DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 132 704   EA 008 994

AUTHOR   Mowday, Richard T.
TITLE   The Exercise of Influence in Educational
                Organizations. Technical Report No. 4.
INSTITUTION   Athens Center of Ekistics (Greece).
SPONS AGENCY   Office of Naval Research, Washington, D.C.
                Organizational Effectiveness Research Program.
REPORT NO   NR-170-812
PUB DATE   Jun 76
CONTRACT   ONR-N00014-76-C-0164
NOTE   47p.

EDRS PRICE   MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Decision Making; Elementary Education; Motivation;
                Organizational Effectiveness; Organizations (Groups);
                *Political Power; *Power Structure; *Principals;
                *Role Perception; School Organization; *Self Concept;
                Social Science Research; Tables (Data)

ABSTRACT
                This study examined selected aspects of the exercise
of influence in educational organizations. Power motivation,
characteristics of the exercise of influence, and influence
effectiveness were studied. A sample of elementary school principals
indicated their perceptions and behavioral intentions relevant to the
exercise of upward influence in several common decision situations.
The results of the study suggest that principals who were rated high
in influence activity can be characterized by both high instrumental
and intrinsic power motivation, as well as high self-perceptions of
power. Several situational factors surrounding the exercise of
influence were found to be related to choices among alternative
influence targets and the likelihood of using various methods of
influence. The likelihood of using "manipulation" as a method of
influence was found to most consistently differentiate between
principals rated high and low in influence effectiveness, with high
effectiveness principals indicating they were more likely to use this
method. (Author)

ED132704

EA 008 994

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
1. REPORT NUMBER Technical Report No. 4	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM 5. THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY D 6.
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) The Exercise of Influence in Educational Organizations		

7. AUTHOR(s) Richard T. Mowday	8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) N00014-76-C-0164
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Dept. of Mgt., College of Business Administration University of Nebraska Lincoln, Nebraska	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS NR 170-812
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Organizational Effectiveness Research Programs Office of Naval Research Arlington, VA 22217	12. REPORT DATE June 1976 13. NUMBER OF PAGES 37
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(if different from Controlling Office)	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified 15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

Distribution of this document is unlimited. Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government.

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

Influence   Influence Effectiveness
Power   Need for Achievement
Educational Organizations   Need for Power
                   Motivational Force

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

This study examined selected aspects of the exercise of influence in educational organizations. Power motivation, characteristics of the exercise of influence and influence effectiveness were studied. A sample of elementary school principals indicated their perceptions and behavioral intentions relevant to the exercise of upward influence in several common decision situations. The results of the study suggest that principals who were rated high in influence activity can be characterized by both high instrumental and intrinsic power motivation, as well as high self-perceptions of power. Several

DD FORM 1473   EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE
1 JAN 73
S/N 0102 LF 014 6601

2

situational factors surrounding the exercise of influence were found to be related to choices among alternative influence targets and the likelihood of using various methods of influence. The likelihood of using "manipulation" as a method of influence was found to most consistently differentiate between principals rated high and low in effectiveness, with high effectiveness principals indicating they were more likely to use this method.

3

THE EXERCISE OF INFLUENCE IN EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Richard T. Mowday
University of Nebraska, Lincoln

Technical Report No. 4

June 1976

Principal Investigators

Richard M. Steers, University of Oregon
Lyman W. Porter, University of California, Irvine
Richard T. Mowday, University of Nebraska
Eugene F. Stone, Purdue University

Abstract

This study examined selected aspects of the exercise of influence in educational organizations. Power motivation, characteristics of the exercise of influence and influence effectiveness were studied. A sample of elementary school principals indicated their perceptions and behavioral intentions relevant to the exercise of upward influence in several common decision situations. The results of the study suggest that principals who were rated high in influence activity can be characterized by both high instrumental and intrinsic power motivation, as well as high self-perceptions of power. Several situational factors surrounding the exercise of influence were found to be related to choices among alternative influence targets and the likelihood of using various methods of influence. The likelihood of using "manipulation" as a method of influence was found to most consistently differentiate between principals rated high and low in influence effectiveness, with high effectiveness principals indicating they were more likely to use this method.

The Exercise of Influence in Educational Organizations[1]

Power, influence and political behavior are ubiquitous phenomena in formal organizations.[2] It is commonly recognized, however, that the study of power and influence is a relatively neglected area of organizational research. Since Cartwright (1959) first chided social psychologists for being "soft" on power, numerous writers at fairly regular intervals have commented on the seeming "dearth" of research on power and related phenomena in organizations (e.g., Kahn, 1964; Pollard & Mitchell, 1972; Schopler, 1965; Thompson, 1959; Porter, 1974). Tedeschi (1972: vii) began a recent volume of research on power by noting: "the current status of theory and research in the area of social power and influence is clearly inadequate from almost anybody's point of view."

The importance of studying power and influence is derived from the growing recognition that relations among organizational participants are governed by an informal power structure as well as the formal authority structure prescribed by the organization (March, 1962; Thompson, 1959). In studying intra-organizational behavior it is useful to recognize that competing sets of interests (e.g., arising from goal differentiation) exist both within and between subunits in the organization. Such competing sets of interests are thought to contribute to the level of informal political behavior (Zalenznik, 1970).

Organizational decisions can be viewed as the outcomes of bargaining processes in which various individuals, subunits or coalitions attempt to advance their own self-interests. The simple observation that all individuals in the organization are unlikely to be equally powerful or equally skillful in exercising the power they have available therefore has important

implications for understanding organizational behavior and decision processes within the organization. Furthermore, such a view highlights power and influence as critical variables of study in organizations (Pollard & Mitchell, 1972).

When power and influence have been studied in organizational settings, a great deal of research attention has been focused on the bases and distribution of power. Following French and Raven (1959), a considerable amount of research has examined the implications of various bases of power for subordinate satisfaction and performance, and leadership effectivenees (e.g., Bachman, Slesinger & Smith, 1966; Hill & French, 1967; Ivancevich, 1970).

Research examining the distribution and bases of power appears to overlook several issues that are important to a comprehensive understanding of the role of power in organizational processes. For example, while research demonstrating that individuals or subunits high in power generally receive a relatively high proportion of organizational resources is useful (e.g., Pfeffer & Salancik, 1974), it provides little information concerning the process by which a given base or amount of power is translated into organizational outcomes. Pollard and Mitchell (1972) make an important distinction between the power an individual is capable of using in a given situation ("possible" power) and the amount of power actually exercised ("effective" power). The process of exercising power involves the translation of "possible" power i. "o "effective" power to accomplish particular goals. The effectiveness wi which this process is accomplished is likely to be an important determinant of successful influence. Unfortunately, research incorporating testable propositions concerning characteristics of the exercise of power in organizations is rare and thus our understanding

of this process remains limited. Research examining specific character-
istics of the exercise of power and relating such characteristics to
influence effectiveness should therefore contribute to our understanding
of political phenomena in organizations.

This study reports a portion of the results from a larger research
investigation (Mowday, 1975) designed to examine selected aspects of
the exercise of influence in an organizational setting. The study speci-
fically examined the exercise of upward influence by managers in organi-
zations. It was felt that such a focus would more closely tie together
the study of power and leadership in terms of a somewhat neglected aspect
of the manager's role (i.e., the exercise of upward influence). Three
aspects of the exercise of influence were studied: (1) power motivation;
(2) characteristics of the influence attempt; (3) effectiveness in
exercising influence.

Power Motivation

Cartwright (1965) and Kipnis (1974) have discussed decisions concerning
whether or not to exercise influence in a given situation in terms of power
motivation. The research question of central importance involves the
identification of characteristics that differentiate individuals who are
active in attempting to exercise influence (high power motivation) from
those who are not. At least three considerations appear important with
respect to power motivation: (1) intrinsic motivation; (2) instrumental
motivation; (3) self-perceptions of power.

Intrinsic motivation to exert influence is thought to be related to
the satisfaction derived from the process of exercising influence itself.
For purposes of this study, intrinsic motivation was conceptualized in

terms of need theory (Murray, 1938). Two needs appear particularly
relevant to the study of power motivation in organizational settings:
need for power and need for achievement.

The need for power is characterized by attempts to control the
environment and influence and direct other people (Jackson, 1967;
McClelland & Watson, 1973; Winter, 1973). Previous research has found
that individuals with a high need for power are more likely to prefer
jobs where leadership is possible and actively attempt to influence others
in small groups (Birch & Veroff, 1966; Winter, 1973). Individuals with a
high need for power can be expected to take an activist role with respect
to their work environment and thus would be expected to more frequently
initiate influence attempts directed toward influencing the outcome of
important decisions.

Individuals with a high need for achievement are generally described
in terms of task orientation, aspirations to achieve difficult goals and
a positive response to competition (Jackson, 1967; Steers, 1975). Tedeschi,
Schlenker & Lindskold (1972) view the need for achievement as related to the
more general concept of self-confidence in power transactions. These
authors suggest that high need achievers are generally more confident that
influence attempts they initiate will be successful. As a consequence, it
was predicted that individuals with a high need for achievement will more
frequently initiate influence attempts (i.e., exhibit a high power motivation)
in the work situation. Such a relationship may be particularly likely where
the exercise of influence is believed by the individual to be instrumental
to task accomplishment. Where the exercise of influence facilitates the
accomplishment of a given work task (which may frequently be the case for
managers), the high need achiever may gain intrinsic satisfaction from the

9

influence attempt itself as well as from subsequent task accomplishment.

Instrumental motivation to exert influence can be viewed as the rational calculation of the net advantages associated with a specific influence attempt (Cartwright, 1965). In other words, the exercise of of influence is a behavioral act directed toward the attainment of particular goals. A number of writers have conceptualized the process of exercising power in terms of a expectancy theory or subjective expected utility model (e.g., Cartwright, 1965; Harsanyi, 1962; Nagel, 1968; Pollard & Mitchell, 1972; Tedeschi, et al., 1972). Despite the theoretical popularity of such approaches in explaining power related behavior, it appears that few studies (e.g., French, Morrison and Levinger, 1960; Zipf, 1960) have operationalized measures designed to test expectancy predictions related to the exercise of influence. Instrumental motivation in this study was conceptualized in terms of a simplified expectancy theory approach incorporating two variables: (1) perceived probability of successfully exercising influence; (2) anticipated value of the outcome of successful influence. When these two components are multiplicatively combined to form a measure of motivational force to exert influence, it was predicted such a measure would be positively related to power motivation.

Power motivation has also been found to be related to self-perceptions of power (Cartwright, 1965; Levinger, 1959; Tedeschi et al., 1972). Levinger (1959), for example, induced high self-perceptions of power in experimental subjects and found moderate relationships between such perceptions and a measure of number of influence attempts. Consequently, it was predicted that individuals with high self-perceptions of power are more likely to exhibit high power motivation in the work place.

It is important to recognize that the three components of power motivation discussed above are conceptually related. For example, high self-perceptions of power are likely to affect the perceived probability of successfully exerting influence. In addition, the needs for power and achievement may be related to the valence attached to the outcomes of successful influence attempts.

Characteristics of the Influence Attempt

The exercise of influence can be viewed as a purposeful act in which the individual exerting influence (i.e., the influence agent) must make calculated choices among alternative influence targets in the organization and methods of influence to utilize in the influence attempt. Factors affecting both of these decisions were examined in this study.

The choice of a target of influence is a relatively neglected aspect of the exercise of power in organizations. Most studies examining characteristics of the exercise of influence hold constant the target of influence (e.g., Kipnis & Cosentino, 1969; Rosenberg & Pearlin, 1962). Organizational decision making, however, is a process characterized by a large number of participants who may differ with respect to their potential influence over the decision outcome (Patchen, 1974). In organizational decision making contexts, then, influence agents are likely to have some discretion in the choice of a target even though the formal decision making channels are specified. One study by Filley and Grimes (1967) found little agreement among respondents concerning who they would approach to influence the outcome of eight hypothetical decisions.

Tedeschi et al. (1972) indicate that the major consideration in the choice of an influence target is the expectation that the target controls

access to the important values desired. Further, they hypothesize that people have a natural tendency to go through the "channels of authority." This is presumably the path of least resistance in selecting a target and involves lower potential costs in exercising influence. The probability of successfully influencing a decision, however, may increase in certain situations by choosing a target outside the "chain of command" with respect to the decision to be influenced. For example, it may be necessary to go over the head of your immediate superior in situations where he or she is believed to be unsympathetic to your goals.

The propensity of influence agents to choose an influence target either inside or outside the "chain of command" was examined in this study. Two factors were hypothesized to affect such a choice. First, the nature of the decision to be influenced may affect the choice of an influence target. Influence agents are likely to approach different individuals in attempting to influence decisions of various types even when the formal "chain of command" with respect to these different decisions is the same. This choice may be highly dependent on perceptions concerning the ability of others to influence the decision outcome (Tedeschi et al., 1972) and informal interaction patterns that develop in the workplace. Second, the timing of the influence attempt was predicted to affect the choice of a target. Decision making in organizations is frequently a process that takes place over a period of time (e.g., budgeting decisions). More importantly, the role of various individuals in the decision process may change as the decision moves through the organization. Individuals who are influential during the early stages of a decision process may not be influential during the late stages. In examining the timing of the influence attempt in relation to the choice of an influence target, the nature of the decision to

be influenced was held constant so the two predictions concerning this choice were not confounded.

The second characteristic of the exercise of influence investigated in this study concerned the choice of a method of influence. Raven and Kruhianski (1970) have reviewed a number of criteria that may be used in choosing among alternative methods of influence. Previous research has found the choice of a method of influence to be related to the nature of the influence situation (Goodstadt & Kipnis, 1970; Kipnis & Costentino, 1969), Rotter's (1966) internal-external control orientation (Goodstadt & Hjelle, 1973) and professional norms (Rosenberg & Perlin, 1962). In addition, such a choice has been hypothesized to depend upon the differential in influence between the influence agent and target of the influence attempt (Kipnis, 1974; Tedeschi et al., 1972, 1973).

Two factors were predicted to influence the choice of a method of influence. First, the choice of a method was predicted to be related to the target of influence (holding decision situation constant). Influence agents may select the method of influence which is believed to be most appropriate and potentially effective given the person to be influenced. Second, the choice of a method was hypothesized to depend upon the timing of the influence attempt (holding both influence situation and influence target constant). Methods of influence likely to be effective during the early stages of a decision process may not be successful during the late stages. For example, individuals may be more likely to use threats during the late stages of a decision process.

The research questions of primary interest here concerns the propensity of the influence agent to use different methods of influence

depending upon the choice of a target and the timing of the attempt. No specific predictions were made concerning which of the several methods of influence studied were most likely to be used in various situations.

Determinants of Influence Effectiveness

Very little is known concerning the determinants of effectiveness in the exercise of influence in organizations. Much of the literature which addresses this issue is biographic in nature (e.g., Evans & Novak, 1966), case study (e.g., Strauss, 1962) or relates overall leadership effectiveness as defined by group productivity to the possession of various bases of social power (Stogdill, 1974). An example of this last type of research is provided by Bachman, Smith and Slesinger (1966). They found that managers of high effectiveness sales offices were more likely to place reliance on referent and expert power as opposed to legitimate, coercive or reward power.' Such research appears to provide only indirect clues concerning effectiveness in the exercise of influe e.

Unlike previous investigations, this study utilize a criterion that was specifically designed to measure effectiveness ir exercising influence (as opposed to overall leadership or group effecti ess). In addition, attention was directed toward characteristics of the process of exercising influence as possible determinants of effectiveness.

The results presented here examine the relationship between the rated effectiveness of managers in exercising influence and the likelihood they would use various methods of influence in given decision situations. The intent of this analysis was to determine whether managers rated effective use characteristically different methods of influence than individuals who are less effective. This analysis was purely exploratory in nature and thus no specific predictions were made concerning the nature of the relationships

likely to be found.

Method of Study

Sample and Research Site

The sample for this study was composed on 65 elementary school principals from three West Coast school districts. Sampling only elementary school principals allowed formal position power and role requirements to be held relatively constant in the study. In addition, studying elementary school principals provided a sample of managers occupying intra-organizational boundary spanning roles. The principals were clearly recognized as the spokesmen for their organizational subunits and thus in a position to exercise upward influence in the organization.

The three school districts studied were composed of an approximately equal number of elementary schools and had somewhat similar organizational structures. In each district the principals reported to an assistant or deputy superintendent of instruction. No major differences were found between the principals sampled from the three districts in terms of age, tenure in the district or tenure on the job of principal. For this reason, principals from the three districts were combined for purposes of analysis.

Research Instruments

Respondents completed a questionnaire specifically designed for this study that asked them to indicate their perceptions and behavioral intentions with respect to three decisions commonly faced by managers in organizations: (1) the allocation of budgetary resources; (2) reclassification or promotion of a subordinate in the absence of currently available budgetary resources; (3) securing resources to undertake a special project

(resources in addition to the basic budget allocation). In addition,
principals were asked to distinguish between the early and late stages of
the budgetary process in answering several questions to introduce the con-
sideration of timing in the study. These decisions were chosen for study
because they were felt to be commonly faced by most managers and the
determination of the decision outcome is outside the authority of the prin-
cipal. The exercise of upward influence is therefore necessary to affect the
decision outcome.

For each decision situation and both stages of the budgeting process,
principals were asked to indicate: (1) the perceived probability of suc-
cessfully influencing the decision (measured on an 11 point probability
scale representing the number of chances out of 100 of being successful);
(2) the anticipated value (valence) of the outcome of successful influence
(9 point scale ranging from "not valuable" to "extremely valuable"); (3)
the name of the individual they would be most likely to approach in attempting
to influence the decision and the name of the individual they would be next
most likely to approach; (4) the likelihood of using five methods of in-
fluence with respect to each potential influence target (5 point scale
ranging from "very unlikely to use method" to "very likely to use method").
The five methods of influence studied were: (1) threats (e.g., to go to the
board); (2) appeals to legitimate authority (e.g., school board policies);
(3) persuasive arguments; (4) rewards or exchange of favors; (5) providing
information to the individual in such a way they are not aware you are
trying to influence them. Following Gilman (1962), the last method of
influence was interpreted as "manipulation." The defining characteristic of
"manipulation" appears to be the lack of awareness on the part of the influence
target that an individual is trying to influence them.

In addition, each respondent was asked to provide ratings of the overall influence of principals and administrators in the school districts, including themself. The self-rating of influence was of particular interest in the study. Influence was defined as the "general ability to get others to do something they might not otherwise do." Ratings of influence were made on a 9 point scale ranging form "almost no influence" to "very high influence." To insure variance in the ratings and establish anchor points on the scale, principals were asked to use the following procedure: (1) first rate the individual they believed had the most influence in the district; (2) next rate the individual they believed had the least influence; (3) complete the remaining ratings. This procedure appears to have successfully insured an adequate level of variance in the ratings.

The needs for power and achievement were measured using the Manifest Needs Questionnaire developed by Steers and Braunstein (in press). This instrument utilizes behaviorally anchored preferences in the work situation to measure need strengths. The developers of the instrument report acceptable levels of reliability and good convergent and discriminant validity of the scales.

Independent ratings were obtained for each principal concerning their: (1) overall influence activity in the district; (2) overall effectiveness in exercising influence. The ratings were made by the immediate superior of each principal on a 9 point scale ranging from "well below peers" to "well above peers." For purposes of analysis the ratings were standardized for each rater (mean zero and standard deviation equal to one) to eliminate the influence of rater response tendencies.

<div align="center">17</div>

Data Collection

Questionnaires were distributed by the researcher and returned directly to the university by mail. Principals were told that the purpose of the study was to examine the use of influence by managers to achieve goals associated with the performance of their job. Questionnaires were individually coded so that responses could later be matched with the independent behavioral ratings. A great deal of emphasis was placed on the anonymity of responses and confidentiality of the study results in explaining the study due to the potentially sensitive nature of the topic. The average response rate across the three districts of 83% which was judged to be quite good given the use of a mail survey.

Results

Power Motivation

A measure of motivational force to exert influence was calculated separately for the budget, reclassification and special projects decision situations by multiplicatively combining the perceived probability of successfully exerting influence and the anticipated value of the outcome of successful influence associated with each decision. The independent rating of overall influence activity was examined in relation to the motivational force to exert influence (three measures), need for power, need for achievement and self-perceptions of power. Since the "predictor" variables cannot be assumed to be independent, a multivariate method of analysis was utilized. Multiple discriminant analysis was the method of analysis chosen due to its ability to provide more extensive information concerning relationships in the data. Respondents were divided into high, medium and low influence activity groups by trichotomizing the distribution

of standardized ratings based on scores one standard deviation above and below the mean. The results of this analysis are reported in Table 1. The reduced sample size in this analysis was due to the failure of several respondents to provide self-ratings of influence.

Insert Table 1 About Here

The results of the analysis indicate that influence activity was significantly related to the measures of motivational force, need strengths and self-perceptions of power. The strength of the multivariate relationship as measured by omega-squared corrected for small samples (Tatsuoka, 1973) indicates that 12% of the variance in the "predictor" measures was explainable by reference to the grouping of principals based on the level of influence activity.

An examination of the means and discriminant weights in Table 1 suggest that high influence activity principals can be described as having both high instrumental and instrinsic motivation to exert influence, as well as high self-perceptions of influence. The finding that the motivational force measure associated with the budget decision and, to a lesser extent, the special projects decision discriminated between high and low influence activity groups provides support for decision theory approaches to power motivation. The results indicate that principals who are active in attempting to influence the outcome of decisions in the school district are more likely to perceive a high probability that such activity will lead to valued outcomes. In addition, it was found that the need for power and self-perceptions of influence also tended to discriminate between influence activity groups. These findings are congruent with the results of previous research in which such measures have been found to be related to the propensity to exert influence in various situations.

Characteristics of the Influence Attempt

The first characteristic of the influence attempt examined concerned the choice of a target of influence (i.e., individual most likely to be approached

in an attempt to influence a decision) for the three decisions studied and
the two stages of the budgeting process. It was predicted that the choice of
a influence target would be related to nature of the decision to be
influenced and the timing of the influence attempt. These predictions were
examined in relation to the assertion of Tedeschi et al. (1972) that
individuals are more likely to stay within the organizationally specified
"chain of command" in selecting influence targets.

Interviews conducted with administrative personnel within each school
district revealed that the "chain of command" was the same for each of the
decisions studied and for the two stages of the budgeting process. In
other words, within each school district the principal should go to the
same individual in an attempt to influence each of these decisions.
Because the "chain of command" was the same for each decision, the choice
of different influence targets across the decision situations constitutes
evidence of the propensity to deviate from the organizationally specified
"chain of command" in exercising influence. A simple frequency count found
that 59% of the principals choose different influence targets with respect
to the three decisions and 27% choose a different target during the early
and late stages of the budgeting decision.

To examine the relationship between the choice of a target and the
nature of the decision situation, the choice of a target for each decision
was divided into two classes: (1) target inside the "chain of command";
(2) target outside the "chain of command." Cochran's Q Test (Siegel, 1956)
was used to test whether the principal's choice of a target was systematically
related to the nature of the decision to be influenced. This test provides
a method of testing whether three or more sets of frequencies differ among
themselves when subjects are "matched" or repeated measures are used. The
results of this analysis are reported in Table 2.

```
------------------------------
Insert Table 2 About Here
------------------------------
```

As the results in Table 2 indicate, there was a significant relationship
between the choice of a target and the type of decision to be influenced.
Although there was a marked tendency for principals to stay within the
"chain of command" for the budget and special projects decision, this was
not found to be the case with respect to the reclassification decision.
Closer analysis of the data indicated that principals who deviated from
the "chain of command" were likely to approach a staff personnel officer
to influence this decision.

A similar analysis was performed to examine the relationship between
the choice of a target and the timing of the influence attempt. As before,
responses were divided into two classes reflecting the choice of a
target inside or outside the "chain of command." McNemar's test for
the significance of changes (Siegel, 1956) was used to test the relationship.
The results are reported in Table 3.

```
------------------------------
Insert Table 3 About Here
------------------------------
```

The results in Table 3 demonstrate that the timing of the influence
attempt was significantly related to the choice of a target. Principals
were most likely to go outside the "chain of command" during the late
stages of the budgeting process. Analysis of the responses suggests that
during the late stages of the process principals indicated they were likely
to go over the head of their immediate superior to the superintendent in
making an influence attempt. Such a finding probably closely reflects
the movement of the budgeting decision through the organization from lower
levels during the early stages to the highest levels during the late stages

of the process.

The second characteristic of the exercise of influence examined
in the study concerned the likelihood of using five methods of influence
in the three decision situations and both stages of the budgeting process.
It was predicted that the choice of a method of influence would be related
to the target of influence (holding decision situation constant) and the
timing of the influence attempt (holding both decision situation and
target of influence constant).

To examine the choice of a method of influence in relation to the
choice of an influence target, the ratings of the likelihood of using
each of the five methods of influence were compared for the two influence
targets identified for each of the three decisions studied. In other words,
a within-decision analysis was conducted resulting in three comparisons.
By comparing the ratings for the two targets named for each decision it
is possible to hold constant the affect of decision type on the choice of
a method.

The method of comparison involved the calculation of a mean absolute
difference score across the five methods for the two sets of ratings in
each comparison (e.g., the absolute difference was taken between the
likelihood of using persuasion with respect to the first target and the
likelihood of using persuasion for the second target, and so forth for
each method). If there were no differences in the likelihood of using
the methods of influence across the two targets, the mean difference score
would have a expected value of zero. On the other hand, if the likelihood
of using the methods differed across the two targets, the mean difference
score would have an expected value greater than zero.

The comparison for each of the three decision situations was tested
by means of a t-test to determine whether the mean difference score
significantly differed from zero. The results of the analyses indicated
that the mean difference score was significantly different from zero
in each of the three comparisons (t = 3.71, 3.20, 3.33, respectively).
All t values were significant at p.<01 with 52 degrees of freedom (reduced
sample size for this analysis is due to the failure of some respondents
to indicate two different influence targets for each decision).

To determine whether the choice of a method of influence was related
to the timing of the influence attempt, a similar method of analysis was
used. The likelihood ratings for the methods of influence were compared
for the target of influence that was most likely to be approached during
the early and late stages of the budgeting process. In this analysis only
responses in which the same individual was chosen as the influence target
during the early and late stages of the process were examined (N = 47
responses). In this manner, it is possible to hold constant both the
target of influence and the type of decision in determining the influence
of timing on the choice of a method. The results of the analysis indicate
that the mean difference score significantly differed from zero (t = 3.33,
p<.01, 46 df). As a consequence of these analyses, it was concluded that
the choice of a method of influence was significantly related to both
the choice of an influence target and the timing of the influence attempt.

Influence Effectiveness

The relationship between the rating of influence effectiveness and
the ratings of the likelihood of using five methods of influence was
examined separately for the three decision situations and for the early

and late stages of the budgeting process. Although it is recognized that these analyses are not independent, the relationship was examined for each of the five situations to determine whether consistent relationships would be found. For each analysis, principals were divided into high, medium and low effectiveness groups based on a trichotomization of the distribution of standardized effectiveness ratings. Trichotomization was achieved by dividing the distribution based on scores one standard deviation above or below the mean. A multiple discriminant analysis was run for each decision situation to determine the multivariate relationship between influence effectiveness and the likelihood of using the various methods.

Insert Tables 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 About Here

The results of the analysis for the budget decision are reported in Table 4, the early stages of the budget in Table 5, the late stages of the budget in Table 6, the reclassification decision in Table 7, and the special projects decision in Table 8. As the results indicate, influence effectiveness was significantly related to the choice of a method of influence in four of the five decision situations (no significant relationship was found for the reclassification decision although the pattern of mean scores found in this situation was similar to that found in the other analyses).

An examination of the means and discriminant weights for each analysis suggests that "manipulation" was the method of influence that most consistently differentiated between high and low effectiveness principals. In the first three analyses, it was found that high effectiveness principals were more likely to indicate they would use "manipulation" than were medium and low

24

effectiveness principals. In addition, it was found that medium effectiveness principals indicated they were relatively more likely to use rewards or exchange of favors than were either the low or high effectiveness groups.

In the special projects decision (Table 8), a somewhat more complex pattern of results were found. The likelihood of using persuasive arguments differentiated the high and medium groups from principals rated low in effectiveness. High effectiveness principals were relatively more likely to indicate they would use "manipulation" than were principals in the other groups. The likelihood of using rewards or exchange of favors distinguished low and medium effectiveness principals from the high group. Further, medium effectiveness princpals were slightly more likely to indicate they would use a threat. The strength of these relationships as measured by the corrected omega-squared (Tatsuoka, 1973) ranged from a low of 12% to a high of 23% across the analyses.

Discussion

The broad concern of this study can be summarized with reference to Lasswell's (1951) description of the central issue in research on politics: who gets what, when and how. More specifically, the results of the study provide information concerning the characteristics of individuals who are likely to be high in influence activity within the organization and several factors that may affect the method by which they exercise influence.

The results indicate that principals who were high in influence activity can be characterized by both instrumental and intrinsic motivation to exert influence, as well as high self-perceptions of power. The finding that high influence activity principals tend to perceive a relatively higher probability that influence attempts on their part will lead to valued out- comes suggest strategies organizations might employ in an effort to control

political behavior. Specifically, organizations may be able to control such perceptions through careful attention to the reinforcement of behavior in the work setting. For example, influence activity that is followed by negative reinforcement or a lack of reinforcement may serve to decrease the perceived probability that valued outcomes will result from influence activity and, eventually, extinguish such behavior. Further, selective reinforcement of the consequences of political behavior may control the extent to which the need for power is stimulated among managers in the work environment.

Although a significant multivariate relationship was found between the rating of influence activity and the measures of power motivation, the low strength of the relationship (12%) suggests that additional measures and more sophisticated measurement techniques need to be incorporated in future research. For example, Cartwright (1965) hypothesized that the role perceptions of the manager may be an important determinant in the degree to which they engage in influence activity. Such a measure was not examined in the present investigation. In addition, more sophisticated expectancy measures incorporating multiple outcomes and differentiating between various levels of effort may improve the prediction of influence activity.

The finding that principals were likely to choose influence targets outside the organizationally specified "chain of command" with respect to important decisions provides indirect evidence of the existence of political motivation in these organizations (this seems to be more plausible than the alternative explanation that principles were not aware of the "chain of command"). Presumably, principals who were not sensitive to political considerations surrounding the influence of decision outcomes would be more likely to confine their influence attepts to prescribed channels. The finding that the choice of an influence target was related to both the type of

decision to be influenced and the timing of the influence attempt suggests

that principals made calculated choices among alternative target 'n

exercising influence. More research is needed to determine the   for

such choices. For example, future research might test the prediction of

Tedeschi et. al. (1973) that the choice of a target is dependent upon

perceptions that the individual controls valuable resources and can be

successfully influenced. Other factors that may influence such a choice

include informal interaction patterns and friendships that develop in the

work setting.

The results with respect to the likelihood of using various methods

of influence also suggest that the principals made calculated choices

depending upon the individual to be influenced and the timing of the

influence attempt. These findings add to the previous research which has

found that several individual and situational factors influence the choice

of a method. Future research may follow the lead of Raven and Kruglanski

(1970) in attempting to determine the nature of the criteria that are

used in making these choices. These results found in this study suggest

that the likelihood of using various methods of influence may be dependent

on perceptions that different methods are more appropriate and likely to

be more effective given the particular person to be influenced. In

addition, the choice of a method may be limited by formal and informal

norms that develop in the organization concerning which methods are

legitimate to use.

The finding that influence effectiveness was most consistently related

to the likelihood of using "manipulation" as a method of influence appears

to have Machiavellian connotations. The use of "manipulation," however, can

be viewed as a strategic technique designed to maximize the influence agent's

flexibility in exercising influence. For example, the influence agent runs

the risk of being turned down early in the process when more direct methods
of influence are used (e.g., persuasive arguments). When this occurs,
the only further course of action available to the individual may involve
potentially costly attempts to go over the head of the immediate decision maker.
In the school district setting, for example, the principal may go to the
school board on a particular issue. By using more indirect methods of
influence such as "manipulation," the influence agent maintains a higher
degree of flexibility with respect to future action. In Newman's (1968)
terms, he or she "avoids a decisive engagement."

When organizational politics is defined as the "deliberate exercise
of power for particular ends" (Porter, 1974), it can be seen that the
exercise of upward influence by managers in organizations constitutes
one subset of the larger study of organizational politics. The tendency
in the past to view organizational politics as an inherently negative
feature of organizations has perhaps inhibited research on this topic.
It appears more resonable, however, to view organizational politics as
a neutral phenomena in organizations. Political behavior is neither
inherently positive or negative. Rather, the important consideration
is whether s   .havior contributes to organizational goal attainment.
Berliner (1973) provides one interesting example in Soviet industry
where political behavior has been institutionalized because of its contri-
bution to overall organizational effectiveness.

There is little doubt that additional research is needed to increase
our understanding of the process through which power is exercised in
organizations. This study focused on aspects of the process in educational
organizations. Future research may examine the generality of these findings
in other institutional contexts. Of particular interest may be the extent

to which organizational climate influences the level of political activity

within the organization. Viewing organizational politics as a neutral

phenomena in organizations will hopefully serve to increase research interest

in this area.

References

Bachman, J.G., Smith, C.G., & Slesinger, J.A. Control, performance, and satisfaction: An analysis of structural and individual effects. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 127-136.

Berliner, J.S. Factory management in a planned economy: The USSR. In K. Azumi & J. Hage (Eds.), Organizational Systems. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath, 1972.

Birch, D., & Veroff, J. Motivation: A study of action. Belmont, Ca.: Brooks/Cole, 1966.

Cartwright, D. Power: A neglected variable in social psychology. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), Studies in social power. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, 1959.

Cartwright, D. Influence, leadership and control. In J.G. March (Ed.), Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.

Evans, R. & Novak, R. Lyndon B. Johnson: The exercise of power. New York: Signet Books, 1966.

Filley, A.C., & Grimes, A.J. The bases of power in decision processes. Proceedings of the 27th Annual Convention of the Academy of Management, 1967, 133-160.

French, J.R.P., Morrison, H.W., & Levinger, G. Coercive power and forces affecting conformity. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61, 93-101.

French, J.R.P., & Raven, B. The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), Studies in social power. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, 1959.

Gilman, G. An inquiry into the nature and use of authority. In M. Haire (Ed.), Organization theory and industrial practice. New York: Wiley, 1962.

Goodstadt, B.E. & Hjelle, L.A. Power to the powerless: Locus of control and the use of power. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 27, 190-196.

Goodstadt, B.E., & Kipnis, D. Situational influences on the use of power. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1970, 54, 201-207.

Harsanyi, J. Measurement of social power, opportunity costs, and the theory of two-person bargaining games. Behavioral Science, 1962, 7, 67-80.

Hill, W.H., & French, W.L. Perceptions of the power of department chairmen by professors. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1967, 11, 548-574.

Ivancevich, J.M. An analysis of control, bases of control, and satisfaction in an organizational setting. Academy of Management Journal, 1970, 13, 427-436.

Jackson, D.N. Personality research form manual. Goshen, New York: Research Psychologists Press, 1967.

Kahn, R.L. Field studies of power in organizations. In R.L. Kahn & E. Boulding (Eds.), Power and conflict in organizations. New York: Basic Books, 1964.

Kipnis, D. The power holder. In J.T. Tedeschi (Ed.), Perspectives on social power. Chicago: Aldine, 1974.

Kipnis, D., & Cosentino, J. Use of leadership powers in industry. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1969, 53, 460-466.

Lasswell, H. Politics: Who gets what, when, how. Cleveland, Ohio: Meridian Books, 1958.

Levinger, G. The development of perceptions and behavior in newly formed social power relationships. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), Studies in social power. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, 1959.

McClelland, D.C., Atkinson, J.W., Clark R.A., & Lowell, E.L. The achievement motive. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953.

McClelland, D.C., & Watson, R.I., Jr. Power motivation and risk taking behavior. In D.C. McClelland & S. Steele (Eds.), Human Motivation. Morristown, N.J.: General Learning Press, 1973.

Mowday, R.T. An exploratory study of the exercise of influence in organizations. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Graduate School of Administration, University of California, Irvine, 1975.

Murray, H.A. Explorations in personality. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.

Nagel, J.H. Some questions about the concept of power. Behavioral Science, 1968, 13, 129-137.

Newman, W.H. Strategic considerations in planning. In D.R. Hampton, C.E. Summer, & R.A. Webber (Eds.), Organizational behavior and the practice of management. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman & Company, 1968.

Patchen, M. The locus and basis of influence in organizational decisions. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1974, 11, 195-221.

Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. Organizational decision making as a political process: The case of the university budget. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1974, 19, 135-151.

Pollard, W.E., & Mitchell, T.R. Decision theory analysis of social power. Psychological Bulletin, 1972, 78, 433-446.

Porter, L.W. Behavioral Scien. in management: Where are we now? Presidential Address to the 34th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Seattle, August, 1974.

Raven, B.H., & Kruglanski, A.W. Conflict and power. In P. Swingle (Ed.), The Structure of conflict. New York: Academic Press, 1970.

Rosenberg, M., & Pearlin, L. Power-orientations in the mental hospital. Human Relations, 1962, 15, 335-349.

Rotter, J.B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80, (1, Whole No. 609).

Schopler, J. Social power. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental psychology (Vol. 2). New York: Academic Press, 1965.

Siegel, S.A. Nonparametric statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.

Steers, R.M. Task-goal attributes, n achievement, and supervisory performance. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1975, 13, 392-403.

Steers, R.M., & Braunstein, D.N. A behaviorally-based measure of manifest needs in a work setting, Journal of Vocational Behavior, in press.

Stogdill, R.M. Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research. New York: Free Press, 1974.

Strauss, G. Tactics of lateral relationships: The purchasing agent. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1962, 7, 161-186.

Tatsuoka, M.M. An examination of the statistical properties of a multivariate measure of strength of relationship. (Final Report). Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Department of Educational Psychology, College of Education, December, 1973.

Tedeschi, J.T. The social influence processes. Chicago: Aldine, 1972.

Tedeschi, J.T., Schlenker, B.R., & Lindskold, S. The exercise of power and influence: The source of influence. In J.T. Tedeschi (Ed.) The social influence processes. Chicago, Ill.: Aldine, 1972.

Thompson, J.D. Authority in "identical" organizations. In J.D. Thompson,
    P.B. Hammond, R.W. Hawkes, B.H. Junker, & A. Tuden (Eds.), Comparative
    studies in administration. Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh University Press,
    1959.

Winter, D.G. The need for power. In D.C. McClelland & R.S. Steele (Eds.),
    Human motivation. Morristown, N.J.: General Learning Press, 1973.

Zaleznik, A. Power and politics in organizational life. Harvard Business
    Review, 1970, 48, 47-60.

Zipf, S.G. Resistance and conformity under reward and punishment.
    Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61, 102-109.

33

Footnotes

[1]This research was supported by a grant from the Graduate Division
of the University of California, Irvine. The author wishes to
acknowledge the assistance of Lyman Porter, Henry Tosi, Joseph McGuire,
Newt Margulies and Ray Oliver at various stages of the investigation.
The useful comments of Richard Steers on an earlier draft of the
manuscript were greatly appreciated.

[2]Following Dahl (1957), the terms power and influence will be used
interchangeably. In the discussion which follows, the "exercise of
power" and the "exercise of influence" both refer to the same funda-
mental process.

34

Table 1
Discriminant Weights and Mean Levels of
Motivational Force, Need Strengths and Self-influence Ratings
for High, Medium and Low Influence Activity Principals

| | Influence Activity | | | Discriminant Weights |
Measures	Low (n=7)	Medium (n=38)	High (n=7)	
Motivational Force				
Budget Decision	21.0	29.9	49.9	.70
Reclassification Decision	15.0	30.6	32.6	.13
Special Projects Decision	45.0	51.8	58.1	-.36
Need for Power	3.4	3.8	4.0	.48
Need for Achievement	2.9	3.3	3.6	.28
Self-influence Rating	4.0	5.3	5.7	.39

Note: Test Statistic = 23.2 (12df), p<.05, $\Omega^2 = 12\%$

Table 2
Choice of Influence Target in Relation
to the "Chain of Command"

Choice of Influence Target	Decision Situation		
	Budget	Reclassification	Special Project
Inside "Chain of Command"	49	33	51
Outside "Chain of Command"	15	31	13

Note: $Q = 8.6$ (2df), p<.05

Table 3
Choice of Influence Target
By Timing of the Influence Attempt

Choice of Influence Target	Stages of Budgetary Decision Process	
	Early	Late
Inside "Chain of Command"	47	40
Outside "Chain of Command"	17	24

Note: X^2 = 6.8 (1df), p<.05

Table 4
Budget Decision:
Discriminant Weights and Mean Likelihood Ratings
of Using Five Methods of Influence
For High, Medium and Low Effectiveness Principals

| | Influence Effectiveness | | | |
Methods of Influence	Low (n=11)	Medium (n=46)	High (n=8)	Discriminant Weights
Threats	1.0	1.0	1.0	.00
Legitimate Authority	4.2	3.9	4.1	.28
Persuasive Arguments	3.9	4.6	4.6	.01
Rewards	1.2	1.6	1.0	-.73
Manipulation	1.8	2.2	3.3	1.03

Note: Test Statistic = 19.9 (10df) p<.05, Ω^2=12%

Table 5
Early Stages of Budget Decision:
Discriminant Weights and Mean Likelihood Ratings
of Using Five Methods of Influence
For High, Medium and Low Effectiveness Principals

Methods of Influence	Influence Effectiveness			Discriminant Weights
	Low (n=11)	Medium (n=46)	High (n=8)	
Threats	1.0	1.0	1.0	.00
Legitimate Authority	4.2	4.1	4.5	.24
Persuasive Arguments	3.9	4.7	4.6	-.26
Rewards	1.1	1.6	1.0	-.76
Manipulation	1.9	2.2	3.3	.83

Note: Test Statistic = 20.5 (10df) p<.05, Ω^2 = 13%

Table 6
Late Stages of Budget Decision:
Discriminant Weights and Mean Likelihood Ratings
of Using Five Methods of Influence
For High, Medium and Low Effective Principals

| Methods of Influence | Influence Effectiveness | | | Discriminant Weights |
	Low (n=11)	Medium (n=46)	High (n=8)	
Threats	1.0	1.0	1.0	.00
Legitimate Authority	4.3	4.0	4.4	.41
Persuasive Arguments	3.8	4.7	4.6	-.13
Rewards	1.2	1.5	1.0	-.76
Manipulation	2.0	2.0	3.3	1.06

Note: Test Statistic = 23.4 (10df) p<.01, Ω^2 = 16%

Table 7
Reclassification Decision:
Discriminant Weights and Mean Likelihood Ratings
of Using Five Methods of Influence
For High, Medium and Low Effectiveness Principals

	Influence Effectiveness			
Methods of Influence	Low (n=11)	Medium (n=46)	High (n=8)	Discriminant Weights
Threats	1.2	1.1	1.0	-.36
Legitimate Authority	4.6	4.4	4.3	.01
Persuasive Arguments	4.0	4.4	4.6	-.04
Rewards	1.1	1.4	1.3	-.44
Manipulation	1.9	1.9	3.1	1.01

Note: Test Statistic = 13.2 (10df) p = NS

41

Table 8
Special Projects Decision:
Discriminant Weights and Mean Likelihood Ratings
of Using Five Methods of Influence
For Low, Medium and High Effectiveness Principals

| Methods of Influence | Influence Effectiveness | | | Discriminant Weights |
	Low (n=11)	Medium (n=45)	High (n=8)	
Threats	1.0	1.1	1.0	.75
Legitimate Authority	4.6	4.2	4.0	-.11
Persuasive Arguments	3.7	4.8	4.8	.97
Rewards	1.5	1.6	1.0	.56
Manipulation	1.9	1.9	3.0	-.80

Note: Test Statistic = 30.8 (10df) p<.01, Ω^2 = 23%

Dr. Macy L. Abrams
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, California 92152

AFOSR (NL)
1400 Wilson Blvd.
Arlington, Virginia 22209

Dr. Clayton P. Alderfer
Department of Administrative Sciences
Yale University
New Haven, Connecticut 06520

Dr. S. J. Andriole
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20742

ARI Field Unit - Leavenworth
P.O. Box 3122
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas 66027

Army Research Institute
Commonwealth Building
1300 Wilson Blvd.
Rosslyn, Virginia 22209

Assistant Officer in Charge
Naval Internal Relations Activity
Pentagon, Room 2E329
Washington, DC 20350

Dr. James A. Bayton
Department of Psychology
Howard University
Washington, DC 20001

Dr. H. Russell Bernard
Dept. of Sociology & Anthropology
West Virginia University
Morgantown, West Virginia 26506

Dr. Arthur Blaiwes
Naval Training Equipment Center
Orlando, Florida 32813

Dr. Barry Blechman
The Brookings Institution
1775 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

Dr. Milton R. Blood
School of Business
Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, Georgia 30332

Bureau of Naval Personnel
Research & Evaluation Division
Code: Pers-65
Washington, DC 20370

Bureau of Naval Personnel (Pers-6)
Assistant Chief of Naval Personnel for
Human Goals
Washington, DC 20370

Cdr. Anthony C. Cajka, U.S.N.
Department of the Navy
Human Resource Management Center
Washington, DC 20370

Canadian Defense Liaison Staff,
Washington
2450 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20008
ATTN: Chief, Defense Research

Chief, Naval Technical Training
NAS Memphis (75)
Millington, Tennessee 38128
ATTN: LCdr. R.R. Caffey, Jr., N452

Chief of Naval Personnel
Assistant for Research Liaison (Pers-Or)
Washington, DC 20370

Chief, Psychological Research Branch
U.S. Coast Guard (G-P-1/62)
400 7th Street, S.W.
Washington, DC 20590

Dr. John J. Collins
9521 Cable Drive
Kensington, Maryland 20795

Dr. Harry R. Day
University City Science Center
Center for Social Development
3508 Science Center
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104

Division Director for Social Science
National Science Foundation
1800 G Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20550

Defense Documentation Center
Building 5
Cameron Station
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Director
ONR Branch Office
1030 E. Green Street
Pasadena, California 91106

Director
U.S. Naval Research Laboratory
Washington, DC 20390
ATTN: Technical Information Division

Division Director for Social Science
National Science Foundation
1800 G Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20550

Dr. Fred E. Fiedler
Department of Psychology
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98105

Dr. Samuel L. Gaertner
Department of Psychology
University of Delaware
Newark, Delaware 19711

Dr. Paul S. Goodman
Graduate School of Industrial Administration
Carnegie-Mellon University, Schenley Park
Pittsburg, Pennsylvania 15213

Dr. Gloria L. Grace
System Development Corporation
2500 Colorado Avenue
Santa Monica, California 90406

Dr. J. Richard Hackman
Department of Administrative Sciences
Yale University
New Haven, Connecticut 06520

Dr. Thomas W. Harrell
Graduate School of Business
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

Dr. M. Dean Havron
Human Sciences Research, Inc.
7710 Old Springhouse Road
McLean, Virginia 22101

Dr. Leo A. Hazelwood
CACI, Incl
Ft. Meyer Drive
Arlington, Virginia 22209

Headquarters, Forces Command
AFPE-HR
Ft. McPherson
Georgia 30330

Dr. Walter G. Held
The Brookings Institute
1775 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

Dr. Charles F. Herman
Ohio State University Research Foundation
1314 Kinnear Road
Columbus, Ohio 43212

Dr. Edwin P. Hollander
The Research Foundation of State
   University of New York
P.O. Box 7126
Albany, New York 12224

Dr. Charles L. Hulin
Department of Psychology
University of Illinois
Champaign, Illinois 61820

Human Resource Management Center
Bldg. 304
Naval Training Center
San Diego, California 92133

Human Resource Management Center
   Attachment
Naval Support Activity
c/o FPO New York, New York 09521
ATTN: TDC Nelson

Human Resource Management Center
London
FPO, New York 09510

Human Resource Management Center, Norfolk
5621-23 Tidewater Drive
Norfolk, Virginia 23511

Human Resource Management Center
   Pearl Harbor
FPO San Francisco, California 96601

Human Resource Management Center, Washington
Washington, DC 20370

Human Resource Management School
Naval Air Station, Memphis (96)
Millington, Tennessee 38054

CDR J. L. Johnson, USN
Naval Amphibious School
Little Creek
Naval Amphibious Base
Norfolk, Virginia 23521

Dr. Rudi Klauss
Syracuse University, Public
 Admin. Dept., Maxwell School
Syracuse, New York 13210

Dr. Lennart Levi, Director
Lab. for Clinical Stress Research Park
S-104 01 Stockholm
SWEDEN

Dr. Arie Y. Lewin
Duke University
Duke Station
Durham, North Carolina 27706

Dr. Morgan W. McCall, Jr.
Center for Creative Leadership
5000 Laurinda Drive
P.O. Box P-1
Greensboro, North Carolina 27402

Dr. Charles A. McClelland
School of International Relations
University of Southern California
University Park
Los Angeles, California 90007

Dr. Elliott M. McGinnies
Psychology Department
American University
Washington, DC 20016

Dr. Terence R. Mitchell
School of Business Administration
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195

Dr. Peter G. Monge
Department of Speech-Communication
California State University
San Jose, California 95192

Dr. Richard T. Mowday
College of Business Administration
University of Nebraska, Lincoln
Lincoln, Nebraska 68588

Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California 93940
ATTN: Library (Code 2124)

Navy Materiel Command
Employee Development Office
Code SA-65
Room 150 Jefferson Plaza, Bldg., #2
1429 Jeff Davis Highway
Arlington, Virginia 20360

Navy Personnel R&D Center
Code 10
San Diego, California 92152

Cdr. Paul D. Nelson, MSC, USN
Head, Human Performance Division (Code 44)
Navy Medical R&D Command
Bethesda, Maryland 20014

Dr. Peter G. Nordlie
Human Sciences Research, Inc.
7710 Old Springhouse Road
McLean, Virginia 22101

Dr. Herbert R. Northrup
Industrial Research Unit
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19174

Office of Naval Research
(Code 452)
800 N. Quincy Street
Arlington, Virginia 22217

Office of Civilian Manpower Management
Personnel Management Evaluation Branch
Washington, DC 20390

Office of Naval Research (Code 200)
Arlington, Virginia 22217

Office of the Air Attache
Embassy of Australia
1601 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

Officer in Charge (Code L5)
Naval Aerospace Medical Research Lab
Naval Airospace Medical Center
Pensacola, Florida 32512

Officer in Charge
Naval Submarine Medical Research Lab
Naval Submarine Base New London, Box 900
Groton, Connecticut 06340

Dr. A.F.K. Organski
University of Michigan
Research Administration Building
North Campus
Ann Arbor, Michigan

LCdr. C. A. Patin U.S.N.
Director, Human Goals Department
Code 70, Naval Training Center
Orlando, FL 32813

Dr. Chester M. Pierce
Harvard University
Nichols House
Appian Way
Cambridge, MA 02138

Dr. Manuel Ramirez
Systems and Evaluations
232 Swanton Blvd.
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Dr. Karlene H. Roberts
School of Business Administration
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720

Dr. John Ruhe
University of North Carolina
Department of Business Administration
Charlotte, NC 28223

Dr. Irwin Sarason
Department of Psychology
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195

Dr. Edgar H. Schein
Sloan School of Management
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, MA 02139

Science & Technology Division
Library of Congress
Washington, DC 20540

Scientific Information Officer
British Embassy
3100 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.
Washington, DC 20008

Dr. Barry R. Schlenker
Department of Psychology
University of Florida
Gainesville, FL 32611

Dr. Saul B. Sells
Texas Christian University
Fort Worth, TX 76129

Dr. Gerald H. Shure
Center for Computer-Based Behavioral Studies
University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Dr. H. Wallace Sinaiko
A & I 3463
Smithsonian Institution
Washington, DC 20560

Dr. Richard M. Steers
Graduate School of Management & Business
University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403

Capt. Bruce G. Stone, U.S.N. (Code N-33)
Director, Education & Training Research
and Program Development
Chief of Naval Education and Training Staff
Naval Air Station, Pensacola, FL 32508

Professor John Senger
Operations Research & Administration Sciences
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93940

Dr. A. L. Slafkosky
Scientific Advisor
Commandant of the Marine Corps (Code RD-1)
Washington, DC 20380

Dr. Bertram Spector
CACI, Inc.
1815 N. Ft. Myer Drive
Arlington, VA 22209

Professor G. L. Stansbury
Florida Southern College
Lakeland, FL 33802

Eugene F. Stone
Department of Administrative Sciences
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907

Dr. Richard E. Sykes
Minnesota Systems Research, Inc.
2412 University Ave., S.E.
Minneapolis, MN 55414

Dr. Lorand B. Szalay
American Institutes for Research
3301 New Mexico Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20016

Training Officer
Human Resource Management Center
NTC, San Diego, CA 92133

46

Dr. Victor H. Vroom
School of Organization & Management
Yale University
56 Hillhouse Ave.
New Haven, CT 06520

Dr. Paul Wall
Division of Behavioral Science
Tuskegee Institute
Tuskegee, AL 36088

Dr. J. Wilkenfeld
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742

Dr. H. H. Wolff
Technical Director (Code N-2)
Naval Training Equipment Center
Orlando, FL 32813

Dr. Phillip G. Zimbardo
Department of Psychology
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

Dr. Davis B. Bobrow
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742

Library, Code 2029
U. S. Naval Research Laboratory
Washington, DC 20390

Dr. David C. McClelland
McBer and Company
137 Newbury St.
Boston, MA 02139

Johannes M. Pennings
Graduate School of Industrial Admin.
Carnegie-Mellon University
Schenley Park
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Psychologist
ONR Branch Office
1030 E. Green St.
Pasadena, CA 91106

Dr. Paul Spector
American Institutes for Research
Foxhall Square
3301 New Mexico Ave, NW
Washington, DC 20016