DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 270 676 CG 019 130

AUTHOR Falbo, Toni; And Others
TITLE Authority Base, Denomination, Moral Philosophy and the Power Strategies Used by Clergymen.
PUB DATE Aug 85
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (93rd, Los Angeles, CA, August 23-27, 1985).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Catholics; Change Strategies; *Clergy; *Individual Power; *Moral Values; Religious Differences; *Self Expression; *Social Influences; Social Psychology
IDENTIFIERS Authority Base; Baptists; *Charisma; *Power Strategies

ABSTRACT

Clergymen are regarded by their congregations as having the authority to influence church members and clergymen are expected to exert influence. Three types of clerical authority have been identified: charismatic, traditional, and legal-rational. The common assumption that people select power strategies that are consistent with their perceptions of their authority was tested in 50 Southern Baptist Convention pastors and 46 Roman Catholic priests. Also examined were the relationships between institutional factors such as denomination, individual differences such as variations in moral philosophy, and the power strategies used by clergymen. Subjects completed a 3-item measure of clergy authority, the Survey of Ethical Attitudes, a measure of power strategies, and a background questionnaire. The results indicated that authority type was significantly related to charismatic strategies and to legal-rational strategies, but not to traditional strategies. Denomination was significantly related to charismatic and legal-rational strategies, with Baptists scoring higher than Catholics in the use of both strategies. The relationship between denomination and traditional strategies was not significant. Ethics of Responsibility/Conscience was significantly related to charismatic and legal-rational strategies, but not to traditional strategies. These findings suggest that identifying one's power base is not equivalent to understanding one's power strategies. Future research on social influence should strive to distinguish power base from power strategy and measure both separately. (NB)

AUTHORITY BASE, DENOMINATION, MORAL PHILOSOPHY AND THE POWER STRATEGIES USED BY CLERGYMEN

Toni Falbo, B. Lynn New, and Margie Gaines

Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 93rd, Los Angeles, CA, August 23-27, 1985.

Authority Base, Denomination, Moral Philosophy and the Power Strategies Used by Clergymen

Toni Falbo, B. Lynn Now, and Margie Gaines
University of Texas, Austin

In the literature on the social psychology of power, the distinction between power base and power strategy has been frequently blurred(cf., Kipnis, 1984a). Nonetheless, these two theoretical constructs are distinct with power base representing an individual's *source of authority* for influencing another and power strategy representing a *sequence of acts* taken by the individual to influence another. Many simply assume that a direct relationship exists between possessing the authority to exert a type of power and using it as a strategy to gain compliance(for example: Pfeffer, 1978; Weber, 1946; 1947).

In the social power literature, the conceptual distinction between power bases and strategies has been made(Cartwright,1965; Dahl, 1957), although no research studies have examined both separately in the same study. Most commonly, a study examines the authority people perceive themselves as having or are perceived as having and relates this to such variables as job satisfaction or decision-making in the family(Centers, Raven, & Rodrigues, 1968; MacDonald,1980; Podsakoff & Schriesheim, 1985). Or, studies examine the strategies such groups as managers, psychotherapists, and college students report using to influence others(e.g., Falbo, 1977; Kipnis, 1984a).

The primary purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between one's basis of influence and specific strategies used to influence others. This relationship will be examined in the context of religious leadership because clergymen are regarded by their congregations as having the authority to influence them and clergymen are expected to exert influence.

The categories of religious authority used here were derived from Weber(1947) who differentiated three types of clerical authority: charismatic, traditional, and legal-rational. According to Weber, charismatic authority derives from the special, superhuman gifts of the individual clergyman. Such authority derives directly from God who is thought to have given these individuals the special qualities that make lay people follow them. Because charisma is inherently unstable (Weber, 1946,1947), the major way that a religious leader can maintain such authority is to institutionalize it by establishing ritualistic traditions and methods of selecting new leaders. This routinized form of charisma is called traditional authority. In contrast, legal-rational authority concerns the authority that clergymen have as a consequence of their training and administrative skill. Such training is generally sanctioned by their religious institutions and the laity are expected to follow because the clergyman is competent and expert.

This study will test the common assumption that people select power strategies that are consistent with their perceptions of their authority. For example, clergymen with charismatic authority are expected to be more likely to attempt to influence people by using strategies emphasizing their charisma, such as showing them the correct path by their own good example or demonstrating that they have the gift of divine grace. In contrast, traditional authority is expected to be associated with strategies such as conducting services in an appropriate manner and upholding strict religious traditions. Finally, clergymen who see themselves as having legal-rational authority are expected to try to influence their congregations by using legal-rational strategies, such as leading study courses on religious doctrine or controlling the composition of a decision-making committee.

As a secondary goal, this study has the examination of the relationship between institutional factors, such as denomination, individual differences, such as variations in moral philosophy, and the power strategies used by clergymen. The justification for examining these relationships follow.

Denomination

Because the nature of the clergyman's authority is defined by his religious denomination, clergymen from two denominations with different views of authority were selected for this study: Southern Baptist pastors and Roman Catholic priests. Each denomination defines the authority of its clergymen and establishes traditions regarding power strategy use. Therefore, to the extent

that clergymen from different denominations see themselves as having different bases of authority, they should use different strategies to influence their congregations.

Among Southern Baptists, pastors are men whose authority is charismatic in that they believe that they personally have been selected by God to lead (Hammond,Salinas, and Sloane, 1978). After experiencing the "call to preach," the man announces his experience to his fellow church members during a worship service and then attends a seminary. Upon graduation, he applies to a church where a pastor vacancy exists. The congregation screens the applicants, eventually inviting one to give a sermon. After the sermon, the congregation votes on whether to accept the pastor. A favorable vote is regarded as evidence of the individual's charismatic authority(Ingram, 1981).

In contrast, among Roman Catholics, priests are men who also feel that they have received a divine calling, but this is mediated by their church and training. Those who become diocesan priests go to seminaries that train them in pastoral work. Upon ordination, priests are assigned to a parish by their Bishop who frequently relies on the recommendations of a committee of diocesan consultors. These consultors try to match the characteristics of the priests with the characteristics of each congregation(Matocha, 1986).

Based on the traditions of priest selection and socialization, one would assume that priests would regard their authority as traditional. However, it is unclear whether this is true for the average diocesan priest. Weber would agree that the authority of the Pope and Bishops would be of the traditional type. Unfortunately, the major empirical investigation of clergy authority in the U.S. (Hammond et al, 1978) failed to include traditional authority as an authority type and therefore the priests in their sample did not have the opportunity to choose it. Hammond's results suggested that the priests perceive themselves as having primarily noncharismatic authority, such as legal-rational. It is possible that priests are split in their authority perceptions, with some seeing themselves as having traditional and others as having legal-rational authority. This is consistent with the findings of Struzzo (1970) who found that priests could be differentiated into two groups, those who saw themselves as professionals, persuaded by their own reasoning and expertise and those who saw themselves as part of a hierarchical structure, obedient to magisterial authority.

Moral Philosophy

Little research has been done relating moral philosophy to power strategy use, although several have suggested that the strategies one uses to influence others is determined largely by one's philosophy of human nature(Kipnis, 1984; Cartwright, 1965, McGregor, 1960). For example, Falbo (1977) found that people high in Machiavellianism were more likely to report using indirect and nonrational strategies, such as flattery and deceit to influence others than people low in Machiavellianism. Clergymen are particularly appropriate subjects for a study of the relationships between moral philosophy and power strategy use because they are expected to establish for their congregations standards of moral conduct and reasoning. Therefore, it is likely that clergymen have integrated their moral philosophy into their everyday role behavior, such as the power strategies they use to influence their congregations.

The dimension of moral philosophy considered in this study has been described and measured by Hogan (1970; 1973) and it ranges from the ethics of responsiblity to the ethics of conscience. Advocates of the former view justify moral conduct by arguing that laws and institutions are the means for promoting the common good. They emphasize compliance to the social order. According to the ethics of responsibility, people are naturally bad and institutions restrain antisocial behavior.

Advocates of the ethics of conscience justify moral conduct by arguing the existence of a higher law, which may not correspond to human law. According to the ethics of conscience, human law is just only if it corresponds to higher law. The ethics of conscience viewpoint is related to the belief that people are naturally good and that institutions cause antisocial behavior.

One of the goals of this research is to examine the relationship between the ethics of responsibility/conscience and power strategy use. It is hypothesized here that clergymen whose moral philosophy resembles the ethics of responsibility will be more likely to use strategies emphasizing obedience to authority. Further, it is argued that such strategies are more likely to be charismatic or traditional in nature. This prediction is based on Weber's portrayal of clergymen with charismatic or traditional authority as expecting obedience from their followers. According to

Weber, once a follower acknowledges the charismatic or traditional authority of the clergyman, then it is the follower's duty to obey his commands regardless of their reasonableness or the effectiveness of their presentation.

It can also be reasoned that a positive association would exist between the ethics of conscience and the use of rational strategies, such as education. This prediction is based on Weber's portrayal of clergymen with legal-rational authority as acquiring expertise and skills at legal reasoning. A clergyman who believes that people are inherently good would be likely to reason with his congregation and/or try to educate them in order to influence them, because he would think they are capable of making their own correct moral choices.

Thus, this study will test the following four hypotheses.

First, this study will test the common assumption that the strategies a clergyman uses will correspond to his perceptions of the basis of his authority.

Second, it is expected that if there is a consistency between authority base and power strategy use, and if there are denominational differences in authority, then there will be denominational differences in power strategy use reflecting the differences in authority. Specifically, Baptists would be expectsd to use charismatic strategies, while Catholics would be expected to use either legal-rational or traditional strategies.

Third, clergymen who support the ethics of responsiblity will report using more charismatic and traditional strategies than do clergymen who support the ethics of conscience. Conversely, clergymen who support the ethics of conscience will report using more legal-rational strategies than clergymen who support the ethics of responsibility.

Finally, it is argued here that perceptions of authority base will have a stronger relationship to the power strategies used by clergymen than either denomination or moral philosophy. This prediction is based on the strength of the longstanding assumption that the strategies one uses are consistent with the basis of one's authority. It is unclear whether denomination or moral philosophy will account for an additional and significant amount of the variance in relation to power strategy use. This is due to the likelihood that each is related to perceptions of authority and therefore, much of their relationships to power strategies may be already accounted for the association between authority and power strategy.

Method

Subjects: The clergymen surveyed were 50 Southern Baptist Convention pastors and the 46 Roman Catholic priests. Their mean age was 49.9 years and the mean year of their ordination was 1962. All clergymen had completed college. Most(90%) of the clergymen worked in churches as pastors or assistant pastors with the remainder being administrators or youth directors. The average membership of the churches served by these clergymen was 3477, ranging from 200 to 8900.

Procedure: An organization serving the clergymen of each denomination was approached and requested to endorse our survey. The organizations provided their endorsement and their membership mailing lists. Clergymen were asked to complete the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed envelope.

The questionnaire consisted of several instruments, only those relevant to testing this study's hypotheses will be presented here. The other instruments were selected to provide feedback to the organization regarding role ambiguity, stress, and job satisfaction. This feedback was the incentive which brought about the endorsement of the organizations' leadership. Seventy-five per cent of the Baptist pastors and 80% of the diocesan priests completed and returned the questionnaire.

Instruments: In addition to the instruments needed to provide feedback to the organizations, the questionnaires included: (1) a 3-item measure of clergy authority, (2) the 35-item Survey of Ethical Attitudes, (3) a 15 item measure of power strategies, and (4) a background questionnaire.

The clergy authority measure was based on a modification of Hammond et al (1978)'s original instrument. The three items used here to measure perceptions of clergy authority are presented in Table 1. The

---

Insert Table 1 about here

subjects were instructed to compare themselves to the hypothetical clergyman and indicate on the rating scale how similar this description was to them on a 7-point scale.

In Hammond et al's original study, 250 clergymen from a broad-range of Christian denominations were surveyed and the results gave support to this method of assessing clergymen's perceptions of their authority. That is, Hammond et al found that clergymen's perceptions of authority were related, as predicted, to denominational structure and religious attitudes, such as religious liberalism/conservatism.

The modification made here involved the replacement of the rational-pragmatic authority included in Hammond et al's original work with a traditional authority description. This was done because Hammond et al had failed to include the traditional authority type in their data collection and had expressed regret for having neglected this significant part of Weber's theory. The rational-pragmatic was omitted in this present study because this was not part of Weber's theory and, in fact, Hammond et al found that none of the denominations surveyed identified primarily with this authority base.

The Survey of Ethical Attitudes (Hogan, 1970) is a widely used measure to assess a single dimension of moral philosophy, ranging from the ethics of responsibility to the ethics of conscience. Scores generated from this instrument have been found to be related to personality and attitudinal characteristics in predictable ways. For example, persons whose scores reflected an ethics of conscience orientation were more likely to believe in civil disobedience than persons with an ethics of responsibility orientation(Hogan, 1973).

The 15 item measure of power strategies was created for use in this study since no already existing measure relevant to the clergy role could be found in the literature. Items were created which appeared to be consistent with the three authority bases. These items, organized by authority base, and the accompanying instructions are presented in Table 2. Five power

Insert Table 2 about here

strategy items were devised to represent each authority type.

The background questionnaire included items such as the clergyman's educational attainment, year of ordination, and age, which were useful in describing the subjects of this study and providing the feedback to the organizations.

Results

Preliminary Analyses: Before testing the hypotheses, the instruments were evaluated. The results obtained with this sample on the clergy authority instrument were compared to those obtained by Hammond et al(1978). They reported that Southern Baptist pastors saw their authority as predominantly charismatic; while Roman Catholic priests saw their authority as noncharismatic, that is, as legal-rational. (Recall that Hammond et al did not include a traditional authority type.) In order to determine whether similar results were obtained in the present sample, three one-way analyses of variances were performed comparing the perceptions of Baptists and Catholics on the authority measure. The results were consistent with those of Hammond et al: That is Baptists scored significantly higher on charismatic authority than Catholics, $F(1,92) = 37.92$, $p<.001$; while Catholics scored significantly higher on legal-rational authority than Baptists, $F(1,92) = 6.11$, $p<.02$. No significant differences were found on the traditional authority base.

An alpha coefficient was computed for the Survey of Ethical Attitudes to determine its reliability. The alpha was .78.

The 15-item power strategies instrument received more evaluative attention because it was created for the purposes of this study. The items were factor analyzed to determine if three factors emerged resembling the three groupings, charismatic, traditional, and legal-rational.

Varimax rotation with Kaiser normalization was adapted with factor extraction based on eigenvalues greater than 1.0. With the number of factors set to three, each of the 15 items distinctively loaded on one of the three strategy factors. The items loading on the first factor consisted of charismatic strategies and accounted for 67% of the variance; the second factor consisted of the traditional strategies and accounted for 20% of the variance; the third factor consisted of the legal-rational strategies and accounted for 13% of the variance.

The factor matrix for the 15 items is presented in Table 3. The scores

---

Insert Table 3 about here

--- offer substantial support for the interpretation that the individual items clustered together into the three types, as expected.

Three strategy scales were created on the basis of these results. Responses to items loading over .40 onto a factor as shown in Table 3 were added together to form a scale. Each scale consisted of five items. Alpha coefficients were computed and they indicated adequate reliability: charismatic strategies, alpha=.76; traditional, alpha=.80; legal-rational, alpha=.81. These three scales served as the criterion variables in the hypothesis testing.

Hypothesis Testing: The four hypotheses were tested with stepwise multiple regression analyes. In these, the three predictor variables were Authority Base, Denomination, and Ethics of Responsibility/Conscience. These three predictor variables were coded in the following manner.

Coding: Clergymen were classified as identifying with the authority base they rated as most similar to themselves. If their highest scores were identical for more than one authority base, then they were assigned to the base which they scored the most above the median for their denomination. That is, within denomination, median scores were computed for each authority base and these were compared to each clergyman's ratings if he gave identical and highest ratings to more than one base. Of the highest ratings, the one most above the median was used as indicative of the clergymen's major authority perception. The medians were computed within deonomination so that all three authority bases would be represented among the clergy of each denomination. This would also reduce the redundancy between the two predictor variables, Authority Base and Denomination.

Denomination was simply coded as a zero for Catholic and a one for Baptist. Scores on the Survey of Ethical Attitudes were entered into the multiple regression equations as continuous variables, with high scores reflecting a preference for the ethics of responsibility.

Data Analysis: Three stepwise analyses were conducted; one for each of the power strategy scales. Stepwise analyses provide two statistics useful for testing the hypotheses of this study. First, an F was computed that tested the relationship between each predictor and criterion variable,

independent of the other predictor variables. Second, an F was computed representing the contribution of each predictor variable while covarying the contribution of the first or previous predictor variables. The second type of F indicates if the second and third predictor variables entered into the stepwise regression add significantly to the overall variance acounted for beyond that contributed by the first variable entered. The predictor variable with the strongest independent relationship to the criterion is the first variable to be entered into the equation. The second variable entered has the next strongest association with the criterion variable, and so on.

Hypothesis One: This hypothesis stated that there would be a consistency between authority base and power strategy. This consistency would be supported if the the analyses revealed that Authority Base is significantly related to all three strategy types such that charismatic authority is associated with the use of charismatic strategies, and so on.

The first hypothesis received mixed support from the three analyses. Authority type was significantly related to charismatic strategies, $F(2,83)=6.70$, $p < .002$; and to legal-rational strategies, $F(1,84)= 8.00$, $p < .006$, but not traditional strategies. Table 4 presents the means.

Insert Table 4 about here

Consistent with prediction, clergymen with charismatic authority did report using more charismatic strategies than did clergymen with legal-rational authority, $F(1,68)=15.83$, $p < .001$. Somewhat consistent with prediction, clergymen with traditional authority also reported using marginally more charismatic strategies than did clergymen with legal-rational authority, $F(1,53)=3.72$, $p < .06$. Also, the difference between those with traditional and those with charismatic authority in charismatic strategy use was not significant.

With the legal-rational strategies, none of the multiple comparisons yielded a significant difference. However, clergymen with legal-rational authority were found to use marginally fewer legal-rational strategies compared to clergymen with traditional authority, $F(1,53)=2.98$, $p< .09$. This is contrary to the first hypothesis.

Hypothesis Two: This hypothesis stated that there would be denominational differences in power strategy use and that these differences should reflect those found in authority. That is, this hypothesis will be supported if the three analyses reveal that Denomination is significantly related to all three strategy types such that Baptists report using more charismatic strategies than Catholics and Catholics report using more legal-rational and traditional strategies than Baptists.

The second hypothesis also received mixed suppport. Denomination was significantly related to charismatic, $F(3,82)=4.47$, $p< .006$ and legal-rational, $F(2,83)=5.08$, $p< .03$ strategies. Consistent with prediction, Baptists($M= 31.9$) scored higher than Catholics($M=30.4$) in the use of charismatic strategies. However, contrary to prediction, Baptists scored higher($M=45.4$) than Catholics($M=42.5$) in legal-rational strategy use also.

The relationship between Denomination and traditional strategies was not signficant.

Hypothesis Three: This hypothesis stated that there would be an association between moral philosophy and power strategy use. Specifically, this hypothesis would be supported if the three analyses revealed that Ethics of Reponsibility/Conscience is significantly related to all three strategy types. Clergymen favoring the ethics of responsibility position were expected to use more charismatic or traditional strategies; while those favoring the ethics of conscience are expected to use more legal-rational strategies.

The third hypothesis received some support. Ethics of Responsibility/ Conscience was signficantly related to charismatic strategies, $F(1,84)=12.44$, $p < .001$ and legal-rational strategies, $F(3,82)=4.85$, $p < .004$. The relationship between Ethics and traditional strategies was not significant.

Consistent with prediction, the correlation($r= .35$) between Ethics and charismatic strategy use indicated that those favoring responsibility reported using more charismatic strategies than did those favoring conscience. Contrary to prediction, the correlation($r= .28$) between Ethics and legal-rational strategy use indicated that those favoring responsibility also reported using more legal-rational strategies than those favoring conscience. No relationship between traditonal strategies and ethical orientation was found.

Hypothesis Four: This hypothesis would be supported if Authority was entered into the three stepwise regression equations first, ahead of the other two predictor variables.

The fourth hypothesis was supported only for the legal-rational strategies. Here, Authority was the first variable entered into the equation and Denomination, $F(2,83) = 5.08$, $p < .03$, also contributed a significant amount of variance beyond that contributed by Authority.

For charismatic strategies, Ethics entered the equation first and none of the other predictor variables contributed an additional amount of variance to that accounted for by the relationship between Ethics and charismatic strategies. The significant relationship between Authority and charismatic strategies reported in the test of the first hypothesis was eliminated when Ethics was entered first into the equation.

As suggested by the results regarding hypotheses one through three, none of the predictor variables was significantly related to traditional strategy use.

Additional Analyses: In order to determine if any of the interactions of the three predictor variables contributed significantly to the strategies reported by clergymen, additional analyses were done. Variables representing all two- and three-way interactions were entered into regression equations along with Authority Base, Denomination, and Ethics. None of these interaction terms accounted for a significant amount of variance in predicting power strategy use beyond that accounted for by the main effects.

Also, in order to aid in interpreting the results regarding authority and specific strategies used, additional stepwise analyses were conducted to determine if clergymen with traditional and charismatic authority simply reported using more strategies than clergymen with legal-rational authority to influence their congregations, regardless of strategy types. The criterion variable was the addition of all 15 power strategy items together. The predictor variables were Authority, Ethics, and Denomination. The results indicated that Authority was entered first into the equation with a significant $F(1,85) = 7.22$, $p < .009$. The Authority means are in Table 5 and indicate that clergymen with traditional or charismatic authority reported using more strategies to influence their congregations. Clergymen with legal-rational authority reported using fewer strategies overall than clergymen with either charismatic authority, $F(1,68) = 9.93$, $p < .002$ or traditional authority, $F(1,53) = 4.46$, $p < .04$.

Ethics contributed additional variance of borderline significance, $F(2,84) = 3.87$, $p < .053$. The correlation between Ethics and strategy use ($r = .26$) indicated that clergymen who emphasize responsibility reported using more strategies overall. Denomination did not add a significant amount of variance beyond that contributed by Authority and Ethics, although Denomination alone had a significant relationship with the combined strategies, $F(1,85) = 3.83$, $p < .01$. The Baptist clergymen($M = 84.8$) reported using more strategies than the Catholic clergymen($M = 82.2$).

Discussion

The results of this study demonstrated that the correspondence between authority base and power strategy use is neither simple nor direct. In the domain of religious leadership, perceiving oneself as having charismatic or traditional authority is associated with the greater use of all types of strategies to influence congregations. This means that those perceiving their authority to lead as coming directly (e.g., charismatic) or indirectly (e.g., traditional) from God are more willing to engage in acts designed to influence their congregations than clergymen who perceive their authority as stemming from their own training or professional skill.

The single instance of a direct correspondence between authority and strategy use was between having charismatic authority and using such charismatic strategies as demonstrating the gift of grace or showing one's good nature and sincerity. Note also that clergymen whose authority represented the institutionalization of charisma were equally likely to use charismatic strategies in influencing their congregation. Thus, it would appear that clergymen with only an institutional connection with God also tend to use charismatic strategies.

Despite this correspondence between charismatic authority and strategy use, ethical orientation had a stronger relationship with the use of charismatic strategies than did authority base, thereby suggesting the importance of ethical orientation in promoting the use of charismatic strategies. That is, clergymen who believe that people should be dutiful to social institutions in order to control their evil impulses and to promote the common good are the most likely to use

charismatic strategies. It is argued here that clergymen who favor the ethics of responsibility believe that individuals need to be divinely inspired in order to achieve correct moral behavior. If an individual acknowledges the charisma of the clergyman, then it is that individual's responsibility to obey his leadership.

Correspondence between traditional authority and strategies as well as legal-rational authority and strategies were not found here. In particular, traditional authority was not differentially associated with the use of traditional strategies such as officiating at marriages or conducting services appropriately. Instead, clergymen who perceived themselves as having traditional authority were similar to those with charismatic authority, more likely to influence their congregations using all types of strategies, especially charismatic ones. Even worse for the correspondence position, clergymen who perceived their authority to lead their congregations as based on their training and skill were found to use legal-rational strategies less often than clergymen with traditional or charismatic authority. In fact, clergymen with legal-rational authority were found to be significantly lower in trying to influence their congregations using any strategy at all.

These results contradict the assumption that identifying someone's power base is equivalent to knowing what they do to influence people. Instead, these results suggest that some power bases are associated with the greater use of a wide range of strategies to influence others; while other bases appear to be associated with a reluctance to influence.

Overall, these results suggest that a hierarchy of power bases may exist, with some bases being associated with the use of more power strategies than others. Such a position is consistent with the finding of Kipnis, Schmidt, Swaffin-Smith, & Wilkinson(1984b) who reported that managers who controlled resources or were in positions of dominance used a greater variety of power strategies than managers lower in the institutional hierarchy. In the domain of religious leadership, it appears that authority stemming more closely from God is associated with greater power strategy use than authority stemming from humankind. It is plausible that hierarchies of power bases exist in other domains with those bases closer to the ultimate power source being more likely to influence others in a variety of ways than those bases more remote from the ultimate source.

On a practical level, these results suggest that research on social influence should distinguish power base from power strategy and measure both separately. To include one without the other in a research study is to ignore a major portion of the power dynamics in a given context.

The results of this study suggest that institutional constraints, such as denomination, have a secondary, but still significant relationship to legal-rational and charismatic strategy use. Although one would have expected Baptists to use more charismatic and fewer legal-rational strategies than Catholics, Baptists were found to use more of both types of strategies. This is consistent with the observation that Baptist clergymen have as a goal the "winning of souls," while Roman Catholic clergymen do not generally proselytize.

In addition, denomination did make a significant and independent contribution to the use of legal-rational strategies. This indicates that among Southern Baptists, there is an especially strong preference for the use of educational and administrative strategies. This is consistent with the report by Ingram (1981) who described Southern Baptist pastors as using such strategies to influence their congregations. He concluded that they used two techniques to influence their congregations when they perceived that their positions differed from that of their congregation: role segregation and manipulation. Role segregation meant that the clergyman would restrict his influence attempts to the persuasive messages within his sermons. At other times, he would simply do the congregation's bidding. Manipulation meant that the clergyman would use whatever strategies he saw fit to get what he thought needed to be done. These included controlling the composition of committees to include people favorable to him and doing what he wanted to do regardless of the wishes of the congregation. Both of these strategies are risky if the position advocated by the pastor antagonized many people, because a pastor could be fired if the majority of the congregation voted to dismiss him. According to Ingram, the main reason pastors were able to continue despite their advocating positions contrary to the wishes of their congregations was that most church members were apathetic and preferred maintaining the appearance of harmony.

Ethical orientation was found to have a strong relationship to power strategy use, with the responsibility orientation being closely associated with charismatic strategies. In addition, next to authority base, responsibility orientation had the strongest association with greater strategy use overall. This result suggests that the ethics of responsibility is positively related to power motivation. This speculation is consistent with Bennett(1985)'s position that people who report using more strategies to influence others have higher needs for power and influence.

It should not be surprising that a discrepancy exists between authority base and power strategy use among Christian clergymen. According to Haley (1969), Jesus Christ demonstrated similar discrepancies. That is, Christ perceived and presented himself as having charismatic authority. Nonetheless, Christ did not limit himself to charismatic strategies, such as faith healing, to influence people, but in addition, he engaged in such legal-rational strategies as building an organization of followers and pronouncing new laws to govern them.

What remains to be demonstrated is the generalizability of this discrepancy to other power domains. At present, there is reason to believe that these discrepancies extend beyond religious leadership. Police officers, for example, have the authority to use deadly force, but they rarely use it, considering as more effective the use of such strategies as bargaining to gain compliance(Scharf & Binder, 1983). Further, the hierarchy of authority bases may be associated with variations not only in the number, but also in the order of the strategies used. According to Rule, Bisanz, and Kohn(1985), the power strategy of first choice is asking, followed by self-oriented methods, dyad-oriented methods, appeals to principles, and finally ending with negative tactics. It is possible that people at higher levels of authority have a greater number of strategies all along this sequence and can skip to negative tactics more rapidly than people at lower levels of authority. Future research should be devoted to identifying the hierarchy of authority bases and the relationships between this hierarchy and the use of power strategies.

References

Bennett, J.B. (1985). Power and influence in the personality: A psychometric approach. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, Austin, Texas.

Cartwright, D. (1965). Influence, leadership, control. In J.G. March (Ed.). Handbook of organizations (pp.1-47). New York: Rand McNally & Co.

Centers,R., Raven, B.H., & Rodrigues (1968). Cultural and social class factors in power structure: Decision patterns in the family. University of California, Los Angeles. Technical Report No. 23, Contract 233.

Dahl, R.A. (1957). The concept of power. Behavioral Science, 2(3), 201-215.

Falbo, T. (1977) . Multidimensional scaling of power strategies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35, 537-547.

Haley, J. (1969). The power tactics of Jesus Christ and other essays. New York: Grossman Publishers.

Hogan, R. (1970). A dimension of moral judgment. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 35, 205-212.

Hogan, R. (1973). Moral conduct and moral character: A psychological perspective. Psychological Bulletin, 79, 217-232.

Hammond, P.E., Salinas, L., & Sloane, D. (1978). Types of clergy authority: Their measurement, location, and effects. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 17, 241-253.

Ingram, L.C. (1981). Leadership, democracy, and religion: Role ambiguity among pastors in Southern Baptist Churches. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 20, 119-129.

Kipnis, D. (1984a). The use of power in organizations and in interpersonal settings. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), Applied Social Psychology Annual Vol. 5(pp.179-210), Beverly Hills, California: Sage.

Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S.M., Swaffin-Smith, C., & Wilkinson, I. (1984b). Patterns of managerial influence: Shotgun managers, tacticians, and bystanders. Organizational Dynamics, 58-67.

MacDonald, G.W. (1980). Family power: the assessment of a decade of theory and research, 1970-79. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42, 841-854.

Matocha, E.C. (1986). Personal Communication, March 30.

McGregor, D.M.(1960). The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Pfeffer, J. (1978). Organizational design. Arlington Heights, Illinois: Harlan Davidson, Inc.

Podsakoff, P. M. & Schriesheim, C.A. (1985). Field studies of French and Raven's bases of power: Critique, reanalysis, and suggestions for future research. Psychological Bulletin, 97, 387-411.

Rule, B.G., Bisanz, G.L., & Kohn, M. (1985). Anatomy of a persuasion schema: Targets, goals, and strategies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48, 1127-1140.

Scharf, P. & Binder, A. (1983). The badge and the bullet: Police use of deadly force. New York: Praeger.

Struzzo, J.A. (1970). Professionalism and the resolution of authority conflicts among the Catholic clergy. Sociological Analysis, 31, 92-106.

Weber, M. (1946). From Max Weber (H.H. Gerth & W. Mills Trans.) New York: Oxford University Press.

Weber, M. (1947). Max Weber: The theory of social and economic organization (A. M. Henderson & T. Parsons Trans.) Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.

Table 1

Descriptions of Three Authority Bases

Authority Base	Description
Charismatic	The first clergyman regards his authority as coming directly from God. He received a Divine Call which, in his view, remains in force. His authority, he feels is a direct gift of grace.
Traditional	The second clergyman regards his authority as coming from the office he holds within the church and not from his own personal gifts. His authority stems from his obedience to the Bible, religious doctrine and church traditions as well as from his performance of religious rites and ceremonies.
Legal-Rational	The third clergyman regards his authority as coming from his training, which was recognized by the church in his ordination. In a way, then, he regards himself as a religious "specialist" as a result of his education in theology and other subjects.

Note: The instructions were: Clergymen vary in their perceptions of the source of their authority. Below are three descriptions of hypothetical clergymen. Each one exemplifies a different notion of religious authority. As you read these descriptions, please compare yourself to the hypothetical clergyman. Indicate how similar this description is to you by placing an X on the rating scale at the place that best represents your similarity to the hypothetical clergyman.

Table 2

Power Strategy Items by Type

Strategy Type	Items
Charismatic	
	1. Demonstrating that the gift of God's grace is within me.
	2. Reminding people of the sacred authority of the Bible.
	3. Showing people my good nature and sincerity.
	4. Reminding people that I am God's servant.
	5. Showing them the correct path by my own good example.
Traditional	
	6. Conducting services in a manner appropriate for a Baptist/Catholic church.
	7. Shaking hands and greeting people before and after services.
	8. Officiating at marriages, funerals, and baptisms.
	9. Helping people in times of trouble.
	10. Dressing and behaving appropriately when in public.
Legal-Rational	
	11. Initiating effective planning and goal setting.
	12. Educating my parishioners about Biblical principles.
	13. Developing and implementing appropriate church programs.
	14. Doing all possible to see that the right people are placed in positions of church leadership and responsibility.
	15. Leading study courses on doctrine and teachings.

Table 2 (continued)

Note: The instructions were: One responsibility of being a pastor/priest is that you are expected to lead your church and influence people. Below are several ways that you could use to accomplish this. Indicate the frequency with which you use each of these methods by placing an X on the line that best describes you.

Table 3

Factor Matrix Scores of Power Strategy Items

Power Strategy Items	Three Factors		
	First (Charismatic)	Second (Traditional)	Third (Legal-Rational)
1. Demonstrating grace	.49	.36	.17
2. Reminding Bible	.65	.10	.34
3. Showing good nature	.59	.06	.22
4. Reminding servant	.79	.18	.09
5. Showing correct path	.41	.27	.03
6. Conducting services	.09	.67	.22
7. Shaking hands	.08	.61	.36
8. Officiating	.14	.50	.04
9. Helping people	.06	.51	.11
10. Dressing appropriately	.27	.55	.12
11. Initiating planning	-.02	.15	.55
12. Educating principles	.37	.10	.54
13. Developing programs	.22	-.05	.61
14. Doing all possible	.13	.03	.51
15. Leading study courses	.13	.22	.45

Note: The full text of the items and the instructions can be found in Table 2.

Table 4

Mean Strategy Use by Authority Base

Strategy Type	Authority Base		
	Charismatic (N=33)	Traditional (N=18)	Legal-Rational (N=38)
Charismatic	27.8	26.2	23.9
Traditional	31.1	31.0	29.7
Legal-Rational	27.7	28.1	26.3
All Combined	86.6	85.3	79.9

Note: The relationship between authority base and strategy use is significant for all strategy types with the exception of traditional strategies.