencing opinions. Kotter (1977) says that the use of power may be direct (i.e., face-to-face) or indirect (i.e., influencing others that may influence the target person). Pfeffer's (1981) model on power-use, however, is aimed at solving organizational conflicts,
and also predicting when power will be used in the
organizational decision making processes.

Is the amount of power in an organization or person
fixed? Those who subscribe to the philosophy of "whoever
fails to increase his power, must decrease it, if others
increase theirs" believe that it is fixed. Marxist theory
of social classes also assumes that it is fixed. Not
surprisingly, Mills (1963) concludes that the middle-class
in America is disappearing, the rich-class is getting
richer, and the poor-class is getting poorer. However,
research in organizational sciences has shown that the total
amount of power in an organization is not fixed (1968), the
power-curves may shift up and down continuously meaning that
the size of the pie is not fixed.

More recently, contingency approaches to power argue
that organizational power is situation-specific (Gray and
Ariss 1985; Mintzberg 1973; Mintzberg 1983; Mintzberg 1984;
Pfeffer 1981; Pfeffer and Salancik 1978). The amount,
meanings, content, and the manifestations of power change
depending on contextual factors like organizational age,
structure, technology, and so forth.

Can managers be powerless? Definitely yes. Kanter
(1979) says that all (lower-level, higher-level, staff,
etc.) managers are susceptible to powerlessness. She says
that some common symptoms are close-dictatorial supervision,
underproducing subordinates, turf protection, information
control, resistance to change, top-down communication, punishing, and focusing on short-term results. She also says that some common causes of powerlessness are routine-structured tasks, limited lines of information, blocked careers, easy replacement, and diminished lines of support. Kerr and Jermier's (1978) "substitutes for leadership" also produce powerlessness. Some of the substitutes are mature and able subordinates, routine-structured tasks, formalization, uniformity, inflexibility, lack of rewards-control, and distance from subordinates. Powerlessness definitely leads to a manager's inability to get the job done.

Does power have ethics? Aristotle (1976) mentions that power is a necessary feature of the "good," therefore it should be respected, whereas the Romans emphasized a political power which was independent of ethics. Machiavelli paid more attention, which is commonly not known, to the responsibilities of those with power to their people, and suggested that the Prince should learn not only to be good but to behave as the situation requires. Then came religions, with great criticism of power in a person because all power is said to be instituted by God. Monotheist religions argued that only God is more powerful and all persons have equal power with each other. Power in a person implies inequality, and religions are opposed to inequality among persons, even though they themselves have created institutions with hierarchial rankings of persons in those
institutions. The Islamic doctrine sees it as a choice between two evils; a ruler is better than no ruler at all. Much of the Christian opposition to Machiavelli, Hobbes, and Nietzsche is because they advocate the autonomy of state-craft from the moral and religious realm (Ng 1980) and treat it as a neutral concept. Russell (1938) discusses in detail the moral issues related to power and concludes that it is necessary to restrain power.

Ethics is not the study of morals (Garrett and Klonoski 1986) but rather it is the science of judging human ends and controlling the means. Business ethics is concerned with the relationship of business goals and means to human ends. As mentioned before, the purposes for which power is used and the way it is used can be ethical or unethical. Power itself is considered to be neutral in current literature. Brady (1986) describes ethics as a form of art. He says it has aesthetic components and it gives credibility to the phrase "the art of managing." Kelly, however, warns managers not to be destructive in using their power (Kelly 1987).

Thibodeaux and Powell (1985) suggest some tools of restraining (controlling) power-politics in an organization. They say that organizational codes of ethics, fair appraisal systems, appeal systems, and organizational consistency are techniques of keeping this phenomenon under control.

How about attitudes on power in the workplace today? These attitudes are considerably different between two
dominant employee groups, which are those who grew up in the 1960s (hippies) and those who grew up in the 1970s (yuppies). The 1960s generation grew up in defiance of authority and demanding equality for all, while the 1970s generation grew up accepting the class structure of the society and focusing more on appearance and conspicuous consumption. The movie "The Big Chill" symbolized the lost hope (of the 1960s generation) for equality. Even though they do not like it, the 1960s generation now too, accepts the power structure as a fact (Lapham 1988; "1968" 1988; Raelin 1987).

Apparent from the review above, power is inevitable in organizations and is a necessary antecedent to a manager's ability to get things done. Thus, he or she should learn how to acquire, keep, and use power. One of the main approaches to acquiring power is to focus on the sources of power and to try to increase the power coming from each one of those sources. In a later section there is a detailed review of the "sources-of-power literature" which is the basis for this study.

This study adopts a process view of power. Power is defined as the ability to mobilize resources to get things done. The next section elaborates on this approach to power in organizations.
Process View of Power

Roberts (1983) views power as an interactive process. The determinants of power (sources) lead to the transaction (power enactment), which leads to certain consequences (change in the indicators of power of participants). Porter, Allen, and Angle (1981) studied the upward influence in organizations and again proposed a process approach. The input stage in their model consists of variables (situation factors, opportunities, agent and target characteristics, agent-target relationship, agent belief system, and decision to influence) which lead to the application of the influence method, eventually leading to some perceived consequences of the influence attempt. Cobb (1984) also explains in detail the power episode, which was the central variable in the two studies mentioned above. Again the approach is a process model. Agent, target and the situational context are the input variables leading to the power episode, with certain consequences on the input variables in the aftermath of the episode.

Figure 2, explained in the following paragraphs, integrates the above review into a process model of power in organizations. The model is basically a combination of the models presented in Roberts (1983, 8), Porter, Allen, and Angle (1981, 136), Cobb (1984, 486), Whetten and Cameron (1984, 278), and Daft (1986, 407). This model presents the power of a person and the counterpower of other persons as
Fig. 2 Process Model of Power
the input variables, influence, power style, and power enactment as the process variables, and power redistribution as the major outcome of the process.

The model shows that the power of a person basically comes from two major sources, position-related sources and person-related sources. These sources are discussed in the next major section of this review.

The situational factors variable in the model includes intra-organizational variables, like the informal organization (Cobb 1984). This variable affects the agent's and the target's psychological orientations, political skills, power bases, and readiness and ability to act. In the model, the power differential between the agent and the target leads to the influence of the agent (Emerson 1962). Power styles affect the way this influence is used. Influence strategies mentioned in the literature are many. Roberts (1983) mentions seven different types of influence strategies, and Falbo (1977) mentions sixteen different types of influence strategies. Cobb (1984) focuses more on the episode character of power, which is the next variable on the model. He proposes that the episode itself is comprised of three stages; decision making, the behavior, and the resultant situation ending at the cessation of changes intended by the behavior.

The outcome of this process is basically a change in the distribution of power. Since power is, in part, a perceptual
concept, both real and perceptual changes in the indicators of power are the consequences of the episode. Roberts (1983) mentions four basic types of indicators (representational, reputational, symbolic, and indicators specific to the transaction) that are affected by the episode. Yukl (1981) also discusses the consequences (whether it is the subordinate's commitment, compliance, or resistance) of the use of each one of the five basic types of power by the manager.

One should not view all of this happening in a vacuum. Since organizations are open systems, this power process in the organization is certainly an element of the larger processes of organizational functioning. Thus, the external inputs to this power process are the organization's internal and external inputs and constraints. There are also some other internal and external outcomes regarding the larger organizational system.

The above explanation of the power process in an organization, is brief because the study focuses on two of the variables in the model. They are the position-related sources and person-related sources. The next section is a review of the literature on the sources of power in organizations.

Sources of Power

Most literature on the sources of power begins with a discussion of the five types of power. French and Raven (1959) propose reward, coercive, legitimate, expert, and
referent powers. The first three are grouped under position-related sources and the last two under person-related sources. Organization Theory (OT) studies focus more on the position sources and Organizational Behavior (OB) studies focus more on the person-related sources. The recent structural (position) sources of power literature is presented in Table 1. All of these studies are based on two excellent studies by Hickson et al. (1971) and Hinnings et al. (1974). They proposed the well-known "Strategic Contingencies Theory of Intra-organizational Power." The literature on the personal sources of power is usually an expansion of the last two sources that French and Raven (1959) proposed; referent and expert powers. The following section contains a discussion of studies mentioned in Table 1.

**Position Related**

Hickson et al. (1971) discuss the inadequacy of explaining power as a property of the individual, referring to the problem that Perrow (1970) had in studying power. The problem was the level of analysis in his study. Perrow had measured departmental power by asking about the power of an individual (the manager). Thompson (1967) said that the imbalanced reciprocal interdependencies between organizational sub-units give rise to power relationships.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centrality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Network Centrality</td>
<td>Affecting</td>
<td>Centrality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Criticality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Providing Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping with Uncertainty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coping with Uncertainty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitutability</td>
<td>Substitutability</td>
<td></td>
<td>Being irreplaceable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routinization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Process of Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Following this, Hickson et al. explained power as a property of the relationship, not of the actor.

Organizations have a power distribution between the interdependent sub-units, and the power of a sub-unit comes from the control a unit has on the strategic contingencies for other units. Within the networks of dependency, activities of one unit are affected by the activities of another sub-unit, each unit controlling contingencies for others. What makes the contingencies strategic is the intensity of control. Hickson et al. (1971) hypothesized that the more contingencies are controlled by a sub-unit, the greater its power within the organization.

According to the strategic-contingency theory, the control (a sub-unit has on the contingencies of other units) results from unspecified combinations of three basic variables; coping with uncertainty, substitutability, and centrality. Coping with uncertainty can be provided by three activities; prevention, information (i.e., forecasting), and absorption. Thompson (1967) suggests this as the primary function of the buffer units; absorbing uncertainty for the core units in an organization. Hickson et al. (1971) propose that there is a positive relationship between the effectiveness of coping and the power of the coping sub-unit.

Substitutability is the second variable leading to sub-unit power. The relationship is negative. The more the ability of other units to perform the activities of a
particular sub-unit, the less the power of that particular sub-unit. Centrality variable is the third variable and is explained by two hypotheses of Hickson et al. (1971). The first hypothesis is that if the workflow of a sub-unit is more pervasive (interacts with most other units and its presence is felt), it will have more power. The second hypothesis is that if the workflow of a unit is immediate to another (in direct contact, the one preceding), it will have more power over the other. Hinnings et al. (1974) report the positive results of an empirical test of these hypotheses.

Crozier (1964) reported his studies in a French tobacco company and how the maintenance workers had increased their power in the organization. They had basically decreased their substitutability by losing all the blueprints and maintenance directions, thus making everyone else dependent on them in cases of mechanical failures. They had also kept away from routinization of their task, individualized all jobs, and trained only a limited number of apprentices at a time. They had complete control over machine stoppages, a strategic contingency for all the other sub-units.

Astley and Sachdeva (1984), in their theoretical review on the structural sources of power, discuss three major sources: hierarchical authority, resource control, and network centrality. They say that most of the studies they reviewed paid little attention to hierarchical authority, the superior's right to issue commands and the subordinate's
belief that the superior has the right to exercise power by virtue of the position only. This inattention, they say, was caused by Emerson's (1962) explanation of power through dependence relationships. This same explanation, though, still impacts their last two major sources; resource control and network centrality.

The resource control variable can be explained easily, but the way Astley and Sachdeva (1984) expand it to also cover the coping with uncertainty dimension of the strategic contingencies theory is interesting. They make an assumption that resources are ultimately derived from the environment, citing Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) and Salancik and Pfeffer (1974). The external environment is a major source of uncertainty in this respect and regarding the capacity for dealing with such uncertainty as a valuable resource, Astley and Sachdeva (1984) conclude that this major variable, resource control, also covers the uncertainty-coping dimension too. The network centrality variable is essentially the same as in the theories of Hickson et al. (1971) and Thompson (1967).

Pfeffer (1981) explains the sources of power in organizations through the dependence theory. Emerson (1962) defines the power of A over B as equal to the dependence of B upon A. Pfeffer's (1981) list contains the following sources; providing resources, coping with uncertainty, being irreplaceable, affecting the decision process, power of
consensus, and the process of power acquisition. The first three sources are self-explanatory and have been explained previously in the above review. The fourth source, affecting the decision process, includes dimensions of control of the decision premises (goals, norms, rules, constraints involved), controlling the alternatives considered, and control of the information about the alternatives. Regarding the fifth source, consensus, Pfeffer (1981) argues that sub-units have a power advantage in the political struggle within organizations if they have a consensually-shared (within the sub-unit) easily articulated and understood position and perspective. Pfeffer also states that participation in the process of power acquisition, itself is a source of power. Since power is a perceptual construct, the unavoidable path to power is political behavior. Thus, political skills of an actor serve as a major source of power in this process. This last variable is very important to this study, since the basic research question here is whether or not the manager as a person is a source of power for the sub-unit.

In discussing sources of position power, Whetten and Cameron (1984) propose a five-item list: centrality, criticality, relevance, flexibility, and visibility. The first three are basically further elaborations on the centrality dimension proposed through the strategic contingency theory of sub-unit power by Hickson, et al. (1971). In Whetten and Cameron's (1984) discussion,
centrality refers to the position on the communication network and criticality refers to the position on the workflow process, of a person or subunit in an organization. Relevance refers to activities that are directly related to central objectives and issues in an organization, those that account most for the firm's ability to compete effectively in the industry. Whetten and Cameron (198481) argue that centrality, criticality, and relevance refer more to horizontal power (between lateral positions and activities) whereas flexibility and visibility refer more to vertical power in an organization. The flexibility variable explains the amount of discretion (decision-making autonomy) in a position or sub-unit. The visibility variable explains the number of people normally interacted with in the organization. All five dimensions are positively related to the amount of power a position or sub-unit has in the organization. Table 2 summarizes the review presented in this section.

Person Related

French and Raven (1959) mention two personal types of power: expert power and referent power. Expert power is based on information, and referent power is based on personal identification. Later studies on personal power are basically further elaborations on these two major types. These studies are mentioned in Table 3, and are discussed below.
TABLE 2

STRUCTURAL SOURCES OF POSITION-POWER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centrality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping with Uncertainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitutability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expertise is a strong base of power for a person, which may result from formal training or on-the-job experience. The person possessing knowledge on a particular issue, has power over others in cases related to this particular issue. Experience is difficult to operationally define. Campbell (1987) argues that experience is a construct with four major dimensions: (1) learning the business, (2) building the network, (3) institutional or professional socialization (learning the rules of the game), and (4) learning the axioms related to the cause-effect relationships in the field.

This is similar to the personal power sources mentioned by Olson and Phelps (1986): the information, connection, and expertise sources. Information power is based on access to important data, which could be gained through both formal and
### Table 3

**Sources of Person-Power**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>Information Connection</td>
<td>Referent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referent</td>
<td>Personal Attraction</td>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>Referent</td>
<td>Sensitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Socially Adapte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Articulate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Popular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extroverted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>Effort and Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the informal channels. Connection power is based on acquaintance with influential others. Luthans (1986) recently found that successful managers spent more than 20 percent of their time on networking activities. Campbell (1987) mentions that acquaintanceship should also include loyalty, respect, trust, and shared values in order to be effective. Expert power is based on the extent to which others attribute knowledge and expertise to the person. This basically is related to learning the business, the cause-effect relationships, the vocabulary, and the rules of the game in one's field.

The second major type mentioned by French and Raven (1959) is the referent power. Olson and Phelps (1986) say that referent power is based on personality, attractiveness, and admiration. Leadership theories on personal charisma have not been supported or reputed empirically. People follow charismatic leaders out of love, devotion, and enthusiasm (1972). The effect of personal attraction as a base for power may have several dimensions, such as agreeable behavior, physical appearance, likability, and friendship. These dimensions basically help a person to personally identify with another person, which ultimately gives the other person a power base in their relationship.

Personality is again one of those concepts which is difficult to define. In the literature about managerial effectiveness and success, most authors try to provide some
lists of personal characteristics of the successful managers (Larson 1983; McCall and Lombardo 1983; Ruderman 1987). Some of the most frequently-mentioned characteristics are sensitivity and care for others, honesty, integrity, stability, confidence, grace, and an ability to get along with all types of people. Those who "have it," have power because others identify with the person and want to do as he or she wishes. Allen et al. (1979) mention that the personal characteristics of effective political actors are articulate, sensitive, socially adept, competent, popular, extroverted, self-confident, aggressive, ambitious, and devious. On personality, every study reports a different list of characteristics. There is not a definite list agreed upon yet.

Whetten and Cameron (1984) mention a third and very important major personal base of power, effort. They say that extraordinary effort is viewed as a sign of commitment and dedication on the part of the person. Consequently, because of the need for cognitive dissonance reduction on the part of the superiors, it is generally rewarded. Mechanic (1962) hypothesized that the less effort and interest higher-ranking participants are willing to devote to a task, the more likely are lower participants to obtain power relevant to this task. Responsibilities are delegated to the lower participants, and some power is likely to accompany the responsibility. Effort reflects on one's boss's
performance as well, which is probably rewarded in return (Drucker 1986; Gabarro and Kotter 1980).

In summary, the personal sources of power can be grouped under three major items: expertise, personal attraction, and effort. Expert power and referent power will have further dimensions to be considered as seen in Table 4.

**TABLE 4**

**SOURCES OF PERSON-POWER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Attraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relationship Between the Two Sources**

The relationship between the two sources of power has not been clarified in the literature on organizational power. Most works on the power of a person admit that the position is a basic source, but not even one article on the power of an organizational unit mentions the person as a source of power for the unit. In the literature on the managerial job (Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler, and Weick 1970; Drucker 1954; Mintzberg 1973; Stewart 1967) it is mentioned that the person brings a lot to the position, and becomes an inseparable part
of the definition of that job. But the literature on power in organizations has ignored this relationship for too long. This gap seen in the power literature is whether the person is or is not a source of power for the unit he or she is managing. This is seen in Figure 3 which provides the theoretical framework for the study.

The literature on executive succession comes closest to explaining the question discussed above. Researchers in this area are interested in explaining the antecedents and the consequences of executive succession, removal of one executive and the selection of another. Basically the question is replacement from where: inside or outside? Selection of an outsider reflects a desire for change and an insider for stability. The concern that relates to this study is the effects of succession on intra-organizational power. Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) argue that executive selection is dictated by an organization's environment. Environment affects the internal power distribution which affects the selection of the new executive, which in turn affects the new internal power distribution. Pfeffer and Salancik also mention some problems in this relationship. Because the environment is defined by existing executives, it is subjectively defined. This may lead to sub-unit power to be stabilized by continually defining the environmental problems in similar ways to the past through internal selections. Dalton and Kesner (1985) found that firms in a mid-range of
Fig. 3 Theoretical Framework for Sources of Power

economic performance hired outsiders. Poor performers saw self-interest in danger from an outsider selection and high-performers did not see any reason for a change strategy. Reinganum (1985) found that the selection of an outsider and the disposition of the predecessor, in large firms, indicated a change strategy to be perceived by the stockholders.

It is apparent from the above discussion that an executive change has significant effects on a sub-unit's power (not necessarily on its performance). Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) mention that a redistribution of intra-organizational power is inevitable. Obviously the person is a source of sub-unit power in an organization. This study is concerned with whether or not this relationship exists,
rather than how it does. Answers to the secondary question of how, can be hypothesized as the higher the person ranks on personal sources of power the more he or she will contribute to the total sub-unit power.

Conclusion

Power is the ability to get things done and there are two basic sources of power in an organization; position-related and person-related sources. The above review shows that an individual's power in an organization comes from both of these sources. However, the literature skips the person-related sources for a sub-unit's power in an organization. That is the research question of this study. It is hypothesized that an organizational unit's power also comes from both of the two major sources; position-related sources and person-related sources.
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CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Design

This study is based on a survey of the perceptions of employees regarding the power of their departments and managers in a manufacturing company. An exploratory, case study design was used. The literature review identified the fact that the manager is ignored in the literature as a source of power for the department. This study addresses that issue. Methodological rigor is not a major concern in this exploratory investigation. The purpose is to explain and understand the phenomenon at this stage. Hypotheses generated as a result of this study can be tested in future research.

The nonexperimental nature of the research precludes causal inferences about the variables under study. The purpose of this research is to study the relationship between the two major variables, position-related and person-related sources of power in organizations. No attempt is made to establish a cause-effect relationship.

Variables and Definitions

The variables under investigation can be grouped under two major items, position-related sources of power and
person-related sources of power in organizations. The purpose of the study is to explain the relationship between these two variables, and the basic research question is whether the manager is a source of power for an organizational unit. The major variables of the study can be defined as follows:

**Power** is the ability to mobilize things (material, people) to get things done.

**Position Sources** are those aspects of the position and the nature of the task that increase the power of the position-holder.

**Person Sources** are personal characteristics of the position-holder that increase his/her power.

These two basic sources consist of many dimensions. They are listed on Figure 3, and are defined in Chapter I.

**Instrument**

The instrument used in this study is designed to measure the perceptions of organizational participants of their department's power and manager's power in the organization. In measuring power, the most common method used in the literature is the control-graph method. This technique is not appropriate for the research question in this study, because it treats power as an aggregate variable and does not deal with the sources of power. Another approach is to ask organizational participants point-blank
to rank organizational units or persons in terms of their power in the organization. This technique is included in the instrument developed for this research. However, this too falls short of explaining the individual sources of power. Another limitation in ranking comes from the extent of awareness that organizational participants have of powerful individuals outside their own sub-unit. Higher-level managers are more knowledgeable about powerful participants, and the above approach is used with them in this study. The managers' responses also provide a valuable comparison to the responses of the lower-level employees. The individual sources of power are assessed basically through an opinion questionnaire with items related to individual sources. A five item Likert scale is used for the responses. The instrument is provided in Appendix I. An example item (Q #13, Employees Questionnaire) is presented below. In scoring the responses, strongly agree was given a value of five while strongly disagree was given a value of one.

My department is powerful. (Check one)

____ Strongly Agree
____ Agree
____ Neutral
____ Disagree
____ Strongly Disagree

This instrument is developed basically using the definitions provided for the variables of the study in Chapter I. This approach in developing the questionnaire
provides both face and content validity for the instrument. Face validity is concerned with whether an instrument appears on-the-face to be valid. The literature review on power in organizations presented earlier produced an itemized list of the sources of power, which can be assumed to be the dimensions of the "whole" concepts of position-power and person-power. The definitions are used as a basis for scale construction. Content validity is evaluated by how well the items in a scale sample the contents of the construct to be measured. It is the degree to which the contents of the scale correspond to the contents of the construct. The instrument developed here meets the requirements of both face and content validity.

Reliability and Validity

Reliability is the degree to which a scale yields consistent scores in the measurement of a variable. Test-retest, equivalent forms, and split-half are the major methods of estimating reliability. None of these techniques are applicable in this study because the measurement is not repeated and the items on the questionnaire are not aggregated into any scale. Reliability of the single items is assumed, and inter-item consistency is not a concern for this study.

Validity of a scale is the degree to which it measures what it is supposed to measure. Face validity is the weakest
form and it basically asks if the instrument appears on-the-face to be measuring the construct. The instrument here appears to do so. It contains all of the sources of power identified in the literature review. Since this study is a descriptive (what is) one rather than a prescriptive (what should be) study, no performance data are collected and no predictions are made in this study. Thus, predictive and concurrent validities are not concerns of this project. However, content and construct validities are the two major validity issues here.

The instrument development process described in an earlier section explains how the scale sampled the contents of the construct being measured. The literature review indicates that the items included in the scale correspond to the dimensions of the construct. However, there is always the fact that the person making-up the scale chooses items that seem to him or her to have content validity. In this case, all the dimensions identified through the literature review are included in the instrument to insure a high degree of content validity.

Construct validity relates to the extent to which the scale represents an adequate operational definition of the construct that is being measured. Campbell (1976) mentions that the establishment of content validity, and using multitrait-multimethod matrix make useful contributions to construct validity. The multitrait-multimethod matrix
assumes that different methods of measuring the same trait should yield similar results (Campbell and Fiske 1959). The instrument used in this study measures the same constructs (departments' and their managers' power in the organization) using three samples (subordinates, managers themselves, and superiors of the department managers) each using different questionnaires. Results are presented in the next chapter.

Pilot Study

One of the questionnaires was pretested in a validation study to see if it had discriminant validity, whether it was able to capture the differences between different samples.

The employee questionnaire was given to nine working students who were taking night classes at a Texas university. The students volunteered to provide the pilot-study data. The nine students worked at nine different large corporations in different industries. The companies were from diverse industries including electronics, telecommunications, utilities, oil and gas, engineering consultants, and service industries. The students were mostly with engineering and technical staff departments in their organizations. Each student passed out five surveys to people in his or her department. A total of forty-five questionnaires were returned. Because these nine departments are from nine different companies and nine different industries, the responses to the questionnaire items were expected to be
different between the cells, especially on the structural variables.

According to Campbell and Fiske (1959), discriminant validity implies that traits that are truly distinct from one another should lead to different results if measured by the same method. In this validation study a chi-square test was used. The chi-square procedure tests for differences among groups and is an appropriate test for ordinal and interval data. The differences found in the pilot study were significant enough, especially for structural sources, as reported in Table 5, providing discriminant validity for the questionnaire.

The results on the person-related items indicate that the nine different groups had similar perceptions about their managers. The fact that most of the subjects were technical staff, may explain the similarity of their responses on this dimension. On their managers' power, the instrument was again able to capture the differences.

Sample

Employees of a medium-sized manufacturing company in Texas provided the data for the study. The company is a division of a large corporation based in another state. The company produces polyurethane parts through injection molding or casting, to be used in a variety of industries including
### TABLE 5

**PILOT STUDY RESULTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criticality</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrality</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Resources</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absorb Uncertainty</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitutability</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical Authority</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Process</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Attraction</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My dept. powerful</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mgr. powerful</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( n = 45, \# \text{groups} = 9, \text{cell size} = 5 \)

The automotive and oil and gas industries. Including the General Manager, the company employs a total of sixty-nine employees. Forty-four employees responded to the questionnaire, giving a 64 percent return rate. The distribution of the sample is provided in Table 6.

There are four layers of hierarchy in the company organization: General Manager, Managers, Supervisors, Employees. Supervisors in both the plant and the office are not separated from the employees because the focus is on departments and department managers. There are eight
TABLE 6
THE SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Return Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plant Employees</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Employees</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Data Collection

After the initial contact with the General Manager, questionnaires were distributed to the participants along with a stamped-addressed envelope. Participants were asked to fill out the questionnaire at home and mail them directly to the researcher. Anonymity and confidentiality were guaranteed by two memorandums attached to the questionnaires, one from the General Manager and one from the researcher. After one week, a reminder was placed in each employee's mailbox at the company.
Data Analysis

SPSS-X procedures were used in analyzing the data. Frequencies, correlations, and chi-square statistics are reported in the next chapter.
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CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

This chapter presents the results of the study. First a description of the sample is provided. Then the perceptions about departments' and managers' power are provided. The next section contains a discussion of whether the results support the primary hypothesis of this study: "The manager as a person affects department power." Following this, the secondary hypothesis "There is a rank of sources of power" is discussed. Other results are presented in the final section of this chapter.

Description of the Sample

The sample size is forty-four, which includes seventeen office employees, nineteen plant employees, seven managers and one General Manager. The company employs sixty-nine people and 64% participated in the study. Demographic characteristics of the sample are provided in Table 7.

Perceptions on Department Power

The perceptions of the employees about their departments' power and structural sources are presented in Table 8. Each cell in the table presents the responses of employees in a particular department. The figures in Table 8 indicate an average score that the employees assigned to
TABLE 7
SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Characteristics</th>
<th>Office Employees</th>
<th>Plant Employees</th>
<th>Managers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure (Avg. Yrs.)</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (Avg. Yrs.)</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (Male %)</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (Finished College %)</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=17</td>
<td>n=19</td>
<td>n=7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

these items, over a five point scale, five being high and one being low. For example, the 3.80 score for the Accounting "Dept. Power" is the average of five responses to the statement "My department is powerful." Specifically, each cell in the table represents the average response of employees in a certain department. Due to the small cell-size for the departments other than the production department, these results may not be valid for some of the dimensions. The obvious cases relate to the criticality and relevance dimensions. Theoretically, marketing departments should not rank high on those dimensions. Marketing departments are not at a critical point in the work-flow of a manufacturing organization, and they physically do not add much to the production of the final product. The marketing employees in this sample gave their departments the highest score on these dimensions. The 5.00 score for the Engineering department on the aggregate variable "My department is powerful," is probably
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power and Sources</th>
<th>ACCT</th>
<th>ENGR</th>
<th>LAB</th>
<th>MKTG</th>
<th>PERS</th>
<th>PROD.</th>
<th>PRODUCTION</th>
<th>QUALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>5.00*</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=1</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>5.00*</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.00*</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=0</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>5.00*</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>4.00*</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>4.00*</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=19</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.66*</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>5.00*</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=0</td>
<td>4.40*</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=1</td>
<td>4.40*</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>4.20*</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>5.00*</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each cell presents the responses of employees in a particular department. Scores indicate an average over a five-point scale, 5 = high and 1 = low. *Indicates the highest score on each row.
biased too. Because there was only one response from the Engineering department. The chi-square test, in fact, failed to show any significant difference between the departments on all of the dimensions. For example, the cross-tabulation of "department" by "my department is powerful" produced a chi-square of 22.74 at .20 significance (df = 18), and by "my manager is powerful" produced a chi-square of 18.17 at .44 significance (df = 18).

However, when the office departments are combined into one group (n = 17), then more meaningful results are seen. They are presented in Table 9. The results presented in Table 9 are compatible with the core-buffer department characteristics conceptualized by Thompson (1967).

Table 9 indicates that the office personnel (buffer units) perceive their departments as ranking low in criticality and relevance and as easily substitutable compared to the production department (core unit). Buffer units in an organization generally are not at a critical point in the workflow, they do not contribute to the final product as much as the core units do, and other departments can substitute for them easier than substituting for a core unit. The buffer departments (office) scored higher than the core department on centrality, visibility, providing resources, absorbing uncertainty, flexibility, hierarchical position, political participation, and consensus. According to the responses, the office departments were at a central
point in the information flow, they were more visible to top management, they dealt with external issues, and their tasks were not very structured. Participants perceived the buffer units to rank higher on the hierarchical ladder, to participate more in the decision-making process, and to have more within-department consensus on issues, compared to the core department.

### TABLE 9

**PERCEPTIONS ABOUT DEPARTMENTS: COMPARISON OF OFFICE AND PLANT EMPLOYEES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power and Sources</th>
<th>Office (buffer) n=17</th>
<th>Plant (core) n=19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criticality</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.73*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrality</td>
<td>4.11*</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.63*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>4.23*</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Resources</td>
<td>4.11*</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absorbing Uncertainty</td>
<td>3.29*</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Substitutability</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>3.05*</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical Position</td>
<td>4.11*</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Participation</td>
<td>3.88*</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>3.94*</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. Power</td>
<td>3.88*</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scores indicate an average over a five-point scale, 5 = high and 1 = low.
*Indicates the higher score on each row.

The managers ranked departments in terms of their relative power as compared to each other. The results from the seven "manager questionnaires" are presented in Table 10.
This ranking does not agree with the ranking at the bottom row of Table 8. Managers ranked the Accounting department as the most powerful, but it was not even in the top four departments in the employees' rankings. This indicates that the subordinates and the managers have different perceptions about departments' power. The General Manager provided another ranking of departments in terms of their power, which for confidentiality purposes is not disclosed here. His ranking was also different. In evaluating department power, the three groups (subordinates, department managers, top management) had three different perceptions. In the next section, results show that their perceptions of manager power are also different.

**Perceptions on Manager Power**

The perceptions of employees about their managers' power and personal qualities are presented in Table 11. Each
cell in the table presents the responses of employees in a particular department. The figures in Table 11 indicate an average score that the employees assigned to these items over a five-point scale, five being high and one being low. For example, the 3.80 score for the Accounting Manager's power is the average of five responses to the question "My manager is powerful." Again, due to the small sample-size in each cell, the results may not be valid for some of the dimensions. The following results can be seen in Table 11:

1. All managers ranked above the medium score (3.00).
2. The scores on individual dimensions are generally higher than the score for the response to an aggregate statement "My manager is powerful."
3. The scores for "People in my department like my manager" are generally higher than scores for "Top management likes my manager."

Employees generally agreed that their managers were powerful. The managers scored high on both overall person power and also its sources. A medium response of 3.00 is a neutral response on the five-point scale used. Anything below 3.00 would be a "disagree" response which means the manager did not have power or a particular source of it. Managers in this company were perceived by their subordinates to have power. All managers ranked above the medium score (3.00).
### Table 11

**Employees' Perceptions of Manager Power**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power and Sources</th>
<th>ACCT</th>
<th>ENGR</th>
<th>IAB</th>
<th>MKTG</th>
<th>PERS</th>
<th>PROD. DEV.</th>
<th>PRODUCTION</th>
<th>QUALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.75*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>4.60*</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Attraction of Subordinates</td>
<td>4.60*</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Attraction of Top Management</td>
<td>4.20*</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.00*</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Power</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.00*</td>
<td>4.00*</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.00*</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each cell presents the responses of employees in a particular department. Scores indicate an average over a five-point scale, 5 = high and 1 = low. *Indicates the highest score on each row.
The scores of the individual sources were lower than the aggregate power score. This was expected for two reasons. First, a manager does not necessarily score high on all sources. A manager may score higher on some of the dimensions, but not necessarily all of them. The second reason is that some of the subordinates are not able to distinguish between person-power and the overall (person plus position) power of a manager, hence giving a high score to the item "My manager is powerful."

The third item mentioned above shows that subordinates ranked "personal attraction of subordinates" higher than "personal attraction of top management" for their managers. This is also expected because the subordinates are detached from the situation. They do not have the chance to observe their manager's relationship with the General Manager all the time. This lack of information pushes the score down rather than up, on that dimension.

The managers also ranked themselves in terms of their personal power. This is provided in Table 12, which is a summary of seven manager responses.

According to the managers, the Accounting Department manager ranked highest in terms of person-power. The subordinates ranked Engineering, Laboratory, and Product Development managers higher than the Accounting manager. This indicates that the two groups have different perceptions of the same concept. Two reasons for this can be argued.
TABLE 12
MANAGERS’ RANKING OF MANAGERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most powerful</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd powerful</td>
<td>Laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd powerful</td>
<td>Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th powerful</td>
<td>Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th powerful</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th powerful</td>
<td>Product Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th powerful</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th powerful</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first reason is the lack of information on the subordinates' part. The second reason is the fact that these two groups are looking at something from two different hierarchical perspectives, which may lead to a difference in the scores.

The General Manager also provided a ranking of the personal power of the managers, which for confidentiality purpose, is not disclosed here. The result is that all three groups (subordinates, department managers, top management) had different perceptions about the personal power of the department managers.

**Primary Hypothesis: "Manager Affects Department Power"**

This study shows that there is a relationship between manager power and department power for this sample. The results of the chi-square procedure are presented in Figure
4. Kendall's Tau B is a more appropriate measure of association here, since the scales were ordinal. Tau B is .27, significant at .03 level. This means that person power and position power are correlated. There is a relationship between these two variables. They affect each other.

The direction of the relationship is of concern here. The literature review given in Chapter II indicates that mutual causation should be the rule. In Figure 4, both Lambda score and Somers' D score are lower (.06 and .27, respectively) when manager power is the predictor. These scores are both measures of association. This means that for this sample, department power predicts manager power more than manager power predicts department power. But, the predictive quality of the manager power is still present.

In the questionnaire, the subjects were asked to evaluate each source of person power in terms of how much it contributes to department power. Their perceptions were also asked on whether manager power contributed to department power. The responses ranged from a low of one to a high of five. The mean score from thirty-six employee questionnaires are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>1. My manager's expertise contributes to my department's power.</th>
<th>4.13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. My manager's being informed contributes to my department's power.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### My Mgr. is powerful

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, N = Neutral, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree

**Statistics:**

- Chi-square = 16.14  Significance = .064
- Pearson's R = 0.36  Significance = .015
- Kendall's Tau B = 0.27  Significance = .030

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Symmetric</th>
<th>With Dept.</th>
<th>With Mgr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambda</td>
<td></td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somers' D</td>
<td></td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>.273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 4** Cross-Tabulation of Department Power with Manager Power
3. My manager's being liked by subordinates contributes to my department's power.  
   3.80

4. My manager's being liked by top management contributes to my department's power.  
   3.80

5. My manager's efforts (working hard) contributes to my department's power.  
   3.83

6. My manager's power contributes to my department's power.  
   3.91

All scores are above the median 3.00, which means that the respondents agree that the manager as a person contributes to department power. Results indicate that the respondents perceive the manager's expertise as the highest contributing factor, and effort the second highest contributing factor.

To conclude anything about this hypothesis based on a case study would only be speculative. One can only say that for this sample, there is strong support for the hypothesis.

Secondary Hypothesis: "There is a rank of sources of power"

Structural Sources

In ranking the structural sources of department power, two things were helpful. The first was the correlation coefficients. The second was an evaluation by the General Manager. Department power scores correlated highly with scores on four of the structural sources. Political participation, hierarchical position, absorbing uncertainty, and visibility had the highest correlation coefficients.
respectively. Correlations with the other sources were not significant. All of the correlations are presented in Table 13.

**TABLE 13**

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN DEPARTMENT POWER AND STRUCTURAL SOURCES:
Subordinate Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Pearson's R with Dept. Power</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criticality</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrality</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.026*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Resources</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absorbing Uncertainty</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitutability</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = significance ≤ .05
** = significance ≤ .01

The second factor that helped in ranking the structural sources is the General Manager's responses. His rankings of departments and managers are shown in Table 14. In this table, the names of the top three departments and the top three managers are concealed by the labels A, B, C or X, Y, Z for confidentiality purpose. The table indicates that one can rank the structural sources in terms of their contribution to departmental power.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Dept. Power</th>
<th>Centrality</th>
<th>Criticality</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Flexibility</th>
<th>Viability</th>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>Connection</th>
<th>Personal Attraction</th>
<th>Effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Dept. A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y-Z</td>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Dept. B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Dept. C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 14: GENERAL MANAGER'S RANKINGS**
The General Manager's response indicates that criticality is the most important factor contributing to his ranking of department power. Centrality and visibility were the second and the third important sources, respectively. Relevance and flexibility had some affects on department power but ranked fourth and fifth, respectively.

This discussion indicates that the subordinates and the General Manager think differently in terms of the effects of each structural source. Nevertheless, both parties gave some indication that one can rank the sources in terms of their contribution to power.

**Person Related Sources**

For the manager's power, the correlation coefficients between person power and personal sources were calculated. These correlations are presented in Table 15.

**TABLE 15**

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN MANAGER POWER AND PERSON RELATED SOURCES: Subordinate Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Pearson's R with Manager Power</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Attraction of Subordinates</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Attraction of Top Management</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** = Significance ≤ .01
The correlations in Table 15 indicate that the subordinates' responses to "manager's power" question are significantly affected by two factors. The manager being liked by top management was the most important factor. The manager having critical information about the organization was the second most important factor. This indicates that one can rank the sources of person power in terms of their contribution to a manager's power.

The General Manager's rankings presented in Table 14 indicate a different ranking of the personal attributes in terms of their contribution to a manager's power. According to the General Manager, the most important source of personal power in an organization is connection with top management. Constant personal interaction increases the power of a department manager. According to the General Manager, the second and the third most important sources are the personal attraction and information sources. These two sources were also ranked high by the subordinates. The General Manager's responses indicate that expertise and effort are the least important sources of power for a manager. This conflicts with the subordinates' responses discussed. Nevertheless, there is still a ranking of the sources.

As mentioned earlier, for the test of the primary hypothesis, the employees were asked about their perceptions of each of the personal attributes and their contributions. Their responses to those questions indicate another ranking
of the person-related sources of power. The ranking provided below is different from the General Manager's. According to the subordinates, the most important source of personal power is expertise, and the second is effort. These ranked at the bottom in the General Manager's responses. The subordinates ranked personal attraction as the third and information as the fourth most important sources of personal power.

**Ranking the Sources**

The rankings of the employees and the rankings of the managers are not combined into a grand list for several reasons. The first is that it would be like adding apples and oranges. Like the grasp of a blind man, each party is describing a different aspect of the elephant in these questionnaires. Second, the study is only a case study and the samples and sub-samples are too small (i.e., General Manager n = 1) to make generalizations. The third reason is that the questionnaire was not designed with this purpose in mind. The primary purpose was to establish a relationship between position and person powers, rather than to explore the contribution of the sources.

Still, there is every indication in these results that the sources of power can be ranked. As a result, one can say that this study supports the hypothesis that there is a rank of the sources of power. There is also support for a
contingency approach in this endeavor, since the perceptions of different subgroups were different in this study.

Other Results

The demographic variables for this sample presented some other interesting results. A Pearson's $R$ correlation procedure gave the coefficients presented in Table 16.

**TABLE 16**

**OTHER CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pearson's $R$</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education with</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. Power</td>
<td>-.4006</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>.5141</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>-.3050</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>-.2659</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers. Attn.</td>
<td>-.4292</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Sat.</td>
<td>-.4238</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure with</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Sat.</td>
<td>-.2882</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex with</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers. Attn.</td>
<td>.3813</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.3689</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Satisfaction with</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. Power</td>
<td>.4855</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>.3888</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>.3231</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correlations show that the more-educated employees perceived their departments to have low power, to be low in the company hierarchy, to have low participation in company politics (decision-making processes). They perceived their jobs to be flexible (having autonomy) but they were not
satisfied with their jobs, and they did not like their managers.

Those employees with longer tenure in this company were not satisfied with their jobs. The reason may be due to a very flat organizational structure with few promotional opportunities. Another interesting finding was that female employees liked their managers more than male employees did. Education may be the confounding variable in this relationship since females in this sample were less educated, and the educated employees did not like their managers.

These correlations indicate that the employees who perceived their departments as powerful and participating in the company's political processes were also satisfied with their jobs. The other score is manager expertise: "My manager knows his job well." Those employees who perceived their managers to be high on this attribute were also satisfied with their jobs. However, the causal directions cannot be established in this study. The job satisfaction scale was just one question, "How satisfied are you with your job," with a five-item response range between very satisfied and very dissatisfied.

Summary of the Results

The data analysis provided some anticipated and some unexpected results. Summaries of these results are presented in this section.
The questionnaire used for this study was able to discriminate between the core unit (production department) and the buffer units (other departments) in terms of their structural qualities in a way that is theoretically sound. This provides the construct validity to the instrument used. Departmental power can be studied using this instrument.

The questionnaire was able to discriminate between the department managers in terms of their power and also their personal qualities. Person power can be studied using this instrument. This instrument can be used to study power and its sources in organizations, since position and person are the two major types and sources of power in organizations. This can lead to a conceptual analysis of the construct "power" and its dimensions. Maybe an operational definition is possible.

The results indicate that there is a mutual influence between department power and manager power. These two variables in the study were highly correlated. The opinions of the employees were in support of the hypothesized relationship: "Manager affects department power." This study, however, cannot provide any causal inferences. This is due its design as an exploratory case study. Thus, the instrument cannot be used to test directional hypotheses on the relationship between department power and manager power. A survey of opinions is not appropriate for that purpose.
The results indicate that the perceptions of the three different hierarchical levels (subordinates, department managers, top management) are different regarding the power of departments and their managers. The cause of the differences is not discussed in this study.

The results indicate that a ranking of the different sources of power in organizations can be made. Although this study fails to provide any concrete rankings, a further refined instrument may do the job. The rankings depend on whose perception it is. The three hierarchical levels in the sample provided different rankings of sources of power.

The demographic variables age, sex, education, and tenure present some interesting results. They seem to affect one's perceptions of department power and manager power in organizations.
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CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

This exploratory research was aimed at finding answers to the research question, "Is the manager a source of power for the organizational unit he or she is managing?" The literature on power includes position-related and person-related sources of power in an organization, and is very specific on including both sources for the power of a person. However, the literature on the power of a department in an organization leaves out one of the major sources (the person) and focuses only on the position-related sources. This gap in the literature provided the problem for this research.

In this research, a survey of the employees of a medium-sized manufacturing company provided data. A total of forty-four employees, 64 percent, participated in the study. Perceptions of the employees regarding department power and manager power and the sources of power were the primary data collected. Data came from three hierarchial levels within the company: subordinates \( n = 36 \), department managers \( n = 7 \), and the General Manager \( n = 1 \). A different questionnaire was used for each of these groups.

The significance of the study is due to two factors. The first is the research question itself. The manager has
been ignored as a source of power in literature on power in organizations. The literature on general management has indicated that the influence is both ways for a long time, but the literature on power did not. The second factor adding to the significance of this study is the fact that it is an "empirical" study of power in a "manufacturing" organization. This is not too common in the literature, because of the unwillingness of companies to participate in research on power.

The study is a descriptive one. It focuses on "what is," rather than on "what should be." The statistics used are non-parametric. Causal inferences are not made in this research because of the non-experimental design. The next section discusses the results of this study.

**Conclusions and Discussion**

This section discusses the results summarized in the previous chapter. The most important result is that the study supports the model provided in Figure 3. The model argues that the manager of a sub-unit in an organization is an important source of power for that sub-unit. Other conclusions are presented below.

The questionnaire used for this study was able to discriminate between the core unit (production department) and the buffer units (other departments) of this company, in terms of structural characteristics. For example, the
production department ranked high on criticality and relevance dimensions (place in the work flow and contribution to the final product) and ranked low on the flexibility dimension (autonomy in the work procedures). This result is theoretically correct (Thompson 1967), which also provides construct validity to the instrument used. Thus, departmental power in organizations can be studied using this instrument.

The questionnaire was also able to discriminate between the department managers in this organization, in terms of their personal power and its sources. The managers' ranking on personal power did not necessarily correspond to the ranking of departments in terms of departmental power. For example, the bottom rows of Table 8 (employees' perceptions of department power) and Table 11 (employees' perceptions of manager power) do not give corresponding rankings. The managers' ranking of departments (Table 10) and managers (Table 12) also did not match corresponding managers and departments. This indicates that the instrument is measuring what it is supposed to measure, manager power in one section and department power in another. This supports the construct validity of the instrument. Thus managers' power in organizations can be studied using this instrument.

Being able to study these two types and major sources of power (position-related and person-related) makes this instrument an appropriate and valid one to use in research
on power in organizations. The results of this research, over time, may lead to a better conceptual analysis of the construct "power" and its dimensions. An operational definition of "power" would be the most significant outcome of such research.

The results of this study also indicate a mutual influence between department power and manager power. These two variables of the study were highly correlated (Pearson's R was 0.36, significant at .015 level). Other than the correlation coefficient, there were other indicators supporting the mutual influence. The other statistical measures of association presented in Figure 4 also indicate mutual influence between department power and manager power.

The major hypothesis of the study was that the manager affects department power. This is supported by the mutual influence found in this study, between manager power and department power. The subordinates in the sample were also asked for their opinions on this question. The responses were presented in Chapter IV. The scores for the aggregate power of the manager and the dimensions of it were all above the median 3.00, which means that the subordinates agree that their manager affects their department's power.

This study, however, cannot conclude on a causal inference. This is due to its design as an exploratory case study. Thus, the instrument used in this study cannot be used to test directional hypotheses on the relationship
between department power and manager power. A survey of opinions and perceptions is not appropriate for that purpose. The results for the hypotheses in this study are not generalized.

The secondary hypothesis in this study was that one can rank the sources of power in terms of their contribution to a department's power, or to a manager's power. This study provides strong support for the hypothesis, even though it failed to provide any concrete rankings. This failure is due to three factors. The first reason is that the design of the study, a post-test only case study, is not appropriate for this question. The second reason is that the instrument was not designed with this sole purpose in mind. And the third reason is that the rankings of the sources of power also depend on who answers the question. The three hierarchical levels in the sample (subordinates, managers, General Manager) provided different perceptions on ranking the sources of power.

This difference in the perceptions of the three hierarchical levels in the organization is interesting. Their rankings of departments and managers in terms of their power are also different. Two reasons can be argued for this difference. The first reason is the difference in the amount of information each level has on a particular department's or manager's power, or its sources. The second reason is the fact that these three groups are looking at something
from three different hierarchical perspectives, which may lead to a difference in their evaluations. This difference in the perceptions of the three different hierarchical levels was one of the more significant results of the study.

The demographic variables age, sex, education, and tenure presented some interesting results, too. They seem to affect a subject's perceptions of power. The results seem to indicate that older, male, more educated, and longer tenured subjects perceive less power in their departments and managers. These variables and relationships provide interesting research questions for further research on power in organizations.

As mentioned before, the most important conclusion from this study is that the manager affects department power. The literature on power in organizations has ignored the manager as a source of power for an organizational unit for too long. This study fills that gap in the literature.

Recommendations for Further Research

This study, being an exploratory investigation, is not conclusive on any of the results presented. The area of study "Power in Organizations" is a new area just discovering its constructs and relationships. The fact that this study is an empirical investigation is a significant contribution. Each one of the results mentioned in this study can provide a research question for further study. The more
important recommendations, however, are related to theory building in this new area of research. These recommendations are presented below.

1. The criterion problem needs to be researched; what is power? An operational definition is needed. Reaching objective truth in this endeavor may be difficult (impossible?) but even if it is socially constructed, the theoretical construct and conceptual vocabulary to guide research and make the study of organization phenomena possible is still needed (Astley 1985).

2. Worries of methodological rigor should be pushed aside. Most organizational research fails to produce solid knowledge about organizational phenomena due to an over-emphasis on measurement, data sources, methods of data analysis, and generally a lack of courage to use qualitative and innovative methodologies (Dubin 1982; Morgan and Smircich 1980; Van Maanen 1979). There are new and imaginative methodologies available for this purpose. For example, phenomenological research considers "lived experiences" of subjects (Sanders 1982), and emic research perspectives (borrowed from anthropology) describe phenomena from the native's (insider) point-of-view (Morey and Lughans 1984). These approaches will be able to explain why in this study three levels of hierarchy had different perceptions of departments' and managers' power.
3. The theories of power and its sources should be simplified. Power in organizations is a complex phenomena, but its study need not be in complex, difficult to understand conceptual jargon. Simple, a-few-items lists of dimensions or sources will be a great help for research in the area.

4. Perhaps a contingency approach is best. In this study hierarchical level, age, sex, tenure, and education affected the subjects' perceptions. To establish the effects of these demographic variables, again, much empirical research is needed.

Overall Conclusion

The results of this research, presented in detail in Chapter IV and discussed in this chapter, are valid for the sample used in this study. However, each one of the items in this summary can become a research hypothesis for a new study. In pursuing knowledge about power in organizations, researchers need to push aside methodological rigor and use their imagination to its limits.

The most important result of this study is the support it provided to the theoretical model, presented in Figure 3. The model argues that the manager is an important source of power for a department in an organization.
REFERENCES


APPENDIX:
THE QUESTIONNAIRES
TOP MANAGEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

YOUR RESPONSES ARE COMPLETELY CONFIDENTIAL.

1. How long have you worked for this company? ____________________

2. What department are you in? ________________________________

3. What is your age? ________________________________

4. Your Sex? Male _____ Female _____

5. Education: Grade School __________________________
   High School __________________________
   Some College __________________________
   College degree _______________________

PLEASE READ CAREFULLY:

This questionnaire is about Power: Power of departments and Power of managers in an organization. In answering the questions in this survey, please think about the departments and managers who report to the General Manager of your company. Power in an organization is defined (for this research) as the amount of influence one has over top management decisions in an organization.
YOUR RESPONSES ARE COMPLETELY CONFIDENTIAL.

Please rank the departments in your company, those that are directly reporting to the General Manager, according to the following dimensions.

1. Centrality: The importance of the department in the overall work-flow.
   a) Most important department
   b) 2nd most important department
   c) 3rd most important department
   d) Least important department

2. Criticality: The importance of the department in the overall information-flow.
   a) Most important department
   b) 2nd most important department
   c) 3rd most important department
   d) Least important department

3. Relevance: Contribution to the final product.
   a) Most contributing department
   b) 2nd most contributing department
   c) 3rd most contributing department
   d) Least contributing department
4. Visibility: Amount of contact with top management.
   a) Department with most contact  
   b) Department with 2nd most contact  
   c) Department with 3rd most contact  
   d) Department with least contact  

5. Flexibility: Autonomy in internal procedures/decisions.  
   (Routine operations don't have flexibility)
   a) Department with most autonomy  
   b) Department with 2nd most autonomy  
   c) Department with 3rd most autonomy  
   d) Department with least autonomy  

6. Power: Influence on the important decisions and the decision making process in the organization.
   a) Most powerful department  
   b) 2nd most powerful department  
   c) 3rd most powerful department  
   d) Least most powerful department
7. In your opinion, for a more effective organization, how should the departments rank in terms of their power, in your company?

a) Most powerful department

b) 2nd most powerful department

c) 3rd most powerful department

d) Least powerful department

8. Any Comments? (about the power of the departments)
NOW: Rank the managers, who report to the General Manager.

9. Expertise: Knowledge and experience in his area.
   a) Top ranking manager 
   b) 2nd ranking manager 
   c) 3rd ranking manager 
   d) Lowest ranking manager 

10. Information: Access to critical information within the organization.
    a) Top ranking manager 
    b) 2nd ranking manager 
    c) 3rd ranking manager 
    d) Lowest ranking manager 

11. Connection: Acquaintance to top management.
    a) Top ranking manager 
    b) 2nd ranking manager 
    c) 3rd ranking manager 
    d) Lowest ranking manager
12. Personal Attraction: How well the person is liked by others.
   a) Top ranking manager
   b) 2nd ranking manager
   c) 3rd ranking manager
   d) Lowest ranking manager

13. How well you like the person.
   a) Top ranking manager
   b) 2nd ranking manager
   c) 3rd ranking manager
   d) Lowest ranking manager

14. Effort: Hard working
   a) Top ranking manager
   b) 2nd ranking manager
   c) 3rd ranking manager
   d) Lowest ranking manager
15. Power: Influence on top-management decisions.
   a) Most powerful manager
   b) 2nd most powerful manager
   c) 3rd most powerful manager
   d) Least powerful manager

16. Any Comments? (about the personal power of the managers)

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation.
YOUR RESPONSES ARE COMPLETELY CONFIDENTIAL.

1. How long have you worked for this company? ____________________

2. What department are you in? ________________________________

3. What is your age? ________________________________

4. Your Sex? Male _____ Female _____

5. Education: Grade School __________________________
               High School _________________________
               Some College _________________________
               College degree _______________________

PLEASE READ CAREFULLY:

This questionnaire is about Power: Power of departments and Power of managers in an organization. In answering the questions in this survey, please think about the departments and managers who report to the General Manager of your company. Power in an organization is defined (for this research) as the amount of influence one has over top management decisions in an organization.
YOUR RESPONSES ARE COMPLETELY CONFIDENTIAL.

1. What department are you managing? ____________________________

2. Please rank the departments in your company in terms of their power relative to other departments.

   Power is the amount of influence on top management decisions and the decision making process in the organization.

   You may include your department.

   a) Most powerful department ____________________________
   b) 2nd most powerful department ____________________________
   c) 3rd most powerful department ____________________________
   d) Least powerful department ____________________________

3. In your opinion, for a more effective organization, how should the departments rank in terms of their power in your company.

   a) Most powerful department ____________________________
   b) 2nd most powerful department ____________________________
   c) 3rd most powerful department ____________________________
   d) Least powerful department ____________________________

4. Any Comments? (about questions 1, 2, 3)
5. Now, please rank the department managers as individual persons in terms of their power in your company.

Department Manager is a manager who reports directly to the General Manager.

You may include yourself.

a) Most powerful manager _______________________

b) 2nd most powerful manager _______________________

c) 3rd most powerful manager _______________________

d) Least powerful manager _______________________

6. Any Comments? (about question 5)

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation.
EMPLOYEES QUESTIONNAIRE

YOUR RESPONSES ARE COMPLETELY CONFIDENTIAL.

1. How long have you worked for this company? __________________________

2. What department are you in? ________________________________

3. What is your age? __________________________

4. Your Sex? Male _____ Female _____

5. Education: Grade School ________________________  
High School ________________________  
Some College ________________________  
College degree ________________________

PLEASE READ CAREFULLY:

This questionnaire is about Power; Power of departments and Power of managers in an organization. In answering the questions in this survey, please think about the departments and managers who report to the General Manager of your company. Power in an organization is defined (for this research) as the amount of influence one has over top management decisions in an organization.
YOUR RESPONSES ARE COMPLETELY CONFIDENTIAL.

FOR THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS, PLEASE CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH QUESTION.

1. My department is at an important stage in the production of our products. 5 4 3 2 1
2. There is a lot of communication between my department and other departments in the company. 5 4 3 2 1
3. My department contributes a great deal to the final product. 5 4 3 2 1
4. My manager contacts top management frequently. 5 4 3 2 1
5. My department provides things to other departments. (Material, people, information, money, customers, etc.) 5 4 3 2 1
6. My department takes care of the outside problems that the company faces, and as a result makes life easy for other departments in the company. 5 4 3 2 1
7. No other department can do my department's work in this company. 5 4 3 2 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Most of the work in my department is routine.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>My manager has a high position in the company.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Inside my department, we agree with each other about our problems.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>My department has influence on how and what decisions are made in this company.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>My department is very important.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Power is the amount of influence one has on top management decisions and the decision making process in an organization.

13. My department is powerful. (check one)

  ____ Strongly Agree
  ____ Agree
  ____ Neutral
  ____ Disagree
  ____ Strongly Disagree

14. My department should have: (Please check one)

  ____ More power than it has now
  ____ Same power as it has now
  ____ Less power than it has now

15. List the top three most powerful departments in your company:

     Most powerful department __________________________

     2nd most powerful department __________________________

     3rd most powerful department __________________________

     Least powerful department __________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. a) My manager knows his job well.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) This affects my department's power in the company.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. a) My manager knows critical information about the company.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) This affects my department's power in the company.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. a) People in my department like my manager.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) This affects my department's power in the company.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. a) Top management likes my manager.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) This affects my department's power in the company.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. a) My manager works hard.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) This affects my department's power in the company.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. a) My manager is powerful in this company.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) This affects my department's power in the company.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. My manager should have: (Please check one)
   _____ More power than he has now
   _____ Same power as he has now
   _____ Less power than he has now

23. List the managers in your company under the General Manager, according to their power in the company.
   Most powerful manager
   2nd most powerful manager
   3rd most powerful manager
   Least powerful manager

24. Any comments?

Thank you very much for your time and cooperation.
25. What are the three things that you like most, about your job?
a) 

b) 

c) 

26. What are the three things that you don't like, about your job?
a) 

b) 

c) 

27. How satisfied are you with your job? (Check one)

Very Satisfied
Satisfied
Neutral
Dissatisfied
Very Dissatisfied

28. Any comments?

YOUR RESPONSES WILL BE KEPT COMPLETELY CONFIDENTIAL.
ONLY SUMMARY INFORMATION MAY BE PROVIDED TO INTERESTED PARTICIPANTS.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION AND TIME.
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